Jamaican Creole morphology and syntax
Peter L. Patrick

Peter L. Patrick

University of Essex

Dept. of Language and Linguistics

Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ

United Kingdom

patrickp@essex.ac.uk

+44 (0) 1206 872 088

Jamaican Creole morphology and syntax
Peter L. Patrick, last rev. November 2003

1   Introduction

Jamaican Creole (JamC, known to its speakers as "Patwa") is a language of ethnic identification for roughly two and a half million people in the island of Jamaica -- and overseas for many thousands of native speakers (and non-natives; see British Creole chapters.) JamC is a canonical example of an Atlantic Creole. One of the first Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles to be described using modern linguistic methods (Loftman 1953, Cassidy 1961), it remains among the best-researched. The first generative grammar of a Creole was Loftman Bailey's *Jamaican Creole Syntax* (1966). The first comprehensive etymological dictionary of a Creole was Cassidy & LePage's *Dictionary of Jamaican English* (1967, hereafter *DJE*).

1. 1   History

JamC owes little or nothing to either the indigenous Arawaks or Spanish invaders, starting with Columbus in 1494, who settled the island in 1509, bringing the first African slaves. By 1601 only a handful of Arawaks remained alive alongside 1,000 Africans. When the British arrived in 1655 with 9,000 troops, they met 6,000 inhabitants, 1,500 of African descent and the rest mostly Spanish; after 1660, a few dozen Spanish remained, while 300 Maroons fought from the mountains. The Maroons today, custodians of African culture, still preserve a distinctive speech form, Maroon Spirit Language (Bilby 1983). Their ranks were supplemented by runaways under slavery, and they maintained their independence by treaty, defeating the British in 1739 and 1795.

However the origins of JamC postdate 1660, in the interaction of British colonists and African slaves. The language did not yet exist in 1658, when the 7,000 settlers and soldiers in the island from Britain, Ireland and the Americas outnumbered Africans 5 to 1; but between 1677, when there were about 9,000 each of whites and blacks, and 1703, when the white population had slightly declined but the numbers of enslaved Africans had risen to 45,000, the roots of JamC were planted. Many key features were in place before 1750, though others can only be documented from the early and mid-19th century (Lalla & D'Costa 1990).

Jamaican language and its place in society reflects the brutal history of Jamaica as a British sugar colony until Independence in 1962. Creolization in the

broadest sense led to emergence of new cultural and social institutions, including language, but the subordination of JamC to English -- the native tongue of a tiny minority -- has persisted to the present day, with consequences for education, economy, and psychological independence. The collapse of the plantation economy between the two world wars brought on mass urbanization, making Kingston the largest "English-speaking" city in the Americas south of Miami (Patrick 1999; Shields-Brodber 1997). Yet only in the 21st century has the Jamaican government seriously begun to explore language planning and recognition of JamC as a national language.

Jamaican Creole's dramatic genesis in British slavery, imperialism and the African diaspora to the Americas has focused creolist research on language contact, especially the influence of African languages (Akan and Kwa families, along with Bantu), and to a lesser extent British English dialects (West of England, Irish and Scots), as well as universals of language acquisition and creation. Over 90% of Jamaica's population are of African origin. Other groups claim Indian, Chinese, Syrian and European heritage; of these, only Europeans were present before 1845 and contributed to the formation of JamC. For all these Jamaicans, JamC is a shared marker of ethnic and national identity which serves to distinguish them from other peoples, and to unite them in possession of a rich, diverse set of discursive resources.

1.2   The Creole continuum

Social stratification in Jamaica is crucial to understanding the extreme variability of contemporary Jamaican speech. The complex linguistic situation may be related to an equally intricate web of social relations, using the model of the creole continuum. This is opposed to discrete multilingual or multidialectal descriptions such as community bilingualism, standard-plus-dialects, and diglossia. The inapplicability of classic diglossia to Jamaica (Ferguson 1959, 1991) motivated DeCamp to invent the (post-)creole continuum model: "There is no sharp cleavage between Creole and standard... [but] a linguistic continuum, a continuous spectrum of speech varieties, ranging from... 'broken language'... to the educated standard" (DeCamp 1971: 350), i.e. from basilect to acrolect.

JamC is natively available to nearly all Jamaicans, but Standard Jamaican English (StJamE), the acrolect, is not -- it is a home language for a small minority, and learned as a second language of school, literacy, mass media and work by others. This is the direct result of the colonial distribution of power in earlier centuries, which worked to create and maximize the norms that still

devalue JamC and elevate StJamE. Many Jamaicans, and even many linguists (Creole-speaking and other), still maintain this contrast in prestige as a base component of their attitudes towards Jamaican language, and it surfaces in many linguistic descriptions.

In truth, both poles of the continuum are idealized abstractions, a collection of features most like standard Englishes (the acrolect) or most distant from them (basilect). Yet between these poles lies the continuum of everyday speech: a series of minimally differentiated grammars with extensive variation – – an apparently seamless web connecting two idealized varieties, which arose in the same place and time-frame and share distinctive features, yet cannot be genetically related.

The descriptive problem is thus to reconcile genetic descent and nongenetic, contact-induced language change within a finely-graded continuum. While StJamE is recognized as an English dialect, descended by normal transmission from 17th and 18th-century British input dialects, creolists agree that the grammar of basilectal JamC differs radically from native English dialects, due to extensive language contact resulting in structural mixing. There is less agreement on whether this process took the form of abrupt creolization, whether a pidgin developed in the island first, or whether a prior pidgin existed -- e.g. on the African coast -- and was relexified (Cassidy 1971; Alleyne 1980; Singler 1984; Hancock 1986; Lalla & D'Costa 1990). The prevailing opinion is that this sharp contrast makes it impossible to relate JamC genetically to English -- or indeed to its African input languages, with which there is also a radical structural break (Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001) -- though it bears obvious historical links to both.

1.3   The Jamaican mesolect

As linguists since Bailey have preferred to focus on these extremes, most research concentrated on basilectal JamC, until the recent emergence of studies on StJamE (Christie 1982; Shields 1989, Shields-Brodber 1997; Mair 2003, Mair & Sand 1998, Sand 1999). (Patrick 1999 is the only study of the mesolect.) Yet in purely social and demographic terms, the most important variety in Jamaica is the intermediate one known as the mesolect; its broad limits include the speech uttered by most Jamaicans, in most situations. Although empirical data for language description of JamC are nearly always drawn from points within the continuum (i.e. the mesolect), it remains undertheorized and underdescribed.

This may be because most linguistic treatments of JamC adopt a categorical perspective (Chambers 1995), seeking to explain away inherent

3

linguistic variation by attributing it to the random mixing of so-called 'invariant grammars', viz., the basilect and acrolect. Thus Bailey (1971: 342) tried to model mesolectal speech as "standard with incursions from the creole, or creole with incursions from the standard" through "borrowing and interference", while Akers (1981: 4) believed it was due to a failure of acquisition by speakers who "incompletely control their code". Both views portray Jamaicans as less than competent in their everyday language, and the mesolect as grammar-less.

Such an approach fails to reach descriptive adequacy. The mesolect cannot be reduced to interference between two discrete, polar systems, and no such detailed description has ever been attempted. The existence of language ideologies and attitudes (resembling those commonly found in bilingual communities) which do not explicitly grant the mesolect autonomy, should not mislead as to its systematic internal organization (Beckford Wassink 1999; Muhleisen 2002). Although highly variable, it comprises a grammar describable via both qualitative linguistic generalizations and quantitative constraints, which has evolved over three centuries, arriving at a set of socially-evaluated patterns with their own historical and cultural ecology. Its post-creolization development is broadly similar to that of other, non-creole speech communities, to which variationist theory and descriptive methods have been profitably applied (Chambers, Trudgill and Schilling-Estes 2002). Earlier speculations that the creole continuum might be so variable as not to constitute a speech community at all proved unfounded (Patrick 2002).

In the most detailed account of the mesolect, Patrick (1996, 1999) concludes that it is characterized by the systematic presence and integration of English forms and rules in a partial and variable, but non-random, manner. On this view, mesolectal grammar does not result from improvised mixing or code-switching between two polar varieties, nor are its speakers fossilized learners. Rather, the mesolect is an organized, distinctive collection of elements with a long history and its own complex norms, structures and social patterning. Many choices and variants are possible within it, but many are not. Ways of speaking are not accidental but conventionalized; borrowing occurs, but is not the sole source of variation; grammatical rules exist and interlock; and it is transmitted through normal language acquisition. Though change occurs, the mesolect contrasts with newer and less stable varieties such as BrC.

Despite the defining presence of English elements, which mark it off clearly from the basilect, the mesolect shares with the latter many constraints, structures and organizing principles which are not generally characteristic of native dialects of English. Insofar as creoles are defined through such contrasts

(Mühleisen 2002), the mesolect is thus Jamaican Creole, and not Jamaican English (i.e. it cannot be genetically related to English). Indeed, it probably appeared earlier than the basilect (Alleyne 1971). English-like surface forms (some exclusive to the mesolect, e.g. *did*, others shared with the acrolect, e.g. *neva*, or even the basilect, e.g. *ben* -- all three tense-markers are discussed below) characteristically alternate with zero, governed by constraints shared with basilectal JamC but not with native Englishes. This pattern is found in both earlier Jamaican texts and contemporary speech.

The mesolect is naturally the primary object of description here, with frequent reference also to basilectal structures. Though there is a clear dividing line between these two grammars (Patrick 1999), there is none between mesolect and acrolect, since the partial presence of English forms and constraints merges indistinguishably into the possession of full competence in StJamE. While the many structures shared with the basilect provide a firm linguistic basis for treating the mesolect as JamC, there is no such structural warrant for restricting "English" only to the high acrolect -- it is strictly the power of social convention which influences speakers, and therefore linguists, to do so.

In practice, this lack of a sharp upper boundary creates difficulties in analysing some speakers or texts. The search for a single point, a linguistic and social division, where StJamE starts and JamC ends, is the misguided product of colonial language ideologies. Below, however, illustrative contrasts are drawn. This coincides with the symbolic value speakers attach to fine, or even illusory, distinctions between "proper English" and "Patwa" (a term broad enough to encompass, at times, everything but the high acrolect).

1.4   The data and orthography

Much data below is cited from written records. Cassidy's phonemic orthography (1961) has served as a model for many other Creole writing systems, but is little-followed by Jamaican writers. Uncredited data (and most translations) are by the author or recorded informants, and generally follow Cassidy. While creolists generally prefer a diachronic perspective, and seek out "pure" basilectal forms as evidence of earlier stages of language development, the description below is synchronic and does not privilege the basilect. This may affect some analyses, e.g. whether to treat *se* 'say' under complementation or verb serialization.

2   Tense, mood and aspect marking

2.1   A Creole TMA system?

All descriptions of basilectal JamC agree that it combines invariant pre-verbal particles with unmarked verb stems to express these grammatical categories, where native Englishes typically use verbal auxiliaries, inflectional suffixes and agreement-marking. It is also generally argued that contrasting linguistic categories and semantic values underlie and constrain these formal differences.

The most influential account is given by Bickerton (1975, 1981) for creoles in general. Three main categories -- anterior tense, irrealis mood, and non-punctual aspect -- each have a principal preverbal marker, which must combine in the order T-M-A. In creoles, Bickerton argued, states, habitual situations and progressive events can all be described as having nonpunctual aspect. Further, verb stativity is said to crucially affect the occurrence and interpretation of markers of past-reference: bare nonstative verbs receive a default past-reference reading, while statives are nonpast unless preceded by a tense-marker. These claimed syntactic and semantic properties together describe a grammar that "clearly bears no relation to the system of English" (Bickerton 1975:47). This gives the following paradigm:

	Stativity	Pre-V Marker	Meaning	Examples
(1)	+stative	none	present, habitual	*Mi Ø lov im*
(2)	–stative	none	past	*Mi Ø run*
(3)	+stative	*(b)en/did*	past	*Mi ben lov im*
(4)	–stative	*(b)en/did*	past-before-past	*Mi ben ron*

with the translations:

(1)   'I love her' (now) / 'I love her' (habitually)

(2)   'I ran'

(3)   'I loved her'

(4)   'I had run' (before some other past event or action)

Bickerton argued that creole basilects, including JamC, do not have an absolute past tense, but rather a relative anterior tense. Instead of taking the moment of speaking as an absolute reference point (with past tense required for events before it, and future for events after), this point is relative. For stative verbs it is the moment of speaking, but for verbs of action it is some relevant

earlier moment. Thus when they are preceded by a past marker (*ben* in 5), they refer to a *past-before-past* action, sometimes called *remote past*.

(5)   *Father Manley fight and mek black pickney go a St Hilda's school,*
        where no black pickney couldn't ben go first time. (Sistren 1987: 105)
        'Manley fought so that black children could go to St Hilda's school,
        where no black children had been able to go in the old days.'

While Bickerton's description often matches JamC utterances at surface level, the analysis is flawed. It is widely conceded that this scheme fails to account for the full range of facts over many creoles (Singler 1990), and articulates poorly with general TMA and typological studies (Winford 2000). However it is rarely noted that, as a categorical analysis assuming privative oppositions, it misconceives the nature of creole grammars, including JamC. That is, it predicts a strict form-meaning isomorphy which does not hold: e.g., in order to convey a past-before-past meaning, a nonstative verb must be marked with an anterior marker (basilectal *ben* and variants *wen, en, min*; mesolectal *did*); and when so marked, it must receive such a reading. In reality, exceptions occur in both directions. The prediction is worth refuting because many other linguists give such idealized accounts of creole grammars.

2.2   Habitual, progressive and completive aspect
Progressive aspect is uniformly signalled by preverbal *a* (6-7), while habitual aspect is often unmarked (1), though at an earlier stage both were marked alike in a single imperfective category with *(d)a* (*da* and *de* persist in western Jamaica, Bailey 1966: 138). It is still possible to mark habitual with *a+Verb*, just like the progressive. Aspectual *a* is tense-neutral in JamC, and may be preceded by tense-markers (*ben+a, did+a, ben+de, was+a* etc.).

| (6) | -stative | *a, de* | progressive | *Mi a ron* |
| (7) | -stative | *ben/did + a/de* | past progressive | *Mi ben a ron* |

(6)   'I'm running' / 'I was running' / 'I (used to) habitually run'
(7)   'I was running' / 'I used to habitually run'

Completive aspect is signalled by *don*, which unlike other TMA markers may occur not only preverbally but after the verb phrase (8-9), or even both.

(8)   *Him lucky we never nyam him too, for we did done cook already.* (Sistren 1987: 30)

'It's lucky we didn't eat it too, for we had already cooked.' *[of a chicken]*

(9)   *Dem deh-deh, till she cook and we nyam done.* (Sistren 1987: 82)

'They stayed there until she had cooked and we had finished eating.'

2.3   Anterior tense

In both basilectal and mesolectal JamC, anterior markers occur more rarely than Bickerton's analysis predicts, and occur in environments where they are not predicted. Bare verb forms are very common, and do not have a single necessary interpretation. Instead of being precisely regulated by syntactic or semantic factors, the occurrence of anterior markers is inherently variable, correlated with such discourse features as provision of background information (Pollard 1989; Sankoff 1990). JamC is thus governed by a principle of wider application:

Mark past-tense more often when temporal organization of the discourse is disrupted, and less often when it is predictable.

This principle also operates in other variable discourse contexts, such as the English historical present (Schiffrin 1981). JamC is much less often constrained by concord than English, but where both are variable, similar pragmatic constraints apply. Furthermore, the tense interpretation of bare verbs interacts with the specificity of the noun-phrase (section 10.3).

In urban mesolectal JamC today *ben* is infrequent (though recognized, in fact stereotyped as rural, by all). Preverbal *did* occurs instead (10). This *did* cannot be confused with the English emphatic auxiliary, which does not exist in JamC (past *did* cannot be stressed). Tense-marking *did*, popularly identified with urban speech and positively valued, appears most commonly among older speakers, and is receding among the young (Patrick 1999). Infrequently, non-concord *was* occurs to mark past-reference -- typically in progressive *was+a+Verb*, more rarely with nominal or locative complements, and not at all with perfective meaning (i.e., ...*was du* in 10).

(10)   *If yu luk pan we Itla did du ina Jaamani*

'If you consider what Hitler did in Germany'

Linguists analyzing creole languages often create grammars for them which are neat, efficient and functional, claiming they do not formally mark information which is recoverable from context -- thus contrasting with older natural languages in which redundancy is a design feature. Comrie argues that JamC "omit[s] tense markers when an overt adverbial of time location is present" (1985: 31). Again, this constraint is not categorical but a tendency, often overruled: not only do unmarked past-reference forms occur in the absence of adverbials, but mutual cooccurrence is also common:

(11)   *Ten tauzin yiers ago dem did penichriet aal dem ting*.
       'Ten thousand years ago they already understood all those things.'

The negative past form is *neva*. While in the acrolect and upper mesolect it is adverbial, like English, lower on the continuum it is a tense-marker. Thus for acrolectal speakers presence of *neva* is not correlated with verb-inflection, time-reference is absolute, and *neva* may be used predictively. For lower mesolectal speakers, inflection is prohibited after *neva*, as after other preverbal particles (12), while time-reference is relative past; perfective meaning is the norm, as for many vernacular English dialects (Cheshire 1982), and predictive use does not occur. (Rarely, *neva* redundantly combines with *did* in *neva did*, parallel to basilectal *no ben*.) *Neva* coexists with tense-neutral preverbal negator *no*, which is more common in the basilect (13). *Neva*, like *did*, is preferred among older urban speakers.

(12)   *Dat manggo chrii dier, notn neva du it*.
       'Nothing (has ever) happened to that mango tree.'

(13)   *Im no biznis huu it kyach*.
       'He didn't care who got shot.'

3   Verb forms
3.1   Verb inflection

The common mesolectal occurrence of variable, English-like verb inflection with *-ed* is a striking contrast with the basilect. Variable inflection appears to be a general feature of Caribbean English Creole grammars, holding true as well in BbdC (Blake 1997) and BahC (Hackert 2001). Despite earlier linguists' belief that it results from error or dialect mixing, regularization and hyper-correct insertion of *-ed* are extremely rare. Patrick (1999) found that fully

one-third of past-reference verbs in urban speech were inflected for tense on the surface, with a wide range of individual variation (though speakers who used *did* or *neva* were least likely to inflect verbs). Bare, uninflected verbs occurred well over half of the time, and preverbal past-markers only 10%; only a single possibly hyper-correct form was found in 15 hours of speech.

Strong verbs are the least-often inflected. In this, JamC resembles the creoles just mentioned, but differs from other varieties of English which variably mark the past, such as AAVE and African American Diaspora varieties in Samaná, Nova Scotia and Liberia (Fasold 1972; Poplack & Tagliamonte 2001; Singler 1984): in these varieties, as well as for English second-language learners, irregular verbs are overwhelmingly marked *more* often than regular verbs. For a number of strong verbs in JamC, the stem corresponds to an English past form: *los* 'lose', *marid* 'marry', *gaan* 'go away, leave', *bruk* 'break', *lef* 'leave' – at least the last two being widely-shared with Creoles from West Africa to the Carolinas to Guyana (Hancock 1969). Upper-mesolectal speakers do inflect irregular verbs, but this marks a very salient distinction between them and other JamC speakers.

Just as with *did* and *neva*, in the mesolect the variable use of English inflectional *-ed* is governed not by absolute past tense but by anteriority -- understood as a general discourse principle -- and/or stativity. However, the tendency for stativity to favor past-marking is not a general syntactic constraint as Bickerton originally proposed, but the effect of a handful of very common stative verbs such as *have*, combined with the tendency for statives to appear in background clauses, e.g. in narration (Patrick 1999; confirmed for BahC by Hackert 2001).

It is not clear how far the basilect can be described as morphologically invariant, but verb inflection in mesolectal JamC is common and significant, despite being discounted in traditional descriptions. Yet while inflection may resemble English, when it occurs it is governed by classic creole constraints. Only at the upper reaches of the continuum do English grammatical principles apply, for speakers who inflect the great majority of their past-reference verbs.

3.2 Person and number agreement

Person and number are not marked on finite verbs in all forms of JamC. That is, present-tense verbs with third-person singular subjects never show inflection with *-s*, and the verb paradigm is perfectly regular (14).

(14) *Dis wan swiit im.*

'This one pleases her.'

This is linked to two other facts about JamC discussed below: (subject) pronouns are not distinguished for case, and auxiliary inversion does not occur (15). All three properties cooccur in some regional dialects of British English too, either for a subset of agreement-less finite verbs, or more generally (Henry 1995). Many Jamaicans are aware of the existence of verbal *-s* in English, and may use it when "cutting English" or talking "speaky-spoky" (Russell 1990: 189; Patrick 1997).

Radford analyzes this, in the terms of minimalist syntax, as an indication that "only interpretable head-features survive" in JamC (1997: 183), i.e. only elements which contribute to meaning. Following this line, rather than say that there is no verbal agreement in JamC, one might say that there are no uninterpretable agreement features -- thus it automatically satisfies the Principle of Full Interpretation in this respect. This focus on the importance of meaning-bearing elements in the grammar might be one respect in which JamC could be characterized as "simpler" than StdE, where earlier broad-brush efforts to say that creoles e.g. lack morphology or derivational depth have proven incorrect (though see section 9 below). The venerable project of finding simplicity in creole structures is however a questionable, ideologically-motivated mission (DeGraff 2001, Mühleisen 2002).

3.3   (Modal) auxiliaries and past participles

JamC lacks the primary auxiliary verbs present in most English dialects: forms of *be*, *do*, *have* (though it possesses main-verb counterparts of *do* and *have*). The functions they normally perform are either absent (e.g. subject-inversion in questions, 15) or carried out by other elements (e.g. the invariant particles marking TMA). There is no distinction between simple past and present perfect verb forms in JamC (*iit* 'eat, eaten'), and neither requires an auxiliary or preverbal marker; distinct participial forms do not occur, and thus cannot be generalized, nor substituted by preterite (e.g. AAVE *had went*). Ellipses like English *They do*, without a main verb, are not possible with JamC modals.

(15)   *Im no lov dem ting?*
       'Doesn't she like those things?'

However, JamC does have a full complement of modal auxiliaries. Bailey (1966) divides them syntagmatically into two groups:

11

(16)   Mod–1:   *mos(–a, –i)*   'must'
                kuda   'could'
                wuda   'would'
                shuda   'should'
                mait(–a)   'might, may'
                wi   'will'

(17)   Mod–2:   *kyan*   'can'
                fi   'ought'
                hafi   'must'
                mos(–a, –i)   'must'

As in English, modals show no agreement; as in regional British and American varieties, double modals occur in JamC. In fact, over a dozen combinations are possible, and even triple modals may occur. (Mod–1) (Mod–2) are followed by a Tense marker (if any), an Aspect marker (if any), and a main verb. This gives the order M–T–A, as in *Im shuda-$_M$ en-$_T$ a-$_A$ ron* 'He should have been running.' Triple modals involve interpolation of *mos* between other forms. Thus, simplifying away the T and A components, one finds:

(18)   Mod–1 Verb: *Dem mosi nuo.*
                        'They must (have) know(n)/They certainly knew'

(19)   Mod–2 Verb: *Mi hafi gaan.*
                        'I must leave'

(20)   Mod–1 Mod–2 Verb   *Dem kuda kyan bai a bred*.
                        'They would be able to buy a loaf of bread.'

(21)   Mod–1 *mos* Mod–2 Verb   *Wi wuda mos hafi riich soon!*
                        'We really ought to arrive soon!'

A mesolectal past modal not mentioned by Bailey (1966), *had was*, occurs only with infinitival *to* (not the typical JamC *fi*), with the meaning 'had to' (22). This appears to be sometimes extended to purposive clauses with the verb *wanted* (23). Interestingly, *was* here is redundant in its tense-marking function.

Alongside main-verb *sapuoz* 'suppose', there is also semi-auxiliary *sapuosi* with epistemic modal force, as in *sapuosi kyan kom* 'ought to be able to come'.

(22) *My stepfaada had was to tell him not to come back to our yard.* (Sistren 1987: 270)
      'My stepfather had to tell him not to come back to where we lived.'

(23) *Him do it because him wanted was to control di people living in di Underworld.* (Sistren 1987: 263)
      'He did it because he wanted to control the people living in the Underworld.'

4   Negation
4.1   Sentential negation

The simplest and most common structure in JamC sees a single, invariant negator *no* (reducible to /na/) before the verb (13, 15); adverbs may intervene. It combines with the basilectal tense marker as *no ben*, which is functionally equivalent to *neva* (see above).

Most speakers also have tense-neutral *duont*. *Duont* is typically non-past or imperfective (24), but may occur with any time-reference or aspect, including perfect (25) and with untensed clauses (26). It is not restricted to psychic-state or habitual verbs (25), contra Bailey (1966:54).

(24) *She don't fight woman; a pure man she fight.* (Sistren 1987: 271)
      'She doesn't(/didn't) fight women; she only fights(/fought) men.

(25) *Up to now, Spangler don't come back in di area.* (Sistren 1987: 279)
      'Until this day Spangler has not come back into the area.'

(26) *Him may leave today to go out to all di countryside, far district,*
      and don't come back tomorrow. (Sistren 1987: 25)
      'He may leave today to go out all over the countryside,
      and not come back tomorrow.'

4.2   Negative tags and negative imperatives

No and *duont* also occur as interrogative tags on either negative or affirmative declaratives (and *no*, but not *duont*, as imperative tag, on affirmative requests only). However, it is not always clear whether tags with *na* are related

13

to negative *no*. *Duont* may also be preposed (28, 29). Negative imperatives may occur with either negator; the typical basilectal form requires an expletive verb *bada* (< *bother*, 29) while *duont*, being verbal, requires none. As a rhetorical question or interjection, *no mos* indicates that something is expected or obvious (30).

(27) *Shut unu ai, na!* (Roberts 1973: 37)
      Shut your (pl.) eyes, won't you?

(28) *A di bridj im a taak, duont? Duont a di bridj im a taak?* (Roberts 1973: 20)
      'It's the bridge he's talking about, isn't it? Isn't it the bridge he's talking about?'

(29) *No bada gwaan bad. / Duon gwaan bad, yaa?*
      'Do not misbehave (you hear?).'

(30) *'Den yu a go kom tinait?' 'No mos!'*
      'Then you're going to come tonight?' 'Of course!'

4.3   Negative concord and other negative forms

Negative concord is the norm in JamC: as in many dialects of English, negative adverbials and nominals (e.g. *nontaal* 'not (at all)', *nombadi* 'nobody') may agree with a sentential negator, without contributing additional negative force. In contrast with some analyses of AAVE however, in JamC such sympathetic negation need not apply on every possible occasion. Thus (31) might as well have concluded with negative *nomo* as positive *again*. Since auxiliary inversion does not occur, there is no negative inversion. The form *ain't* does not occur in JamC, nor does negative tag *innit* (though both do in BrC).

There is coalescence of *no* with progressive particle *a*, giving preverbal *naa*, which is used both for progressive and for periphrastic future (32). Most modals have negative forms (33), except *wi*. Negative *kyàan* is differentiated from positive *kyán* by the former's low tone (Sutcliffe 1992: 104) and vowel length, and is much less likely to contain a palatal glide, especially in formal speech (34).

(31) *Don't me done tell yuh seh me na go do nutten again.* (Sistren 1987: 70)
      'Haven't I told you already that I'm not going to do anything further?'

(32) *Nabadii na a kom ina mai aus.* (Roberts 1973: 36)
      'Nobody is going to come into my house.'

(33) Mod-1:   *kudn*   Mod-2:   *no fi*
                 wudn   *naafi* (< *no hafi*)
                 shudn   *mosn*
                 maitn

(34) *If I kyán only get word to him... Mama kyàan catch us because we run.*
      'If I could only get word to him... Mama couldn't catch us because we ran'

Finally, copular forms of *be* from StJamE appear first in the mesolect in negated form, e.g. *wasn't*. Another mesolectal form, *nat*, alternates with *no* most often in structures corresponding to English *be+not+Complement* or *be+not+Verb-ing*, though frequently without an overt *be*-form.

5   Word order, focus and copular structures
5.1   Word order

JamC word order is head-initial: in verb phrases the order is thus [V – NP], while prepositions occur in [P – NP] order, determiners appear as [Det – N], and adjectives as [Adj – N]. It is uniformly Subject-Verb-Object, like most Atlantic English-lexicon Creoles. Lacking auxiliary inversion, as noted, it also lacks negative and question inversion. *Yes-no* questions differ from declaratives only in having a final-rise intonation contour. The main deviation from surface SVO order occurs in focus structures.

5.2   The copula: Functions and significance

JamC has no single copular verb matching English *be*, but employs a range of forms differentiated by function. These verbs are tense-neutral and uninflected, combining with preverbal TMA markers; some alternate with zero-forms, others are necessarily overt. Alternation with non-concord (but tense-specific) forms of *be* also occurs in the mesolect. However, full forms of *be* are the norm, while contracted forms are surprisingly uncommon compared to AmE and BrE.

There is sharp contrast with native English varieties in the distribution of forms and functions; possibilities of alternation and absence; and relative frequencies of copula presence by syntactic environment. The exception is African American Diaspora varieties of English, with which significant

resemblances have been observed. The distribution of JamC copular forms has figured importantly in debates concerning historical linkage between AAVE and Caribbean English Creoles.

5.3   The copula in progressive forms

Progressive *a+Verb* is discussed above (6, 7); an alternating mesolectal form is *Ø+Verb+in*. Tense-specific variation of zero with *is/was* also occurs here, though *a* itself is incompatible with both *be*-forms and with the *-in* suffix. Contrary to notions of neat separation according to forms, the so-called basilectal *a+Verb* form is used at all levels of the mesolect, while predominantly basilectal speakers are familiar with the supposedly mesolectal *Ø+Verb+in* form (Patrick 1988). Several main verbs which are semantically continuative typically take *a+Verb* complements: *kipaan* 'keep on', *gwaan* 'go on', *depan* 'be engaged in an action or activity; in a state of continuing or repeated action' (lit. locative *de + pan* 'upon, on in, at').

5.4   The copula in equative forms

In equative contexts, a subject and a nominal complement are joined by the verb *a*. In older JamC, the form was *da* (35). This varies mesolectally with non-concord *is/was*. Zero copula does occur, but Rickford's (1996: 225) quantitative data show an overt copula more than 80% of the time.

(35)   *Ebry day da fishing day, but ebry day no fe catch fish*.   (*DJE*: 141, from 1873)
   'Every day is a day for fishing, but you won't catch fish every day.'

Bailey treats *niem* 'name' as a distinctive verb (1966: 33) in constructions such as *Mi niem Piita* 'My name is Peter/I am named Peter'. They do not allow an overt copula in JamC; in her analysis, they are not equative but predicative.

5.5   Focus structures: Predicate clefting

The same form *a* serves to focus a wide range of fronted or clefted constituents, both predicative and non-predicative. The fronted item receives stress and emphatic or contrastive meaning. Only predicative elements are copied in the original sentence position when clefted; they include verbs (36, 38), adjectives (37) and, uniquely among modals, *mos* (38). Variation of *a* with *is* occurs, giving present or perfect meaning, but no other *be*-form appears in this structure.

(36)   *A swel it swel, luk da. A bigfut dem gi mi.*
       'It certainly **swelled** up, look there. Somone gave me the bigfoot.'

(37)   *Luk hou a krievm im krievm.*
       'See how **greedy** she is!'

(38)   *A mos im mosi gaan aredi*   or   *A gaan im mosi gaan aredi.*
       'He **must** have left already.'   'He must have **left** already.'

5.6   Focus structures: Other types of clefting

Non-predicative elements may be clefted similarly but are not copied. These include pronouns and nouns (28, 36, 39), locative phrases (40), temporal phrases (41), manner adverbials, and question-words (42). *Wh*-questions are normally clefted, and have a falling intonation contour; they may be introduced by *a*, *is*, or zero. Louise Bennett, the paragon of basilectal folk-poets, shows such variation as *A noh sintin... Is sintin...* 'It's not something that... It's something that...' (Bennett 1966: 126).

(39)   *She waan mi fi come back cause a she one deh-deh and she fraid.* (Sistren 1987:77)
       'She wanted me to return for **she alone** was there and she was afraid.'

(40)   *A wisaid unu a go go luk fi im? A wichpaat im de ya?*
       'Where are you (pl.) going to look for him? Where is he?'

(41)   *Afta it kom oot a di fut, a chrii die schriet hit bon mi.*
       'After it came out of my foot, it burned me for **three days straight**.'

(42)   *Lord God! A weh a go tell me madda seh?* (Sistren 1987: 69)
       'Lord God! What am I going to tell my mother?'

(43)   *Yes, Brer Puss, all di weddin' you was a come a yahso,*
       you was a come come eat out di butta!   (Dance 1985: 19)
       'Yes Brother Puss, even the "weddings" you were coming to here,
       you were only coming to finish eating the butter!'

Other focus constructions are common in JamC as well. Pseudo-clefts occur with initial *aal* 'all', which may have either quantitative force or intensive, or both (43). Non-restrictive relatives often use an identificational left-dislocation structure (72).

5.7   The copula with adjectives and locatives

Zero copula is normal before bare predicate adjectives in JamC (Rickford 1996 finds it to be near-categorical). Predicate adjectives in JamC may be negated by *no*, may follow preverbal TMA markers (44), and may be the complement of a modal. Progressive *a* conveys a processual interpretation (45) with semantically appropriate nonstative verbs (Winford 1996); this also happens with the comparative (*deh-deh a colder*), or with the simple adjective plus the process verb *get* (*deh-deh a get cold*). Bailey notes that the quantitative adjectives *likl* 'little', *nof* 'much, many; abundant' and *tumoch* 'too many' have predicative functions, and thus do not require an overt copula (1966: 43).

When adjectives modify a following noun complement (Adj-N is the order of modification in JamC), i.e. when they are attributive, the equative copula is required, as expected.

(44)   *Mi ongl se im did shaat!*
'I only said he was short!'

(45)   *Yuh wife cook yuh dinner and it deh-deh a cold.* (Sistren 1987: 72)
'Your wife cooked your dinner and it sits there getting cold.'

(46)   *Dem musn kom ko nobadii no di de an tiicha no da ya.* (Roberts 1973: 37)
'They mustn't come because nobody is there and Teacher is not here.'

(47)   *Yu hav wan sinting __ niem Ruolin Kyaaf.*
'There is something __ called Rolling Calf.'

A distinct, tense-neutral verb *de* 'be there' occurs with locatives (45, 46), either taking a prepositional complement or question-finally; it is homophonous with *de* 'there'. Studying a text "replete with basilectal or 'deep creole' elements", Rickford finds verbal *de* "the most persistent of the creole copulas" (1996: 221, 227), occurring in about two-thirds of all locatives. However, even

here he finds in nearly 20% of cases *iz/waz* are used; these *be*-forms occur before locatives throughout the mesolect as well.

Returning to the significance of comparisons made between creoles (JamC in particular) and AAVE, Baugh (1980) was the first to look for separate patterning of *be*-forms before adjectives and locatives in AAVE, theorizing that they might confirm its creole ancestry. While the AAVE data on this point remain complex and equivocal (Rickford 1996, 1998), there is no doubt of the dramatic contrast between these structures within JamC: overt copula forms of any sort are rare before predicate adjectives, but zero copula is rare before locatives.

Existential meaning in JamC is expressed by the verb *hav*, often with an indefinite pronoun subject *yu* or *dem* (47; here and in other examples containing a relative clause the gap site is marked "__").

6   Complementation and subordination

JamC clause structure contrasts with English dialects in several ways. Non-finite complements use the verb stem only: there are no gerund forms with *-in(g)*. More radically, JamC like other Atlantic Creoles possesses serial verb constructions (SVCs, below), due to the substrate influence of West African languages.

6.1   Nonfinite clauses

JamC does not always require a particle (e.g. English *to*) to precede non-finite clauses (48); as in StdE, some verbs optionally select bare infinitive clauses. The default infinitive marker is *fi* (not to be confused with modal *fi*), but *tu* alternates for upper mesolectal speakers. *Fi* often occurs with purposive clauses (49), and as the complement of the desiderative verb *waan* 'want'. Impersonal subjects of adjectives also take *fi*-complements (50), as do animate subjects (51-52). Structures like *Mi glad for see you* are attested as early as 1774 (Lalla and D'Costa 1990: 89). Unlike StdE, constructions like **John is easy to cry* are acceptable (51). Imperatives can be formed with *Pliiz tu + Verb* (e.g. *Pliiz tu kom dis said* 'Come over here').

(48)   *Him start tell di cousins all sort a someting*. (Sistren 1987: 103)
        'He started to tell the cousins all kinds of things.'

(49)   *She only do half day work fi come fi follow him go a airport*. (Sistren 1987: 103)

'She only worked a half day in order to come here to follow him to the airport.'

(50)   *I hard fi kraas di riba*   or   *Di riba haad fi kraas.*
       'It's hard to cross the river.'   'The river is hard to cross.'

(51)   *Jan iizi fi krai.*   or   *I iizi fi Jan fi krai.* (Bailey 1966: 125)
       'John cries easily.'   'It is easy for John to cry.'

(52)   *Him fraid fi grab it, for him fraid me tear it.* (Sistren 1987: 103)
       'He was afraid to grab it, for he was afraid I would tear it.'

6.2   Finite clauses

JamC declarative complementizers include *se* 'say' and the all-purpose *dat* 'that'; both take finite complements and alternate with zero, so that in general it is possible for no complementizer to appear before a subordinate clause. *Se* is restricted to following verbs of speech (53), thought (e.g. *biliib* 'believe', *nuo* 'know', *fain* 'realize'), perception (*sii* 'see', *yier* 'hear') or emotion (*sari* 'sorry', *shiem* 'shame'); it probably derived from a serial construction for speech alone. It may serve as complement to predicate adjectives, and can be stranded by clefting of *wh*–items (42). Complementizer *se* cannot follow main-verb *se* 'say', thus testifying to its incomplete grammaticalization. Some psychic–state verbs however typically take zero complementizers, such as *biznis* 'care'. In (54), we might equally have found *Dat mean dat...* or *Dat mean se...* All these forms are very common; examples (48–49, 52–54) occur on a single page of dialogue, randomly chosen.

(53)   *Him all swear seh him was going to tell me.* (Sistren 1987: 103)
       'He even swore that he was going to tell me.'

(54)   *Dat mean him deh go tek set pon me.* (Sistren 1987: 103)
       'That means (that) he is going to become malignly fixated upon me.'

6.3   Subordinating conjunctions

JamC uses several subordinating conjunctions which are either absent, or now archaic, in StdE. (The coordinating conjunctions *an*, *bot*, *ar*, *nar* function similarly to their StdE counterparts *and*, *but*, *or*, *nor*.) These include conditional forms such as *wais* 'whilst, if, provided' and *sieb* 'except, unless' (55, from

save), causal *sieka* 'because of' and *tru* 'because' (from *for the sake of* and *through*; 56), temporal *wen(eva)taim* 'when(ever)' (57), concessive *no kya* 'No matter' (58, from *no care*) and manner *laka se* 'as if' (59, from *like say*).

(55)   *Yu kyaan kom iin-ya siev yu pie yu fier* (*DJE*: 394)
        'You can't come in here unless you pay your fare.'

(56)   *She just tell him dat tru him leggo di secret.* (Sistren 1987: 184)
        'She just told him that because he let out her secret.'

(57)   *Weneva taim dat im kom, im gwain plie a trik.* (*DJE*: 469)
        'When she comes she is going to play a prank.'

(58)   *No kya we yu go yu naa fain non.* (Bailey 1966: 58)
        'No matter where you go, you won't find any.'

(59)   *Him ron laka se dem set daag ata im.* (*DJE*: 270)
        'He ran as if they had set dogs after him.'

7   Serial verb constructions

Serial verb constructions have been extensively researched by creolists (Alleyne 1980, Veenstra 1990, and Holm, Patrick et al. 1999). Though they resemble both coordination and subordination structures, there are strong arguments against both analyses. It has been suggested that they are natural products of first- or second-language acquisition under certain conditions, but this seems unlikely. Not all Creoles have SVCs; they appear to be a legacy of substrate languages, especially the Kwa family in the JamC case. Lalla and D'Costa (1990: 71) note "Serial verbs are not attested in the earliest texts," appearing only in the later 19th century.

SVCs involve two or more verbs brought together without a complementizer, conjunction or infinitive marker, and with no pause. If TMA or negation are marked, the marking on all verbs agrees, and typically only occurs on the first. There is normally a single expressed subject, and one direct object (if any); these are often shared across the verbs, but there is cross-linguistic variation here. SVCs are commonly categorized as directional, instrumental, dative (62), benefactive, comitative, comparative etc. Creoles may be grouped according to how many of these functions occur. Most types occur in JamC, except possibly benefactive. Direction away normally employs *go*, and towards

uses *come*; (60) recalls the indignant semi-auxiliary *come* of AAVE (Spears 1982). Instrumental with *tek* 'take' (61) is a typologically important function, grouping JamC with 'deep' Creoles such as the Surinamese languages, Krio and Haitian. The comparative serial (63) is now infrequent in JamC. When three serial verbs occur together, one is always directional (64; here the third verb has a different subject).

(60)   *Dis naga man come come collar me de same like a say me da him sexis.*
        'This black man comes and collars me just as if I were the same sex as he.'   (Murray 1877, quoted in *DJE*: 116)

(61)   *Im tek naif kot mi.*   (Alleyne 1980: 93)
        'He cut me with a knife', lit. 'He took knife cut me'

(62)   *Kya di buk kom gi mi.*   (Alleyne 1980: 94)
        'Bring the book for me.'

(63)   *Manggo de a yaad paas plenti.*   (FG Cassidy p.c.)
        'A great many mangoes are in the yard.'

(64)   *Im waan mi fi go kya im kom.*   (Alleyne 1980: 91)
        'He wants me to bring it', lit. 'He wants me to go carry it come'

8   Relativization

The general structure of relative clauses in Atlantic Creoles follows their lexifier languages (Holm, Patrick et al. 1994). JamC is no exception. Christie (1996) closely examines JamC relatives which are simultaneously the subject of emphatic focusing strategies (left-dislocation, pseudo-clefting); she finds this cooccurrence very common, and gives a developmental account.

JamC relative markers are *a*, *we*, *wa(t)*, *huufa*, *dat* and *huu*; in many cases a null relativizer is also possible. The non-pronominal relativizers originated in deictic elements (*a*, *dat* < *that*), while the relative pronouns originated in interrogative pronouns, e.g. *wa* < *what*. Christie assumes the most general basilectal pronoun, *we*, to have derived from *where* and expanded from an original locative use, but the *DJE* gives a NW England dialectal etymon *wha* for both *wa* and *we*, which are indistinguishable today except in locative relatives (*we* only). *Huu* is the acrolectal and mesolectal form, following English in its

restriction to [+human]. So too does *huufa* (< *who+for* via possessive pronoun *fi-huu*), but its use is basilectal; it does not alternate with zero.

Three types of relativization can be distinguished, involving overt relativizers, null relativizers, and resumptive pronouns. The one closest to StdE involves a relative marker introducing a clause in which there is a corresponding structural gap (65, where the gap is in subject position of the relative clause; 10, 66, in object position with *we*; 13 with *huu*; 71 with *huufa*; and 67, the object of a stranded preposition). The gap results from movement of the *wh–*item.

(65)   *Yu miin him a __ wena mek naiz mam?*
      'Do you mean the one that __ was making noise, ma'am?'

(66)   *We have a place weh we call __ Atom Hole.* (Dance 1985: 94)
      'There is a place that we call __ Atom Hole.'

(67)   *Mi rispek ar tu di dort we shi waak pan __, Mada.*
      'I respect her to the ground that she walks on __, Mother.'

Pied-piping is not possible in JamC: in (67), * ...*pan we shi waak*). In general prepositions and other postverbal particles are tightly bound to the verb. The only apparent exception to this is *fi–* in the interrogative pronoun *fi-huu*.

Null relativizers are the norm in existential sentences when the relativized noun-phrase is indefinite, and the subject of the clause (47 above, but not 66); they also occur in other sentence types (23, 68). Christie argues for "deletion of the coreferential NP within the relative clause" (1996:54), rather than *wh–*fronting. She also includes some purposive *fi–*clauses here (68), though *fi* does not vary with zero and in other ways is not a typical relativizer.

(68)   *Him say me one one hog me have __ me fi give you __ .* (Dance 1985: 21)
      'He said I should give you (__) the only hog I have __.'

(69)   *Mi bring kluoz fi di uman put aan __ .* (Christie 1996: 55)
      'I've brought clothes for the woman to put on __ .'

In the third type, resumptive pronouns occur inside the relative clause (70). Christie suggests this "more usually occurs... where the co-referential NP

is possessive... [and] an overt relativizer is necessary" (1995: 58). Resumptive pronouns also occur outside the relative clause, most commonly in non-restrictive relatives (72). Both types occur in nonstandard English dialects. Interestingly, resumptive pronouns are also common in acrolectal Jamaican English relatives.

(70)   *Di uman we dem tiif **ar** biebi __ gaan a stieshan.* (Christie 1995: 58)
       lit. 'The woman that they stole **her** baby __ has gone to the station.'

(71)   *Di uman huufa biebi dem tiif __ gaan a stieshan.* (Christie 1995: 56)
       'The woman whose baby they stole __ has gone to the station.'

(72)   *Mi yu si ya, **mi** kyaan bada wid dem.* (Bailey 1966: 108)
       'I (whom) you see here, **I** can't bother with them.'

9   Pronouns

The pronominal system of JamC makes few distinctions of case or gender, and is not characterized by agreement in these dimensions. It does however make systematic distinction of person and number, in fact more so than StdE. Even at the most basilectal level JamC distinguishes case in the possessive pronoun *huufa*, if nowhere else, though Christie suggests it is a late-19th century innovation (1996: 56-57). Mesolectal speakers typically possess some gender- and case-specific forms, but are not consistent in their use. The system is therefore not simpler than StdE, either in the sense of possessing fewer dimensions of contrast, or in being grammatically regular as English is (Mühlhäusler 1997: 234-236). Little work has been done to explore conditions for variation.

Setting aside *huufa*, Radford finds a case-less system of pronouns further evidence that JamC lacks "uninterpretable case-features; those which have been retained are interpretable person-, number- and gender-features" (1997:182-183). Thus JamC would share common ground with native child acquisition of English, in which uninterpretable features are acquired later. Radford argues JC distinguishes "between overt and covert forms... the minimal case distinction we should expect to find in any language" (1997: 206-207).

9.1   Personal pronouns

The personal pronouns are given in (73). *Im* 'he, she, him, her, it' is the default, gender- and case-less form (14), sometimes used for impersonal or

nonhuman referents (8), but *i* 'it' is not used for human ones (50); animacy is a distinction native to JamC. English-like forms enter in 3rd person singular; though common in the mesolect, they are not fully integrated into the grammar of JamC. *Shi* is the first gender-marked form to appear; *ar* cannot be focused (**A ar mi lov*, 'It's her I love'), indicating that it is a marked form. Mesolectal speakers use gender- and case-marked 3sg pronouns (when they do use them) in appropriate ways (24, 67), without hyper-correction. Use of *ii* 'he' and *shi* 'she' for oblique cases does not occur in JamC.

(73)	Person	Singular	Plural
	1	*mi, a (ai)*	*wi*
	2	*yu*	*unu*
	3	*im, i (ii) (shi) (ar)*	*dem*

The 2pl form *unu* (27, 40) is traced to Igbo (*DJE*; Allsopp 1996; Parkvall 2000), or to convergence among e.g. Wolof *yena*, Kongo *yeno*, Kimbundu *yenu*, and Common Bantu **nu* (Holm 2000). Lalla and D'Costa (1990:78), however, find it "only in the middle and later 19th century". *Unu* is also used as an indefinite pronoun, like AmE *you* or BrE *one* (74), while *yu* sometimes has non-singular reference.

Ai is a distinctive feature of Rastafarian speech, with productive compounding in e.g. *I-man*, *I-an-I*, *I-dren* (Pollard 1994). These metaphorically and ideologically-motivated uses cannot be confused with everyday standard usage, where it is strictly acrolectal. As an element of Rasta Talk accessible to a general audience for a variety of discourse purposes (Patrick & Payne-Jackson 1996), *ai* is a regular, if specialized, component of the JamC pronominal system. However, as creative use is a hallmark of this register, *ai* and its compounds cannot be exclusively assigned a single number, case or person (75).

(74) *Unu kudn bloodbat gi i man chrii onjrid dala*.
      'Nobody could even give the man three hundred damn dollars.'

(75) *Ai an ai taakin tu di ai ier* (Pollard 1994:7)
      'I have been talking to this man'

First- and second-person pronouns (and 3sg *i*) have final short lax vowels, and even *ai* may be reduced to /a/ (42). As this is quite common in West

African languages and other Atlantic Creoles, but not permitted by the phonotactics of most English varieties, it is clearly African-derived. Rickford's (1979) account of vowel laxing in GuyC pronouns largely applies to JamC.

9.2   Possessive pronouns

Possessive pronouns are simply derived in JamC by prefixing *fi-* to the personal pronouns *mi*, *yu*, *im*, *ar*, *wi*, *unu* or *dem* (76). *Fi-huu* serves as possessive interrogative, and the probable source of *huufa*; though it is not necessarily stressed, the *fi-* prefix may receive primary stress here (77). This is also possible when it operates as a possessive adjective, i.e. modifies rather than replaces a noun (78). Lalla and D'Costa (1990: 75) note "the absence of *fe + noun* as a possessive marker in the earliest texts".

(76)   *Black bud lef' fe 'im ticks fe pick fe go pick cow own.* (Watson 1991: 37)
        'Black bird leaves his own ticks to go and pick **Cow's**.'

(77)   *Mi nuo di fuor touzin mi mek a **fi**-mi!*
        'I know the four thousand I made is **mine**!' *[=dollars]*

(78)   *Den no **fi**-me work me put yuh inna?* (Sistren 1987: 126)
        'Then wasn't it **my** job I got for you?'

The emphatic or contrastive possessive adjective *uon(a)* 'own' usually follows a possessor noun (76), but may appear with just a pronoun (79), or even the combination of *fi* + proper noun (80). When *uon(a)* does appear, the possessed noun may be present -- e.g. (77) might as well have terminated *...a fi-mi uona ting!*, with stress on *uona* -- but is more often absent, in which case the complex functions as possessive pronoun (i.e. *ar uon* = 'hers', *fi-wi uon* = 'ours'). In these constructions stress generally falls on the preceding possessor (pro)noun, unlike English, where stress usually falls on *own*.

It is also possible to have only bare personal pronouns with possessive force (*unu* in 27, *yu* in 55, the first *me* in 68), i.e. possession by juxtaposition [possessor + possessed]; this structure is not restricted to pronouns, but occurs also with full nouns, including proper nouns (e.g. *di uman biebi* 'the woman's baby', *Rabat buk* 'Robert's book'). English-like forms alternate in the mesolect, especially in the first person (*mai*, *owa*), as in (81).

(79)   *Me did a carry a pan a water from di next door yard*

26

for dem did lock off fi-we own again. (Sistren 1987: 187)
'I used to carry a pan of water from the yard next door,
for they had shut off ours again.' *[=a standpipe]*

(80) *Jos bikaaz evribadi wena go luk pan fi-Patsi uon...*
'Just because everybody was looking at Patsy's...' *[=frock]*

(81) *Mek wi go ina owa pakit an bai di lika oot a wi pakit!*
'Let's reach in our pockets and buy the liquor out of our own pockets.'

9.3   Interrogative pronouns

Interrogative pronouns include the *wh*-items *we*, *wa*, *huu* and *huu-fa* (above). These function similarly to adjectives *wich* 'which', adverbs *wa mek* 'why', *hou* 'how, why', *wen* 'when', and *homoch* 'how much/many' in terms of a preference for *a*-clefting. In the mesolect *wai* 'why' occurs, but it cannot be clefted. Several interrogative pronouns are semantically transparent compounds, e.g. *huufa* and *homoch* above, but also *wen-taim* 'when' (57), *wich-paat* 'where, wherever' and *wi-said* 'where' (40), which may be relative pronouns too. This strategy also occurs in prepositions such as *batam-said* 'below' (82).

(82) *Mi waak kom dong a dis ais kriim plees, likl bit batamsaid di hoos.*
'I walked down to this ice-cream place, a little below the house.'

(83) *So wen she go long, she see so-so head in de road.* (*DJE*: 417)
As she went along, she saw just a head in the road (without a body).

(84) *Dem miit op (dem) wan aneda pan di ruod.*
'They met each other on the road.'

9.4   Indefinite, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns

Indefinite pronouns are transparently derived from English, but may combine several functions, e.g. *somting* 'something; thing' (usually reduced to [soʔm]), *smadi* 'somebody; person; human being; one'. They may also take determiners and be quantified or counted, e.g. *wan smadi* 'someone, a person', *chrii smadi* 'three people', *evri smadi* 'everyone'.

While JamC does follow an English model for reflexive pronouns, suffixing number-neutral *-sef* 'self' to make *misef*, *yusef*, *imsef*, *arsef* -- as well as *wisef*, *unusef* and *demsef* -- other forms also serve similar functions, e.g. *so-so* 'only,

27

by itself' (83). Reciprocals in any person may be formed on the model *(Pron-pl) wan aneda* 'each other', with an optional preceding personal pronoun (84).

9.5 Demonstratives

Demonstratives in Atlantic English Creoles generally derive from superstrate forms and syntax, given the normal word order of modification by demonstrative adjectives: European superstrate (Dem-N), but West African substrate (N-Dem). Indeed, superstrate demonstratives are also generally thought to be the source of the definite articles in many Creoles (below), given the prominence of deictic terms in language contact situations, plus their strong forms and likelihood of bearing stress, compared to articles.

JamC demonstrative pronouns are singular proximal *dis* 'this', singular distal *dat* 'that', and plural *dem* 'these, those'. The demonstrative adjectives are the same, and always appear in pre-N position. They are supplemented by singular *da* 'this, that', which may only occur before nouns suffixed by the locative particles *-ya* 'here' or *-de* 'there'. However, the main forms are not only compatible with this structure, but also with direct suffixing of the locatives, giving the paradigm in (85).

(85)		Proximal	Distal
	Singular	*dis-ya ting*	*dat-de ting*
		dis ting-ya	*dat ting-de*
		da ting-ya	*da ting-de*
		'this thing'	'that thing'
	Plural	*dem-ya ting*	*dem-de ting*
		dem ting-ya	*dem ting-de*
		'these things'	'those things'

JamC demonstratives are [+definite] and occupy the same syntactic slot as articles, thus may not cooccur with them. However, they may cooccur with all other available components of the noun-phrase (including plural suffix *-z*) except, apparently, post-nominal plural-marker *-dem*. In over 3600 tokens of semantically plural noun phrases, only one case of demonstrative *dem* with plural *-dem*, i.e. *dem* N-*dem*, was found (86; Patrick 1994).

(86) *So, dem bwai-dem kom an dem fling tuu brik an tuu bakl.*
    'So those guys came and threw a few bricks and a few bottles.'

(87) *Hou dem spiik da wie de an wii spiik da wie ya?*
      'How come they speak that way, and we (only) speak this way?'

(88) *A dis yah kind a life yuh want? Look pon yuh!* (Sistren 1987: 123)
      'Is this the kind of life you want? Look at you!'

(89) *If we did ever see yuh dat deh night, we wuda mek police beat yuh.*
      'If we had seen you that night, we would have let the police beat you.'

10   Noun phrase structure

10.1 Possession

Several aspects of noun-phrase structure have been treated above. In particular, possessive structures are generally similar regardless of whether they are headed by a possessor pronoun or noun. In StdE there are three types of possessive structures:

i)   [possessor pronoun – possessed noun], e.g. *my book*
ii)   [possessed noun + *of* + possessor noun], e.g. *books of Michelle*
iii)   [possessor noun + *-z* + possessed noun], e.g. *Michelle's books*

The structures equivalent to (i) are described above; (ii) is rare, and does not differ from StdE except in the preposition, *a* 'of' (90). The third type, suffixing possessive *-z*, does not occur in JamC, and is a salient marker of StJamE. However, JamC has another common structure which does not occur in StdE:

iv)   [possessor noun – possessed noun], e.g. *Jien pat* 'Jane's pot'

Complex possessive phrases also occur mixing patterns: (91) utilizes (i) and (iv). This order also occurs in non-possessive noun-noun compounding, e.g. kin-terms such as *biebi-madda* (Patrick 1995) (92, 93); the pattern is well-established in StJamE, e.g. (93), which also uses the possessive *-z* suffix.

(90) *Wel natchrali! Mi fiil di anz a dopi, man.*
      'Well, naturally! I have felt the hands of ghosts, man.'

(91) *Me aunty never like we to mix wid we faada family.* (Sistren 1987: 164)

'My aunt didn't like us to mingle with our father's family.'

(92) *She never like we fi go down to mi Granny, me faada-madda.* (Sistren 1987: 164)

   'She didn't like us to go visit my Granny, my father's mother.'

(93) *Betty's baby-father came to the dress rehearsal...* (Sistren 1987: 292)

10.2 Noun classification

Nouns are divided into the same classes traditional in English grammars, namely mass, count and proper nouns. Their properties are largely the same as StdE. Mass nouns (e.g. *rais* 'rice'), being non-count, cannot take a plural marker or the singular indefinite article *wan* 'a, an', though they may be either semantically definite or indefinite. Proper nouns have similar restrictions, except that when they refer to humans, they may take the associative plural, below. Count nouns may receive any determiner or plural marker; only count nouns can properly be generic. Bailey (1966: 21-26) further identifies a class of abstract nouns (94) which may take the definite article (*di*, 'the') where StdE does not allow it, or an indefinite quantifier (*no*, *aal*, *tumoch* 'too much', etc.). However, there are counterexamples to her claim that they may not take the demonstrative (95).

Noun class membership is not the same as in StdE. In particular, some nouns that are mass in StdE are count in JamC (96, 20).

(94) *Di honggri ena wip me.* (Bailey 1966: 25)
   'Hunger was whipping me.'

(95) *Dat lov, dat ziyl, wa wi did av fors taim, yu don hav it agen.*
   'That love, that zeal, we had in the old days, you don't find it anymore.'

(96) *If me sista want a money, she would have to go and meet him...* (Sistren 1987: 165)
   'If my sister wanted money, she would have to go and meet him'

10.3 Articles

JamC has a singular indefinite article *wan* 'a(n)', and a number-neutral definite article *di* 'the', which appear deceptively similar to StdE in function. *Wan* is transparently derived from the numeral *one*. In JamC, specificity rather than

definiteness directly motivates article use. A striking reflection of this, is the influence of noun-phrase specificity on the tense interpretation of bare nonstative verbs (section 2.3).

		Spec	Def	Past	Non-past
(97a)	*Di uman sel di manggo.*	+	+	+	
(97b)	*Di uman sel di manggo-dem.*	+	+	+	
(97c)	*Di uman sel manggo.*	–	–		+
(97d)	*Di uman sel mangoes.*	–	–		+
(97e)	*Di uman sel wan manggo.*	+	–	+	

The default interpretation for (97a, b), with object noun-phrases that are both definite and specific, is past-tense. In contrast, the default interpretation for (97c, d), with object noun-phrases that are neither definite nor specific, is non-past. For (97e), however, the specific but indefinite noun phrase forces a past-tense reading, just like the other [+specific] cases. This interaction has been described for Haitian Creole, and interpreted as evidence that while stativity is useful in accounting for tense interpretation, other *aktionsart* properties (e.g. telicity) are also important (DeGraff fc).

Bickerton (1981) proposed for creoles in general the following pattern:

- The definite article is used for presupposed/specific NPs (98);
- The indefinite article is used for asserted/specific NPs (99); and
- No (zero) article for nonspecific NPs (100).

This account describes much JamC data (98-100), though a number of non-Atlantic creoles do allow a definite interpretation of bare nouns (Holm 2000: 214; i.e., cases resembling 97c behave like 97a).

(98) *Lef dem chiljren op a di hoos.*
    '(I) left those kids up at the house.'

(99) *Y'av a glas choch op de.*
    'There's a glass[-fronted] church up there.'

(100) *Bad man dem taim-de!*
    '[There were] bad guys around in those days.'

Furthermore, generic noun phrases, which are utterly non-transparent in the StdE article system, are systematically rendered with no article in JamC. The subjects of the StdE sentences in (101–104) are all generic, but each exhibits a different determiner structure. In their JamC equivalents, each subject noun phrase would be rendered simply *Man* (except 104: *Wiel a mamal*, with the equative copula *a*).

(101) *A man should have a dog.*

(102) *Man is a mammal.*

(103) *Men are mammals.*

(104) *The whale is a mammal.*

(105) *Police shoot Starman inna dance... Dem rain down gunshot pon him.* (Sistren 1987: 192)

‘The police shot Starman at a dance... They rained down gunshots on him.’

However, in JamC a bare noun may also receive an indefinite, specific reading (*gunshot* in 105), suggesting that at least some sentences like (97c) behave like (97e). Thus bare noun phrases, just like bare verb forms, do not have a single necessary interpretation. This is another piece of evidence that categorical analyses based on privative oppositions misrepresent creole grammars, including JamC: strict form-meaning isomorphy does not hold for bare, unmarked forms.

From a historical perspective, this is unsurprising: unstressed, non-transparent elements like the English articles might well have gone missing early in language contact, leaving bare forms subject to a range of interpretations and contextual constraints. Subsequent conventionalization over three centuries has not essentially altered this situation. Though the reconstituted article system of JamC operates along simpler, more regular lines than that of StdE, it is not the sort of perfectly neat, idealized system which linguists prefer to construct for creole grammars (but which is alien to other natural languages).

10.4 Number marking

In contexts where Standard English requires plural number to be categorically marked with allomorphs of {-z}, JamC attaches post-nominal affix *-dem*, historically derived from the third-person plural pronoun *dem* 'they'. Plural *-dem* only occurs on definite nouns, and there is a strong tendency for it to be preceded by *di* 'the' (Patrick, Carranza and Kendall 1993), while it is very rarely found in the *dem + Noun-dem* construction (86 above). Plural *-dem* is only available for third-person referents, not first-person or direct address (* *Aal yu bwai-dem!* 'All you boys!") -- no doubt owing to its pronominal origin.

Yet the mesolect shows frequent use of *-z* marking, and JamC also allows zero-marking of plural nouns (*pieren* in 107), which occurred 45% of the time in a Kingston study (Patrick 1994). In fact, both *-z* and zero-marked forms, and variation between the two, are attested in 17th and 18th century JamC -- far earlier than *-dem*, which has only been found from the latter half of the 19th century (Lalla and D'Costa 1990). All are present in basilectal speech as well as mesolectal (106).

Though it is relatively rare, it is perfectly acceptable for *-dem* and *-z* to co-occur (107-109): *-z* is always more closely attached to the noun (i.e. *Noun-z-dem*), while *-dem* may attach to the right edge of the noun phrase (109).

(106) *Tings noh bright, bickle noh nuff!* (Bennett 1966: 121)
　　　'Things aren't easy, there's not much food!'

(107) *Afta a no iivn nomba- rimemba di nuots-dem agen*.
　　　'I don't even remember the *[musical]* notes any more.'

(108) *Fi-dem pieren mait muor richa dan mai pieren, so dem mait av muor -- beta fasilitiz-dem*.
　　　'Their parents might be richer than mine, so they might have more -- better facilities.'

(109) *Frenz an a uol-dem, neva falo frenz an a uol*.
　　　'Friends in general, never follow friends in general.'

Possessives, demonstratives, and definite articles all mark a noun-phrase as definite; *-dem* cannot easily appear without them. While indefinite quantifiers freely occur with *-dem* in partitive phrases (110, 111), the very few instances of definite quantifiers (e.g. cardinal numerals) plus *Noun-dem* are often interpretable as indefinite (note the first use of *two* in 112). Furthermore, *di +*

Noun–dem phrases are compatible with a definite but non-specific reading (113).

(110) *Some a di woman dem is single woman.* (Sistren 1987: 49)
'Some of the women are single women.'

(111) *None a di member dem no do notten bout it.* (Sistren 1987: 87)
'None of the members did anything about it.'

(112) *Me pack up me* **two** *sinting dem inna two big barrel.* (Sistren 1987: 192)
'I packed up my **few** possessions into two big barrels.'

(113) *Di man dem in my district is not easy.* (Sistren 1987: 89)
'The men of my district can be truculent.'

The requirement for *–dem* to occur in definite NPs is categorical. In StdE, of course, this does not apply to *–z* at all, but in JamC, these environments also favor *–z*. Determiners that mark number (quantifiers, numerals and demonstratives) disfavor *–z*, while *–dem* practically does not occur with them at all. This can be characterized as a functional pattern, where markers tend to appear in cases that would otherwise not bear surface signs of their plural meaning.

Both markers are favored by the presence of a [+human] head noun. Similar constraints apply in Liberian and Nigerian English Creole varieties (Singler 1989, Poplack and Tagliamonte 1994), possibly related to *–dem's* history of grammaticalization from a pronoun with primarily human reference.

Number marking in JamC grammar is thus characterized by intricate, coexisting constraints on competing forms from English (*–z*) and Creole (*–dem*).

10.5 Associative plurals and other phenomena

In JamC, as in a number of Atlantic Creoles and African substrate languages, an associative plural using *–dem* may attach to a person's proper name with the meaning "X and her customary associates" (e.g. friends, family members, co-workers, etc.). While this construction resembles coordinate structures in vernacular Englishes (e.g. *John an' dem* in AAVE, see Wolfram this volume), there is no conjunction in the JamC cases (114).

(114) *Miss Waaka dem laaf afta im.* (Roberts 1973: 18)
      'Miss Walker and the others laughed at him.'

(115) *Mi faati-plenti aredi!*
      'I am well over forty already!'

JamC possesses several indefinite quantifiers which contrast with StdE, and typically co-occur with *-dem*, other than those given by Bailey (1966: 30). A near-obsolete one is *pempeny* 'plentiful' (DJE: 345, < Twi *mpempem* 'thousands'); common today is *uol-iip* 'many, a lot' (< *whole heap*). *Wan-wan* may either mean 'occasional(ly), sporadic' or 'one at a time'. The word *-plenti* may be suffixed to a numeral (115), but this normally only happens with a bi-syllabic stem. Finally, measure words of weight, distance, currency etc. occur in JamC much as in StdE but unlike other many British dialects which have *three mile*, *four pound*, they show no tendency to disfavor plural marking with *-z* -- in fact, there is a small tendency to the contrary.

11   Conclusion

Compared to many creoles, and indeed many vernacular dialects of English, a great deal is known about JamC morphology and syntax, but this basic description of morphology and syntax suggests further exploration is needed. I have barely mentioned sociolinguistic and applied linguistic research. I conclude however by pointing to other new or recently-explored areas which are important because they demonstrate the empirical use of language corpora, and/or seek to shed light on JamC by looking at new and little-studied sources. Linguists often rely too much on their own, or other people's, intuitions, or on a handful of well-known texts or sources of data (e.g. Emmanuel Rowe's stories, transcribed by DeCamp in LePage 1960; Beryl Bailey's native intuitions in Bailey 1966). JamC is a vital language, continually producing new data, both innovative and traditional, for linguists to attend to. Some recent examinations of such data include the study of ordinary vernacular writing (Dray 2002, Hinrichs 2002) and mass-media (Cooper 1993, Richardson 2000, Schneider and Wagner fc), the characteristics and functions of styles and registers (Patrick 1997), issues of vernacular orthography (Sebba 1998), translations to and from JamC and other languages, including Creoles (Mühleisen 2002), and academic writings (Devonish 1996), pragmatics of paralinguistics (Patrick and Figueroa 2002) and communicative practices (Spears 2002), and the exploration of the characteristics of institutionally-defined speech and literacy, e.g. in forensic

linguistics (Shields-Brodber 2002, Brown-Blake 2002, Patrick and Buell 2000). There can be little doubt that a great deal more remains to be discovered.

References

Akers, Glenn   1981 Admissibility conditions on final consonant clusters in the Jamaican continuum. In: Pieter Muysken (ed.), *Generative studies on Creole languages*, 1–24. Dordrecht: Foris.

Alleyne, Mervyn C.   1971 Acculturation and the cultural matrix of creolization. In: Hymes (ed.), 169–186.

Alleyne, Mervyn C.   1980 *Comparative Afro-American*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Alleyne, Mervyn C.   1988 *Roots of Jamaican culture*. London: Pluto Press.

Allsopp, Richard (ed.)   1996 *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, Beryl Loftman   1966 *Jamaican Creole Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, Beryl Loftman   1971 Jamaican Creole: Can dialect boundaries be defined? In: Hymes (ed.), 341–348.

Baugh, John 1980 A re-examination of the Black English copula. In: William Labov (ed.), *Locating Language in Time and Space*, 83–106. NY: Academic Press.

Beckford Wassink, Alicia 1999 Historic low prestige and seeds of change: Attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. *Language in Society* 28 (1):57–92.

Beckford Wassink, Alicia 1999 A sociophonetic analysis of Jamaican vowels. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Bennett, Louise   1966 *Jamaica Labrish*. London: Collins.

Bickerton, Derek   1975 *Dynamics of a Creole System*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickerton, Derek   1981 *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Bilby, Kenneth M. 1983 How the 'older heads' talk: A Jamaican Maroon spirit possession language and its relationship to the Creoles of Suriname and Sierra Leone. *Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 57(1-2): 37-88.

Blake, Renee A.   1997 All o' we is one? Race, class and language in a Barbados community. Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Brown-Blake, Celia   2002 "Mi kyaan riid": Language, literacy and the Peter Blake Principle. Paper presented to the 14th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 2002, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad.

Bruyn, Adrienne   1995 Noun phrases. In: Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles: An introduction*, 259-269. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cassidy, Frederic G.   1961 *Jamaica Talk: Three hundred years of the English language in Jamaica*. (The Institute of Jamaica.) London: Macmillan & Co.

Cassidy, Frederic G.   1971 Tracing the pidgin element in Jamaican Creole. In: Hymes (ed.), 203-221.

Cassidy, Frederic G. and Robert B. Le Page (eds.) 1967 (1980, 2nd ed.) *Dictionary of Jamaican English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chambers, J. K.   1995 *Sociolinguistic Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Chambers, J. K., Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.)   2002 *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cheshire, Jenny   1982 Linguistic variation and social function. In: Suzanne Romaine (ed.), *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities.* London: Edward Arnold, 153–166.

Christie, Pauline   1982 Trends in Jamaican English: Increasing deviance or emerging standards? Paper to Society for Caribbean Linguistics, Suriname, August 1982. Reprinted in: Silvia Kouwenberg (ed.) 1998, *History and Status of Creole languages: Papers by Pauline Christie*. Special issue of *UWI Ling: Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 19–35.

Christie, Pauline   1996 Jamaican relatives in focus. In: Pauline Christie (ed.), *Caribbean Language Issues Old and New*. Mona JA: University of West Indies Press, 48–60.

Comrie, Bernard   1985 *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, Carolyn   1993 *Noises in the Blood: Orality, Gender and the 'Vulgar' Body of Jamaican Popular Culture*. (Warwick University Caribbean Studies.) London: Macmillan Education.

Dance, Daryl C.   1985 *Folklore from Contemporary Jamaicans*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

De Camp, David   1971 Towards a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum. In: Hymes (ed.), 349–370.

DeGraff, Michel   2001 Morphology in Creole genesis: Linguistics and ideology. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. (Current Studies in Linguistics Series 36.) Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

DeGraff, Michel   Fc   Kreyòl ayisyen, or Haitian Creole. In: John A. Holm and Peter L. Patrick (eds.), *Comparative Creole Syntax: Parallel Outlines of 18 Creole Grammars*. (Westminster Creolistics Series.) London: Battlebridge Press.

Devonish, Hubert 1996 Kom groun Jamiekan daans haal liricks: Memba se a plie we a plie. Contextualizing Jamaican 'Dance Hall' music: Jamaican language at play in a speech event. *English World-Wide* 17(2): 213–237.

DJE, *Dictionary of Jamaican English*, see Cassidy & Le Page.

Dray, Susan 2002 "A yard we deh": The uses of Creole on roadside texts in Jamaica. Paper presented to the 14th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 2002, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad.

Fasold, Ralph W. 1972 *Tense Marking in Black English: A Linguistic and Social Analysis*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ferguson, Charles 1959 Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–340.

Ferguson, Charles 1991 Diglossia revisited. *The Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10(1): 214–234.

Guy, Gregory R. 1980 Variation in the group and the individual: the case of final stop deletion. In: William Labov (ed.), *Locating Language in Time and Space*, 1–36. NY: Academic Press.

Hackert, Stephanie 2001 'I did done gone': Typological, sociolinguistic and discourse-pragmatic perspectives on past temporal reference in urban Bahamian Creole English. Ph. D. dissertation, Heidelberg University.

Hancock, Ian F. 1969 A provisional comparison of the English-based Atlantic Creoles. *African Language Review* 8: 7–72.

Hancock, Ian F. 1986 The domestic hypothesis, diffusion and componentiality: An account of Atlantic anglophone creole origins. In: Muysken and Smith (eds.), 71–102.

Henry, Alison 1995 *Belfast English and Standard English: Dialect Variation and Parameter-setting*. Oxford University Press.

Hinrichs, Lars 2002 Patois and E-mail: A study of new Creole writing practices developed by Jamaican university students. Paper presented to the 14th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 2002, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad.

Holm, John A. 1984 Variability of the copula in Black English and its Creole kin. *American Speech* 59: 291–309.

Holm, John A. 2000 *An Introduction to Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holm, John A, Lilian Adamson, Dwijen Bhattacharjya, Michel DeGraff, Christa de Kleine, Nicholas Faraclas, Kate Green, Cornelia Khamis, Gerardo Lorenzino, Heliana Mello, Abigail Michel, Jonathan Owens, Peter L. Patrick, and Sorie Yillah 1994 Relative clauses in Atlantic and non-Atlantic Creoles. *Papia: Revista de Criollos de Base Ibérica* 3(2): 70–87. Special issue, *Atas do Coloquio sobre Crioulos de Base Portuguesa e Espanhola, Brasília, 3 a 6 de setembro de 1994*.

Holm, John A, Dwijen Bhattacharjya, Daniel Chapuis, Michel DeGraff, Christa de Kleine, Nicholas Faraclas, Kate Green, Cornelia Khamis, Gerardo Lorenzino, Heliana Mello, Abigail Michel, Jonathan Owens, Peter L. Patrick, Salvatore Santoro, Miki Suzuki, and Sorie Yillah 1999 A comparison of serial verb constructions in Cape Verdean and other creoles. In: Klaus Zimmermann (ed.), *Lenguas Criollas de base lexical Española y Portuguesa*, 297–319. (Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana.) Frankfurt: Vervuert.

Holm, John A, Lilian Adamson, Dwijen Bhattacharjya, Michel DeGraff, Christa de Kleine, Nicholas Faraclas, Kate Green, Cornelia Khamis, Gerardo Lorenzino, Heliana Mello, Abigail Michel, Jonathan Owens, Peter L. Patrick, and Sorie Yillah 2000 Copula patterns in Atlantic and non-Atlantic creoles. In: John R. Rickford & Suzanne Romaine (eds.), *Creole Genesis, Discourse and Attitudes: Studies Celebrating Charlene Sato*, 97–119. (Creole Language Library 20). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Holm, John A. and Peter L. Patrick (eds.) Fc *Comparative Creole Syntax: Parallel Outlines of 18 Creole Grammars*. (Westminster Creolistics Series.) London: Battlebridge Press.

Hymes, Dell (ed.) 1971 *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, William   1982 Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society* 11: 165–201.

Lalla, Barbara and Jean D'Costa   1990 *Language in Exile: Three hundred years of Jamaican Creole*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Le Page, Robert B. 1960 *Jamaican Creole: An Historical Introduction*. (Creole Language Studies 1.) London: Macmillan.

Loftman, Beryl   1953 Creole languages of the Caribbean area. M.A. thesis, Columbia University.

Mair, Christian   2003 Creolisms in an emerging standard: Written English in Jamaica. *English World-Wide* 23(1): 31–58.

Mair, Christian and Andrea Sand   1998 Caribbean English: Structure and status of an emerging variety. In: Raimund Borgmeier, Herbert Grabes and Andreas H. Jucker (eds.), *Anglistentag 1997, Giessen. Proceedings vol. XIX*, 187–198. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

Morales Padron, Francisco   2003 *Spanish Jamaica*. Tr. Patrick E. Bryan with Michael J. Gronow & Felix Oviedo Moral [from *Jamaica Española*, 1952]. Kingston: Ian Randle.

Mufwene, Salikoko   1986 Number delimitation in Gullah. *American Speech* 61: 33–60.

Mufwene, Salikoko   2001 *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mühleisen, Susanne   2002 *Creole Discourse: Exploring Prestige Formation and Change across Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles*. (Creole Language Library 24.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mühlhäusler, Peter   1997 *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* (rev. ed.). (Westminster Creolistics Series 3.) London: University of Westminster Press.

Muysken, Pieter, and Norval Smith (eds.)   1986 *Substrata versus Universals in Creole Genesis*. (Creole Language Library 1.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Muysken, Pieter, and Tonjes Veenstra   1995 Serial verbs. In: Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles: An introduction*, 289–315. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Parkvall, Mikael   2000 *Out of Africa: African Influences in Atlantic Creoles*. London: Battlebridge Publications.

Patrick, Peter L.   1988 /A/ is for aspect: Multifunctional particles and grammaticalization in Jamaican Creole. Paper presented to NWAVE–17 (New Ways of Analyzing Variation) annual conference. October 29, Université de Montreal, Canada.

Patrick, Peter L.   1994 Functional pressures on plural-marking in Jamaican Patwa. Paper presented to the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, meeting jointly with the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 26, University of Guyana, Georgetown, Guyana.

Patrick, Peter L.   1995 Recent Jamaican words in sociolinguistic context. *American Speech* 70(3): 227–264.

Patrick, Peter L.   1996 Variation and the mesolect in Jamaican Creole. In: James A. Alatis, Carolyn A. Straehle, Maggie Ronkin and Brent Gallenberger (eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1996*, 196–220. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Patrick, Peter L.   1997 Style and register in Jamaican Patwa. In: Edgar W. Schneider (ed.), *Englishes Around the World: Studies in honour of Manfred Görlach. Vol. 2: Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australasia*, 41–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Patrick, Peter L.   1999 *Urban Jamaican Creole: Variation in the Mesolect.* (*Varieties of English Around the World* G17.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Patrick, Peter L.   2002 Caribbean Creoles and the speech community. *Society for Caribbean Linguistics Occasional Paper No. 30*. St Augustine, Trinidad: University of the West Indies.

Patrick, Peter L.   Fc   Jamaican Patwa. In: John A. Holm and Peter L. Patrick (eds.), *Comparative Creole Syntax: Parallel Outlines of 18 Creole Grammars*. (Westminster Creolistics Series.) London: Battlebridge Press.

Patrick, Peter L., Isolda Carranza and Shari Kendall   1993 Number-marking in the speech of Jamaican women. Paper presented to NWAVE-22 (New Ways of Analyzing Variation) conference. October 15, Ottawa, Ontario.

Patrick, Peter L. and Arvilla Payne-Jackson 1996 Functions of Rasta Talk in a Jamaican Creole healing narrative: 'A bigfoot dem gi mi'. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6(1): 1–38.

Patrick, Peter L. and Samuel W. Buell 2000 Competing Creole transcripts on trial. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics 32:* 103–132.

Patrick, Peter L. and Esther Figueroa 2002 Kiss-teeth*. American Speech* 77 (4): 383–397.

Patrick, Peter L. and Maria Cristina Fumagalli   Mss. Three healing narratives: Suffering, reintegration and the struggle of language. Submitted to a special issue of *Callaloo*, Paul Breslin and Robert Hamner (eds.), in honor of Derek Walcott's 75th birthday.

Pollard, Velma   1989 The particle *en* in Jamaican Creole: A discourse-related account. *English World-wide* 10(1): 55–68.

Pollard, Velma   1994 *Dread Talk: The Language of Rastafari*. Kingston: Canoe Press.

Poplack, Shana, and Sali Tagliamonte 1994   *–S* or nothing: Marking the plural in the African American diaspora. *American Speech* 69(3): 227–259.

Poplack, Shana and Sali Tagliamonte 2001 *African American English in the Diaspora*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Poplack, Shana, Sali Tagliamonte and Ejike Eze   2000 Reconstructing the source of Early African American English plural marking: A comparative study of English and Creole. In Shana Poplack (ed.), *The English History of African American English*, 73–105. Oxford: Blackwell.

Richardson, Elaine 2000 Cross-cultural vibrations: A study of lexical borrowing between Jamaican dancehall and American hiphop artists. Paper presented to the 13th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 2000, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica.

Rickford, John R.   1979 Variation in a creole continuum: Quantitative and implicational approaches*.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Rickford, John R.   1986 Some principles for the study of black and white speech in the South. In: Michael Montgomery and Guy Bailey (eds.), *Language Variety in the South: Perspectives in Black and White*, 38–62. Tuscaloosa AL: University of Alabama Press.

Rickford, John R.   1996 Copula variability in Jamaican Creole and African American Vernacular English: A reanalysis of De Camp's texts. In: Gregory R. Guy, Crawford Feagin, Deborah Schiffrin and John Baugh (eds.), *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in honor of William Labov. Volume 1, Variation and Change in Language and Society*, 357–372. (Current Issues In Linguistic Theory 127.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rickford, John R.   1998. The Creole origins of African American Vernacular English: Evidence from copula absence. In: Salikoko S. Mufwene, John R. Rickford, Guy Bailey and John Baugh (eds.), *African American English: Structure, History and Usage*, 253–320. New York: Routledge.

Rickford, John R.   1999 *African American Vernacular English: Features, Evolution, Educational Implications*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Roberts, Peter   1973 Speech of 6-year-old Jamaican children. *Society for Caribbean Linguistics Occasional Paper No. 1*. Mona, JA: University of the West Indies (Caribbean Language Research Programme).

Russell, Thomas   1868 *The Etymology of Jamaica Grammar*. Kingston: DeCordova, MacDougall. [Reprinted in full in Lalla and D'Costa 1990, 184–201.]

Sand, Andrea   1999 *Linguistic Variation in Jamaica. A Corpus-based Study of Radio and Newspaper Usage*. Tübingen: Narr.

Sankoff, Gillian   1990 The grammaticalization of tense and aspect in Tok Pisin and Sranan. *Language Variation and Change* 2(3): 295–312.

Sankoff, Gillian and Penelope Brown 1976 The origins of syntax in discourse: A case study of Tok Pisin relatives. *Language* 52: 631–666.

Schiffrin, Deborah 1981 Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57(1): 45–62.

Schneider, Edgar W. and Christian Wagner Mss   The variability of literary dialect as a reflection of pan-lectal competence: Jamaican Creole in Thelwell's *The Harder They Come*. Submitted to *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*.

Sebba, Mark 1997 *Contact languages: Pidgins and Creoles*. London: MacMillan.

Sebba, Mark 1998 Meaningful choices in Creole orthography: 'Experts' and 'users'. In: Rainer Schulze (ed.), *Making Meaningful Choices in English: On Dimensions, Perspectives, Methodology and Evidence*, 223–234. Tübingen: Narr.

Sherlock, Philip and Hazel Bennett   1998 *The Story of the Jamaican People*. Kingston: Ian Randle.

Shields, Kathryn   1989 Standard English in Jamaica: A case of competing models. *English World-Wide* 10(1): 41–53.

Shields-Brodber, Kathryn   1997 Requiem for English in an 'English-speaking' community: The case of Jamaica. In: Edgar W. Schneider (ed.), *Englishes Around the World: Studies in honour of Manfred Görlach. Vol. 2: Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australasia*, 57–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shields-Brodber, Kathryn   2002 The prosecution now calls John Doe. Verbal interaction in a criminal court in Jamaica. Paper presented to the 14th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 2002, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad.

Singler, John Victor   1984 Variation in tense-aspect-modality in Liberian English. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.

Singler, John Victor   1989 Plural marking in Liberian Settler English. *American Speech* 64(1): 40-64.

Singler, John Victor (ed.) 1990 *Pidgin and Creole Tense-Mood-Aspect Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sistren, with Honor Ford-Smith   1987 *Lionheart Gal: Life-stories of Jamaican Women*. Toronto: Sister Vision.

Spears, Arthur K. 1982 The Black English semi-auxiliary *come*. *Language* 58: 850-872.

Spears, Arthur K. 2002 Directness in African-American English and Creoles. Paper presented to the 14th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. August 2002, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad.

Sutcliffe, David with John Figueroa   1992 *System in Black Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Thomason, Sarah G. and Terrence Kaufman   1988 *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thomason, Sarah G.   2001 *Contact Languages*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Veenstra, Tonjes   1990 Serial verb constructions in Jamaican Creole and grammatical theory. MA thesis, University of Amsterdam.

Watson, G. Llewellyn   1991 *Jamaican Sayings: With notes on Folklore, Aesthetics and Social Control.* Tallahassee FL: Florida A&M University Press.

Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov and Marvin Herzog   1968 Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In: Winfred Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel (eds.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, 95–188. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Welmers, William   1973 *African Language Structures*. Berkely: University of California Press.

Winford, Donald   1996 Verbs, adjectives and categoriality in Caribbean English Creoles. In: Pauline Christie (ed.), *Caribbean Language Issues Old and New*, 12–26. Mona JA: University of West Indies Press.

Winford, Donald   2000 Tense and aspect in Sranan and the creole prototype. In: John H. McWhorter (ed.), *Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles*, 383–442. (Creole Language Library 21.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.