

LAURA TRAMUTOLI

*'Abstract Objects'
in Creole Languages*

A Study on Guadeloupean Creole
and Other French-based Creoles

IL SEGNO E LE LETTERE

*Collana del Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Culture moderne
dell'Università degli Studi 'G. d'Annunzio'*

DIREZIONE

Mariaconcetta Costantini

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO

Università "G. d'Annunzio" di Chieti-Pescara

Brigitte Battel - Claudia Casadio - Mariaconcetta Costantini
Mariapia D'Angelo - Paola Desideri - Persida Lazarević - Maria Rita Leto
Lorella Martinelli - Carlo Martinez - Marcial Rubio Áñez - Anita Trivelli

Atenei esteri

Antonio Azaustre (*Universidad de Santiago de Compostela*)

Claudia Capancioni (*Bishop Grosseteste University, Lincoln*)

Dominique Maingueneau (*Université Sorbonne*)

Snežana Milinković (*University of Belgrade*)

COMITATO EDITORIALE

Mariaconcetta Costantini - Barbara Delli Castelli

Elvira Diana - Luca Stirpe

I volumi pubblicati nella Collana sono stati sottoposti a doppio referaggio anonimo.

ISSN 2283-7140
ISBN 978-88-7916-955-4

Copyright © 2021

LED Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto

Via Cervignano 4 - 20137 Milano

www.lededizioni.com - www.ledonline.it - E-mail: led@lededizioni.com

I diritti di riproduzione, memorizzazione e archiviazione elettronica, pubblicazione con qualsiasi mezzo analogico o digitale (comprese le copie fotostatiche, i supporti digitali e l'inserimento in banche dati) e i diritti di traduzione e di adattamento totale o parziale sono riservati per tutti i paesi.

Le fotocopie per uso personale del lettore possono essere effettuate nei limiti del 15% di ciascun volume/fascicolo di periodico dietro pagamento alla SIAE del compenso previsto dall'art. 68, commi 4 e 5, della legge 22 aprile 1941 n. 633.

Le riproduzioni effettuate per finalità di carattere professionale, economico o commerciale o comunque per uso diverso da quello personale possono essere effettuate a seguito di specifica autorizzazione rilasciata da: AIDRO, Corso di Porta Romana n. 108 - 20122 Milano
E-mail segreteria@aidro.org <mailto:segreteria@aidro.org>
sito web www.aidro.org <http://www.aidro.org/>

Volume pubblicato con il contributo
dell'Università degli Studi 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara
Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Culture moderne

In copertina

Picture by Laura Tramutoli

Les Saintes from Les Trois Rivières (Guadeloupe)

Videoimpaginazione: Paola Mignanego

Stampa: Logo

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE GLOSSES	9
INTRODUCTION	11
1. NPs' GENERICITY AND REFERENTIALITY	15
1. Genericity (p. 15) – 1.1. Kind-referring NPs (p. 15) – 1.2. The taxonomic and quantitative function of generic NPs (p. 16) – 1.3. Kinds and 'abstract objects' (p. 18) – 2. Reference to 'abstract objects' in natural languages (p. 20) – 2.1. Referentiality and non-referentiality (p. 20) – 2.2. Prototypical and non-prototypical NPs (p. 21) – 3. 'Abstract objects' as we mean them (p. 23)	
2. THE COLLECTION OF CREOLE DATA	33
1. Data for case study 1 (p. 33) – 2. Data for case study 2 (p. 35) – 3. Data for case study 3 (p. 36)	
3. CASE STUDY 1: THE SEMANTICS BEHIND THE REANALYSIS OF FRENCH ARTICLES IN FRENCH-BASED CREOLES	39
1. The article agglutination (p. 39) – 2. Phono-morphology of the article agglutination: from French to Creole (p. 41) – 3. Alternations (p. 43) – 4. Previous studies (p. 44) – 4.1. A complex phenomenon (p. 44) – 4.2. The substrate influence hypothesis (p. 46) – 5. The lexical-semantics aspect (p. 49) – 6. The morpho-syntax of NPs denoting 'abstract objects' (p. 50) – 7. An attempt of classification: semantically and formally related agglutinated nouns in French creoles (p. 53) – 7.1. Semantic and formal correspondences (p. 53) – 7.2. Class 1 (p. 54) – 7.3. Unique referents (p. 56) – 7.4. Class 2 and 3 (p. 58) – 8. A noun-class principle (p. 60) – 9. African languages (p. 62)	
4. CASE STUDY 2: THE ENCODING OF NON-PROTOTYPICAL ADJECTIVES IN FRENCH-BASED CREOLES	65
1. The lexical reiteration constructions and TAM system in Caribbean French-based creoles (reiteration vs. reduplication) (p. 65) –	

2. Predicate reiteration in Haitian and other Lesser Antillean creoles (p. 67) – 2.1. Syntactic types of predicate reiteration (p. 67) – 2.2. Predicate-cognate objects (p. 69) – 2.3. The multifunctionality of verb-cognate reiteration constructions (p. 70) – 2.4. The aspectual-evaluative function (p. 72) – 3. Compatibility of reiteration constructions with adjectival predicates (p. 74) – 3.1. Verbs and adjectives (p. 74) – 3.2. Individual-level properties and stage-level properties (p. 76) – 3.3. Semantic types of properties (p. 77) – 4. Degree achievement with imperfective marker (p. 78) – 5. Compatibility of individual-level properties ‘adjectives’ with intensive reiteration constructions (p. 80) – 5.1. Intensification of ‘adjectives’ (p. 80) – 5.2. Compatibility with intensive modifier <i>bon</i> (p. 81) – 6. Compatibility of individual-level properties ‘adjectives’ with attenuative reiteration constructions (p. 83) – 6.1. Strategies to express attenuation of a property (p. 83) – 6.2. <i>Yon ti</i> (p. 84) – 6.3. Reiteration constructions with <i>yon ti</i> to express completion and attenuation (p. 85) – 6.4. Compatibility of <i>yon ti</i> with property predicates (p. 86)	
5. CASE STUDY 3: THE ‘FACT TYPE’ COMPLEMENTIZER IN GUADELOUPEAN CREOLE	89
1. Complementizers in Creole languages (p. 89) – 2. Complement types and complement-taking predicates (p. 91) – 2.1. Fact type, activity type and potential type complements (p. 91) – 2.2. The complement-taking predicates (p. 94) – 3. The syntax of the fact-type and potential-type completive clause in Guadeloupean Creole (p. 97) – 3.1. The distribution of the forms of complementizers (p. 97) – 3.2. The distribution of TAM markers on the main and completive verbs (p. 102) – 3.3. Subject coreference (p. 104)	
6. CONCLUSIONS	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY	109
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	129

For Giovanna, Roberto and Chiara

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE GLOSSES

COMP	complementizer
COND	conditional
COP	copula
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
f	feminine
FUT	future
HAB	habitual/continuative
I.OBJ	indirect object
IMPV	imperfective
INDEF	indefinite
LOC	locative
m	masculine
NEG	negation
OBJ	object
POSS	possessive
PL	plural
PST	past tense
PFT	perfective
PROG	progressive
REL	relative
SG	singular
SPEC	specific
SUBJ	subject
SUBJ _v	subjunctive

INTRODUCTION

The abstract/concrete distinction is still an open challenge for contemporary philosophy. There is no doubt that this couple of opposite concepts constitutes one of the essential instruments through which the human mind categorizes reality, but it is difficult to put a finger on what it is exactly that determines such dichotomy, or, in other words, by which epistemological, metaphysical or cognitive basis an entity can be categorized as concrete or abstract. For instance, although it seems straightforward to sort items such as *man*, *chair* or *ball* as concrete, and items such as *unicorn* or *numbers* as abstract, the decision can be more contentious for entities such as *wind*, *music* or *the colour white*, with the result that their categorization is mainly played on intuition.

In the metaphysical research, *abstract* has been described on various accounts. In the first place, Frege envisages abstractness as a *negative* concept since it only exists as the lack of concreteness. Concrete objects are those belonging to the physical and sensory world and they are of immediate knowledge and conceptualization, while an abstract object is characterised by the absence of one or more properties which paradigmatically define a concrete object, such as spatiality (boundedness in time and space) or causal efficacy, being able to be only conceived without being experienced. Secondly, for Quine, *abstract* is paired with the concept of *universal*, as its counterpart *concrete* with the concept of *individual*, on the basis of the property of individuality (and the dichotomy that it generates), which typically belongs to concrete objects, and which underlies the dichotomy uncountable/countable, too. Finally, in more recent times, abstract has been described as the mental process which occurs when the mind focusses on one peculiar property characterizing different objects, discarding all the other features for which they differ. For instance, if objects with different shapes and functions are all of the same colour, our mind can abstract away from the differential features in order to focus solely on the colour, and create a set of objects based on that colour concept.

In actual fact, the presented propositions are quite divergent; however, they let us distinguish a common point that characterizes abstract objects, e.g. their indeterminacy and vagueness in terms of quantitative and qualitative status, or, to better say, that they drift away to various extents from the concept of a determinate and specific object (an idea close to that of *concrete* paradigm).

In this book, we concentrate on the linguistic reasoning, in order to propose a definition of abstractness by observing how certain languages mark elements denoting entities characterised by the lack of one or more concrete properties, making them 'abstract objects'. In particular, we embrace the cognitive-semantic concept of abstractness, which lays in the notion of kind or category prototype, and we connect it with the studies on genericity in linguistics, identifying the encoding of abstract objects with linguistic nominals typically marked in natural languages as weak-referentials, since they entail a generic semantics.

We discuss data from a number of French-based creoles, especially those of the Caribbean, offering three case studies on the grammatical strategies to encode different types of linguistic objects with a generic semantics, namely (1) nominal lexemes, (2) verb cognate object (reiteration) constructions; (3) completive clauses.

The book is structured as follows.

Chapter 1 is dedicated to the theoretical framework by which we explain more in detail how abstract objects and generic semantics of linguistic elements are connected. Moving away from the philosophical discussion, we consider the semantic analysis of abstract objects proposed by Moltmann (1997, 2013a, 2013b, 2016), the theories of genericity and referentiality in linguistics (from Carlson - Pelletier 1995), and the prototype theory applied to the concept of nouniness both in cognitive and linguistic studies. According to the given definition of abstractness, we identify seven categories of 'abstract' referents, typically encoded as (marked) nouns in languages: masses; aggregates; locations and times; properties; events and state of affairs; facts and propositions; pronouns, special quantifiers and light nouns.

Chapter 2 contains a methodological explanation concerning data from the French-based creole considered in the case studies. It gives details on the collection and the interpretation of data for each case study.

Chapter 3 deals with the phenomenon of the article agglutination on nouns in French-based creoles. Notably, almost all French-based creoles display a number of nouns that have originated from the reanalysis of the French noun phrase [article + noun] into a new monomorphemic

lexeme, where the former article is agglutinated to the noun; for instance Fr. *la plage* > Haitian Creole *laplaj*; Fr. *de l'eau* > Seychelles Creole *dilo*. Our analysis shows a semantic correlation between the article agglutination and the lexical semantics of most nouns involved in this restructuring, and we suggest that the article works as a classifier for classes of nouns that express kind concepts, and that are more likely to be treated in languages as non-prototypical nouns.

Chapter 4 is dedicated to the encoding in Haitian Creole and Guadeloupean Creole of individual-level and stage-level property predicates, and to the latter's compatibility with typically grammatical verbal strategies, such as syntactic reiteration constructions which, through a cognate object, simultaneously express evaluative manner and aspect, or TAM markers which express progressive aspect. We analyse the compatibility of adjectives belonging to various semantic classes with typically verbal syntactic constructions and morphological markers in the two Caribbean creoles.

Finally, in Chapter 5, the grammar of fact-type and potential-type completive clauses in Guadeloupean Creole is investigated, together with the rise and distribution of the fact-type complementizer *kè* versus the zero form. Besides, other significant factors in complementation such as the subject coreference and the TAM markers on verbs of the main and the secondary clauses are analysed. The aim is to give account of the distribution in Guadeloupean Creole of the form of the complementizer *kè*, which is shown to be associable with the fact type semantics of the completive event (Dixon 2006), and so do other grammatical functions and markers that are featured in the completive clauses when *kè* is present, such as independent TAM markers on the verb and the obligatory featuring of a subject form in case of subject coreference.

Chapter 6, Conclusions, will summarize the main results of the case studies and link them to the preliminary argumentation.

1.

NPS' GENERICITY AND REFERENTIALITY

1. GENERICITY

1.1. *Kind-referring NPs*

The notion of *genericity* is one abundantly treated in the history of the philosophy of language and linguistics (Dahl 1975; Carlson 1977, 2010; Lyons 1977; Kleiber 1990; Langacker 1991; Ojeda 1991, 1993; Asher 1993; Carlson - Pelletier 1995; Kratzer 1995; Krifka *et al.* 1995; Moltmann 1997, 2013a; Chierchia 1998; Mari - Beyssade - Del Prete 2013, among others). In a fundamental contribution to the topic, Krifka *et al.* (1995) pinpoint two linguistic phenomena that can be classified as 'genericity'. The first one is the generic NP, i.e. an NP which refers to a *kind*.

The underlined noun phrases (NPs) in (1) do not denote or designate some particular potato or group of potatoes, but rather the kind Potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) itself. In this usage a generic NP is an NP that does not refer to an "ordinary" individual or object, but instead refers to a kind.

(1)

- a. The potato was first cultivated in South America.
- b. Potatoes were introduced into Ireland by the end of the 17th century.
- c. The Irish economy became dependent upon the potato.

We will call NPs like potatoes or the potato in these sentences kind-referring NPs, or sometimes generic NPs, as opposed to object-referring NPs [...]. (Krifka *et al.* 1995, 2)

The cited notions of (a) 'object' and (b) 'kind' (Carlson 1977) describe (a) the conceptualization of a discrete physical object and (b) that of a category built around a specimen, a sample, which relates to the entities of the real world (or, to better say, to their conceptualization) through an

exemplification relation (Carlson 1977; Carlson - Pelletier 1995; Kratzer 1995; Löbner 2002).

The given definition of 'kind' encompasses the view on categorization developed within the the cognitive semantics' paradigm, which establishes that a category (a *kind*) spins around the concept – the mental representation – of a prototypical exemplar (specimen)¹, endowed with a series of necessary and sufficient conditions and features, setting a baseline for the categorization of other referents or entities disposing of the same conditions and features, so that they are reckoned to be associable or similar to the prototype, and thus of the same kind.

The kind *potato*, for instance, is defined according to a cluster of fundamental properties with which a prototypical potato is endowed, such as being a *tuber*, *roundish* and *brownish*, whose sum is sufficient for its identification, and necessary, because the lack of one of these features would not allow the identification of a *potato* prototype (a *kiwi*, for instance, can be roundish and brownish without necessarily being a tuber)².

This description sums up pretty well the *exemplification relation* that already according to Carlson and Pelletier (1995) ties a (the concept of) kind to (that of) an object, and which generally is at the base of the mechanism of categorization, since it stands as result of the associations and comparisons between entities, that the human mind can perform as a basic cognitive task³.

1.2. *The taxonomic and quantitative function of generic NPs*

According to the Carlsonian's definition of *kind*, a kind does not identify a "sum of objects disposing of n. features". Instead, the referent of a kind is the *kind* itself, a category, i.e. a construal obtained by a mental operation of abstraction, which apprehends a commonality of properties and functions in a n. of entities, and formulate a standard structure out of it.

In early logic and semantic studies concerning the theory of meaning, the difference between these two entities (sum of objects disposing of

¹ For the notion of prototype, cf. Rosch 1978. For the linguistic notion of prototype, cf. Comrie 1981; Givón 2001.

² Cf. Kleiber 1990; Ojeda 1991; Löbner 2002, 174 on the 'necessary and sufficient conditions' model in the semantic theory; Wierzbicka 1988, 471 on the connotation of meaning in kinds.

³ Cf. Langacker 2008, 101-102; cf. also Dobrovie-Sorin - Pires de Oliveira 2007; Espinal - McNally 2007, 2011 for the definition of kinds as only intensional and categorial concept.

n. features/kind) was already present and identified in the *intensional* and *extensional* meaning of a linguistic element (Carnap 1947; Quine 1953). The extensional meaning of a noun represents the whole number of referents that a noun can denote, while its intensional meaning is given by the properties of the referent that the noun connotes; given the same noun 'potato', its intensional reference identifies a generic referent characterised by a set of properties, or in other words the specimen of the taxonomic category of *solanum tuberosum*, the potato.

Hence, typically, the concept of kind corresponds in the language to the *intensional* reading of a noun, and associates with its taxonomic and classificational reference or denotation.

Nevertheless, it is noticed that what is usually analysed as a kind-referring NP can take in natural languages other functions than simply the taxonomic one.

According to Krifka *et al.* (1995, 64), for instance, a quantitative function of generic NP is exemplified in English sentences with generic NPs such as *the rat reached Australia in 1770*, where of course the meaning of *rat* implies an intension as the kind 'rat', but the truth of such episodic sentence is only stated if the noun makes reference to real animals rats arriving to the shores of Australia, and thus the image that the generic NP conveys is that of a quantity of referents. The meaning of *rats* as used in such a sentence would rather subsume the extensional meaning of the noun, rather than its intensional one⁴.

In fact, although Carlson (1977) affirms that a generic NP expressed in English by a bare plural noun (ex. *lions, potatoes*, like in 1b in the quotation above) can actually work as a kind-referring NP, other interpretations, such as Pelletier (1995)'s, Chierchia (1998)'s and more recently Borik and Espinal (2012)'s, argue that a bare plural is more suitable for a quantitative interpretation of the referent, because a plural form would suggest a different internal structure of the referent with respect to that of a definite singular NP denoting a kind (*the lion, the potato*). Namely, a grammatical plural form on a noun would dismiss the idea of an *atomic* reference instantiation (to use a Fregean term; Chierchia 1988) and favour the idea of a multi-instantiated referential domain⁵.

⁴ According to this interpretation, and contrary to the Carlsonian definition of kind, kinds in literature are often defined as *sums of entities*; cf. Kratzer 1988; Chierchia 1998; Givón 2001.

⁵ This concept will be explained more extensively in in § 3. Different theories are that of Dayal 2004; Farkas - de Swart 2004, 2007.

Going back to Carlson's postulations, the reading of a noun as quantificational or taxonomic is finally sorted out looking at the nature of the sentence predication. The second type of genericity explained by Krifka *et al.* (1995) is the one related to the predication in a sentence, whether it reports about a generic or habitual event, or a persistent property, or about a specific and isolated episodic event or a temporal state or property. The generic or specific meaning conveyed by the predicate is reflected in the taxonomic or quantitative interpretation of its subject or (syntactic) object generic NP – as well as in interpretation of an NP as referring to an object or to a kind –. A bare plural will be more likely preferred if the predication concerns a fact or an episodic event, or a stage level predicates (Carlson 1977; Chierchia 1998); on the contrary the more generic will the predication be, the more a taxonomic interpretation will be given to the NP (typical taxonomic predicates are *be extinct* or *die out*).

1.3. Kinds and 'abstract objects'

The distinction between objects and kinds can be often found formulated within one of the fundamental ontological oppositions, that of 'concrete' vs. 'abstract'. While objects are commonly described as concrete entities, kinds are usually associated with abstract objects or entities (Kleiber 1990; Moltmann 1997, 2013a).

But what are *abstract objects* and why can kinds be considered in their number?

In actual fact, the term 'abstract' matches a multiplicity of meanings, causing a certain confusion in understanding what are the characteristics that an entity must have (or not have) in order to be conceived as an abstract.

According to the metaphysical definition, an abstract entity is one that lacks the physical dimension, implying the absence of a series of properties such as spatio-temporal location, perceptibility by senses and causal efficiency (Asher 1993). For these reasons, abstract objects are traditionally identified with properties, state of affairs, facts and propositions – second and third order entities in Lyons' semantics (1977)⁶ –.

⁶ Nonetheless, in Lyons 1977, it is stated that the difference between second order entities and third order entities is that the former can be actually located in time and space – contrary to the latter, completely outside space and time –, but that, rather than existing, they take place, meaning that their spatio-temporal location, perceptual properties and causal efficiency are not as inherent and stable as for first order entities (Lyons 1977, 443), and thus they are not as much concrete.

Notably, though, the label 'abstract' is not only limited to describe these classes of entities; elements like 'unicorns', 'numbers' or 'atoms' are, for instance, considered abstract concepts for missing one or more of the 'concrete' properties, or for having them manifested in peculiar ways; while unicorns are merely the product of our imagination, an atom is a physical entity, but its body is such to escape to an immediate sensory experience, causing it a more 'abstract' conceptualization⁷.

In the present study, we are turning to the cognitive semantic definition of abstracts and abstractness. In this perspective, abstractness occurs when a 'schema' is set about a concept (Langacker 2008), being a 'schema' a category prototype, following the terminology hitherto used. Abstraction takes place since, as said before, the prototype of any domain and category is fixed by a number of properties, which, with respect to the entities related to the prototype by comparison and exemplification relations, are hyper-characterised with respect to the specific properties that any of these entities singularly possesses.

If I say that a person is *tall*, this characterisation is schematic – abstract – relative to the more precise specification that he is *over six feet tall*, for the latter restricts the permissible values to a narrower range along the height parameter. The latter expression is in turn schematic for *about six feet five inches tall*, and so on [...]. (Langacker 2008, 132)

In other words, for Langacker the word *tall* implies that there is in the speaker's mind a prototypical height starting from which a person can be considered tall, and the only use of the adjective with no further specification is sufficient to assure that the information about a certain tallness is transmitted. *Tall* is not just describing a property, it is also ideally identifying all the specific measures that can be contained, associated or compared in/to the standard of tallness, so it is identifying the kind *tall* (for a person).

From a theoretic point of view, this *tall* example explains how a category characterisation works: it is built on the lack of specification, and so it abstracts away from the single and specific features or instantiations, in the name of a universal and atomic structure based on the commonality of features.

This perspective favours the idea that an operation of abstraction consists in shifting from a particular and specific level of conceptualization

⁷ For an exhaustive bibliography on 'abstract objects' and their reference, cf. Zalta 1983; Hale 1987; Asher 1993; Rosen 2001; Fine 2002; Wetzel 2009; Garcia Carpintero - Marti 2014.

to a universal and generic one, and strongly recalls the metaphysic model of *individuals* – the entities of the world –, considered in their *particular* or *universal* dimension (*particular individuals* and *universal individuals*; Strawson 1959); any entity or individual can be put under a universal relation with respect to other entities, but it also possesses some particularities that separate it from the other entities (*particular relation*)⁸.

2. REFERENCE TO 'ABSTRACT OBJECTS' IN NATURAL LANGUAGES

2.1. Referentiality and non-referentiality

*Semantic referentiality*⁹ is a property of the meaning of a noun (or of other linguistic elements) to denote an entity identifiable in the real world (Givón 2001).

In this book, we take on board the assumption that a nominal lexeme or lexical base denotes primarily a *kind*, in line with the already cited semantic theories of Carlson (1977) and Krifka (2004), and with the cognitive notion of the noun's schema.

Such an assessment was already at the base of the concept of *sense* of a word for Frege (*Sinn*; Frege 1982), according to whom, a word is endowed with one lexical-semantic sense, i.e. the cognitive or epistemic concept associated to it, depicting a universal category of referents, while only when it is inserted in the discourse, it denotes a single specific referent (takes a reference or denotation function; *Bedeutung*).

In other words, the content of a nominal lexical root or stem would *per se* be associated to the concept of an ideal referent, of a category (*kind*)-prototype, characterized by a stable set of properties; once this content is brought into the universe of discourse, its denotation can be restricted to identify one specific object¹⁰.

In the functional discourse tradition, nouns denoting at the kind-reading level are called *non-referentials* (Hengeveld 1992), while those denoting

⁸ This distinction had been even previously formulated by Russell (1905) in terms of *existential* and *universal* quantifier, following the Aristotelian distinction between a noun's *sensus divisus* and *sensus compositum* (cf. Givón 2001, II, 440).

⁹ Distinct from the *referential function* (pragmatic referentiality) of a noun or of any other linguistic element.

¹⁰ Relation of instantiation, cf. Ojeda 1993.

at an object-reading level are called *referentials*¹¹; but, although any noun can potentially make reference to a kind and to an object in a sentence, from a lexical-semantic point of view, any noun contains some information on the reference domain it can instantiate, which is correlated to the inherent concepts it represents (Wierzbicka 1988; Ojeda 1993) and not always associated to an object prototype.

As Quine (1960)¹² already argued, every word possesses build-in modes of dividing the reference, even if their denotation identifies in fact the same entity of the real world.

[...] consider 'shoe', 'pairs of shoes' and 'footwear': all three range over the same [...] stuff, and differ from one another solely in that two of them divide their reference differently, and the third one not at all. (Quine 1960, 91)

If reference is measured by the possibility of identify atomic entities in the discourse, and a noun or an NP prototypically denotes an object, which is quintessentially an atomic entity, the more the conceptual structure of a noun represents in individual terms, the higher the reference that can be instantiated will be.

This reference argument is also relevant in shaping the countable/uncountable distinction. A countable word stem denotes an atomic structure of the entity it denotes and providing a semantic criterion for the individuation of its reference. On the contrary, an uncountable stem does not suggest an individuation of reference, or at least of an atomically instantiated reference.

According to the chosen definition of abstractness, all the 'abstract objects' categories that we are taking into consideration are uncountable nouns if considered from the referential point of view, being their structure more similar to that of a kind than that of an object.

2.2. Prototypical and non-prototypical NPs

For nouns and NPs, the category prototype typically consists in the concept of a physical object (i.e. *object*) (Langacker 2008, 103), characterised by the properties of unity, identity, functional cohesion, perceptual boundedness, and instantiation (Jackendoff 1991; Acquaviva 2008, 90-118). Besides

¹¹ Cf. Aguilar-Guevara - Le Bruyn - Zwarts 2014 about all the elements that can play a role in non-referentiality, apart from the lexical-semantics of a noun, and on the linguistic bibliography on referentiality.

¹² Cited in Ojeda 1993, 116.

denoting an object, a prototypical NP has a nominal head, denotes by lexical means, and is used referentially (Hengeveld 1992; Hengeveld - Mackenzie 2008).

Notably, when an NP (or any linguistic element filling a nominal syntactic slot) does not denote an object, it is usually marked in natural languages with dedicated morphological means or syntactic strategies, deviating from a default nominal encoding.

Besides kind terms, a typology of grammatically marked nouns includes (Moltmann 2013a): (1) noun phrases with nominalizations or functional nouns as heads; (2) expressions in subject or complement positions that are not NPs (for instance completive clauses); (3) bare plurals and mass nouns; (4) special quantifiers and pronouns.

In terms of denotation, the contents of non-prototypical nouns are, according to Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008, 131), individuals such as *chair*, properties such as *colour*, state of affairs such as *meeting*, location such as *country*, time such as *week*. In fact, as the two linguists explain, natural languages might allow reference to these elements on a different conceptual basis than that required by a semantic prototypical object: for instance, a noun like *chair* is included in the list because a *chair* is not always conceptualized in languages on the behalf of its own being an object *chair*, but on the behalf of its being an element of a group of the same objects with – for instance – the same function (*chairs*), i.e. a set or a plurality (*set-objects*) to which somehow “we can impute a sufficiently regular behaviour” (Chierchia 1998, 348); just as also fruits like apples or pears, or tools like spikes or knives and forks do (*ibid.*, 511-512; Rijkhoff 2002; Langacker 2008).

Other entities that treated grammatically differently than prototypical nouns in languages that systematically reflect the ontological difference between an object and an ‘abstract object’ (although not all languages do; cf. Wierzbicka 1988, 499-555) are masses (ex. *water, sand*), aggregates and cohesive (and dual) aggregates (ex. *bones, fingers, scissors, trousers*), collectives (ex. *furniture, police*)¹³.

Finally, traditional abstract object, like properties, events, state of affairs and propositions are typically encoded in languages as nouns and NP by the use of specific and dedicated grammatical strategies.

¹³ There is still a vivid debate going on about the internal structure and conceptualizations of these entities, cross-linguistically encoded with various strategies; we have here followed the denominations used in Acquaviva 2008; on the topic and for examples from the world's languages, cf. also Chierchia 1998; Ojeda 1998; Wierzbicka 1998.

3. 'ABSTRACT OBJECTS' AS WE MEAN THEM

Below, we are listing the classes of referents that we consider 'abstract objects' according to the given definition of abstractness and referentiality, and to their grammatical encoding in languages:

(a) Masses

Masses such as homogeneous substances, like *water*, *air*, *flour*, but also grained substances like *sand* or *rice*¹⁴, are conceptualized as missing one usual peculiar property of concrete objects: boundedness, i.e. the external delimitation through spatial and temporal boundaries.

While a prototypical object has a definite spatial boundary, such property is not necessary to identify a substance (*mass*) like *water*: we can plunge in water and be completely surrounded by it, and still not know the extent of its boundaries. In addition, homogeneous substances are also traditionally described as internally non-instantiated (Talmy 1988 says that they do not have an *internal structure*), i.e. not composed by grouping together single entities (*instantiations*).

Nonetheless, Jackendoff (1991, 19) remarks that in linguistics it is commonly noted that the contrast between count nouns (typically denoting bounded and instantiated objects) and mass nouns has a parallel in temporally bounded and unbounded events, on the basis that both a count noun's referent, such as an *apple*, and a temporally bounded event, such as *the light flashed*, cannot be divided in two (or more) instances and still give the same element as a result. On the contrary, the spatially unbounded *water* and the temporally unbounded event such as *Bill slept* can be divided in two parts and still give as result elements describable as *water* and as *Bill slept*.

Such a 'division' test verifies whether an entity has an internal part-structure, i.e. whether it is composed by a multiplicity of parts or instantiations, or whether it stands as a single object, and, according to Jackendoff, we can contemplate the idea that a substance like water is a cumulative entity, divisible in smaller and single *quantities*¹⁵ of the same domain,

¹⁴ With [+granularity] property; on size and granularity of masses, cf. Wierzbicka 1988, 542-548; Acquaviva 2008, 82-83. Hawkins (1978) calls entities such as sand or rain 'inclusive masses'. Jackendoff (1991) notices that, contrary to homogeneous masses such as water, substances such as rain or sand have in nature other quantificational elements that set boundaries to unbounded mass concepts, and that in language are encoded as classifiers of mass nouns, such as *a drop* of rain or *a grain* of sand. Cf. also Higginbotham 1994.

¹⁵ Cf. Cartwright 1970 for the concept of *quantity*.

being them molecules or drops, ponds or jars, which are still identifiable as *water*, but bounded instances of it.

Viewed from this perspective, a mass becomes associable to another unbounded and cumulative entity, an *aggregate* such as *giraffes*. Notably, from a linguistic point of view, mass nouns share many grammatical features with nouns of aggregates, from selecting the same determiners or a zero article (in English, nouns of aggregates are mostly bare plurals, like *giraffes*), to be located in distributive sentences like 'there were *books/water* all over the floor'.

The crucial difference between masses and aggregates is that such internal part-structure characterises an aggregate concept, while it is not *entailed* in the conceptualization of a mass. In fact, the conceptualization of a homogeneous substance like *water* does not necessarily entail that it is composed by smaller quantities, while the conceptualization of an aggregate like *giraffes* necessarily entails that the entity is constituted by the cumulation and plurality of giraffes¹⁶. We can say, then, that masses have potentially a part structure, but that this part structure is not concerned or in view during their conceptualization.

This issue is evident if we look at the reference domain that a mass noun sets, which is non divisional (Harbour 2011), as mass nouns' grammatical default singular number encoding demonstrates (Corbett 2000).

On the opposite, plural conceptualizes an entity as consisting of parts, and this is the reason why nouns of *aggregates* are usually grammatical plurals or select specific pluralizing suffixes (Acquaviva 2008).

Masses, so much like properties, have been often compared to kinds (Chierchia 1998; Borer 2005) because of their non-divisional part-structure reference in languages (Acquaviva 2008), since they are primarily referred to as individual categories, and seldom the reference is reduced or restricted to identify their internal bounded instantiation, just as kinds. According to Carlson (1977) and Krifka (1995, 2004) every noun identifies first of all a kind, but, depending on the internal structure of the referent, some nouns are more keen than others to denote the single instances or objects that constitute the extension of the noun. Thus the noun *rats* refer priorly to the animal kind *rat*, and indeed it can work as a kind-referring NP, but its plural number makes us understand that its reference domain can be structured down to the single parts that constitute it, to one single element related to the category, i.e. one rat, expressed by *a rat*.

¹⁶ Indeed, the debate is still remarkably interesting and vivid (cf. McKay 2006; Nicolas 2008; Moltmann 2013, 2016).

Kinds, properties, and masses, because of their logical properties, do not set such division and restriction in their default reference process. The cases where the reference is set on the single instantiation of a mass, is when either a mass noun is marked with a plural morpheme (ex. *waters*, *sands*), or when it selects a concrete classifier such as *grain of* or *drop of*.

One of the recent theories following the Carlsonian's idea of nouns denoting priorly at a kind-level is that proposed by Borik and Espinal (2012); according to the authors, some nouns can receive the number syntactic projection, which moves the reference from the kind-level to the object-level, but for some other nouns, that the authors call *indefinite generics*, this projection is not available.

(b) Aggregates

Commenting over a group of Dutch neuter nouns that have kept an ancient form of plural suffix (ex.: sg. *kind* 'child' / pl. *kinderen* 'children'), Acquaviva writes that:

The referents of these plurals are all weakly individual notions: physical objects naturally occurring in cohesive aggregates (*bones*, *joints*, *wheels*), entities liable to being experienced as interchangeable units (*leaves*, *songs*, *eggs*, *children*, *animals*), notions conceptualized as a mass (*minds*, *goods*), and the intrinsically collective 'people', whose plural is as likely to express a multitude of persons (*nations*) as of people. (Acquaviva 2008, 15)

As said, an aggregate is an entity consisting of a plurality of objects. Differently than mass nouns, a noun of aggregate sets a part structure reference, and it is as a consequence expressed by plurals.

Of course, an aggregate can function as a category, and in fact a noun for aggregate works well as a generic NP. Langacker (2008, 105) argues that once a group of objects is established, at a higher level of conceptualization, it can be seen as a single and unitary entity, through the mental operation of *reification*: "the capacity to manipulate a group as a unitary entity for a higher cognitive purposes".

In order to allow a conceptualization as a group, an aggregate must contain objects that are spatially contiguous, similar and interconnected among them; in grouping, objects are compared and finally recognised as similar and interconnected, because they share a number of features, just as entities that relate to the same category do. In natural languages, nouns that are grammatically classified and marked as aggregates are often those denoting natural categories, such as plants, animals, meteorological and astronomical objects (such as *clouds* and *stars*), geological objects (such as *bills*, *mountains*), etc.

Cohesive aggregates can be considered a subtype of aggregates, but the grouping principle, and the internal divisional structure is the same: they usually concern a bounded group of several entities, such as body parts like *bones*, *fingers* and *toes*, or dual entities, pairs such as *trousers* or *scissors*.

Nouns expressing aggregates can also denote them as a single unit, as collective nouns do. From the point of view of the entities they denote, they are not different from aggregates, but in terms of referential domain they do not dispose of a divisional structure, being similar in this sense to mass nouns.

(c) Locations (and times)

Although some places and locations can be indeed looked at as objects (ex. the physical venues – the buildings – *house* and *hospital*), in some languages they are not categorized and encoded as such (Wierzbicka 1988; Goddard - Wierzbicka 2002).

Lately, much research has concentrated on nouns of natural locations, such as *hill* or *lake* (Bromhead 2017), arguing that the semantics of natural locations is very similar to the semantics of kind and group concepts such as natural entities like *trees*, *bees* or to that of artefacts like *chairs* or *knives*, and, indeed, it is not difficult to find examples of languages that assimilate grammatically locations and times with other entities that have been listed above in the number of *abstract objects*; for instance, in Tariana – what Aikhenvald (2000) calls – *abstract nouns* like *day*, *weather*, *world*, or *rain*, and places, like *place where home is*, belong to the same noun class, and are marked by the noun classifiers *-wani*. Masses are numbered in the same class and receive a dedicated classifier *-peri*, whose grammatical behaviour is parallel to *-wani*.

An attempt to explain why nouns like *home*, *hospital*, *coffeehouse* or *beach* are not typically categorized as objects but rather as kinds is found in Corblin (2011). Following the studies of Furukawa (2010) on nouns of places, the author argues that nouns that denote a location are often interpreted according to their 'intensional' meaning, i.e. as kinds, because they are frequently used in sentences to fulfil a locative thematic role¹⁷, and are thus expressed in NPs or prepositional phrases (10), where the reference conveyed does not concern information about an object but rather about the kind of object defined by its *function*¹⁸ (*hospital*: place where sick people are healed; *coffeehouse*: place where people go to drink coffee).

¹⁷ Hengeveld - Mackenzie 2008, 248-249.

¹⁸ A recall to Pustejovsky (1995)'s semantic theory of qualia is needed here: a noun whose interpretation is based on the functional properties of its referents would be argued to involve a telic *qualia*.

10. French (Furukuwa 2010, 75)¹⁹
 Ma mère est morte à l'hôpital, d'un cancer.
 1f.sg.POSS. mother is dead.f.sg. at the hospital of a cancer
 'My mother died at the hospital, for a cancer'.

In order to allow an object-reference for these nouns, what is needed in the context of a sentence is more specific and anaphoric information to be related to the noun, in order to convey an interpretation of definiteness of the referent.

11. French (Corblin 2011, 61)
 Dans ce restaurant, le garçon est nettement moins sympathique que le menu.
 In this restaurant the waiter is definitely less nice than the menu
 'In this restaurant, the waiter is definitely less nice than the menu'.

In a sentence like 11, for instance, besides the demonstrative *ce*, which is *per se* a grammatical means to express specificity in French, the introduction in the discourse of associate-referents like *garçon* and *menu*, raise the possibilities that the reference of *restaurant* is object-instantiated in the context, so that the noun does not denote the *kind of place where you go to eat* but rather a particular physical venue.

In the theory of (weak) referentiality (or definiteness), this associates-sustained attribution of the semantic definiteness of a noun (also called *bridging*; Clark 1975; Farkas 2002) is called (*co*-)varying interpretation of the definites²⁰ (Hawkins 1978; Carlson *et al.* 2006; Schwarz 2014), and it allows an object-instantiations reference for those nouns which semantically convey genericity, being typically conceptualized as *kinds*²¹.

Interestingly, it is noticed that all nouns denoting objects that have a characteristic function in a society (not only locations, but also things or persons like *the newspaper*, *the doctor*, *the train*, *the phone*) behave generally as kind-referring nouns, thus as *weak definites* (Carlson - Sussman 2005; Aguilar-Guevara - Le Bruyn - Swartz 2014)²².

We propose that a weak definite like *the newspaper* or *the hospital* refers to a well-established kind, just like a singular definite generic like *the chinchilla* does (Carlson 1977; Krifka 2004), but unlike bare plurals, which refer to maximal entities. (Ašić - Corblin 2014, 186, already citing Aguilar Guevara - Zwarts 2010)

¹⁹ Already cited in Corblin 2011.

²⁰ These kinds of non-referential nouns are those that are typically called weak-referentials (Aguilar Guevara - Zwarts 2010), or also weak-definites (Poesio 1994) or indefinites (Löbner 1985).

²¹ Cf. Swartz 2014, 214-217 and Farkas 2002 for the syntactic properties of those nouns.

²² Cf. also the principle of *Seinsart* formulated in Rijkhoff 1991 and Dik 1997.

(d) Properties

Property concepts belong to the core of 'abstract objects' according to the logic and metaphysical tradition.

Here, we focus on the difference between stage-level properties and individual-stage properties (Milksark 1974; Carlson 1977), based on the persistence of a property. If a property is persistent, like *having brown hair* (Kratzer 1995), that will be an individual property, since it is understood to regard a stable characterisation (quality) of an individual. If a property is transitory, like *being sitting on a chair*, then it will be a stage property, since it regards a stage of an individual's life.

From a cognitive perspective (Langacker 2008, 99), the distinction between individual-level properties and stage-level properties relates to the processual relation, one of the relationships that characterize basic cognitive categories, which implies that a certain entity develops through time, and that this development dimension is put into focus. A non-processual relation, on the contrary, implies that an entity is configured as fully manifested in one single time; it can be persistent through time, hence report always the same values in different instants, and temporal evolution is not fundamental to its characterization. Langacker defines non-processual relations as *atemporal*, since their evolution through time is considered a backgrounded aspect. Clearly, individual-level properties (or states) are compatible with a non-processual relation (or persistent), while stage-level properties are processual (or transitional).

Before the linguistic cognitive analysis, a distinction of entities based on processual values was already at the basis of a semantic distinction proposed by Davidson (1980), who viewed *events* (states, processes and actions) as entities characterized by a change, while *classes* as entities that are constant over time and which are therefore not temporally located.

Milksark and Carlson first argued that languages can show a consistent difference in the grammatical encoding of individual-stage predicates and stage-level predicates (Milksark 1974; Carlson 1977; Stump 1985; Chierchia 1995; Musan 1997). For instance, in English, if the predication of a property occurs in the last position of a *there*-sentence, it will be a stage-level predicate, not an individual-level predicate.

12. (Kratzer 1995, 125)

There are firemen *available*. (stage-level property)

*There are firemen *altruistic*. (individual-level property)

Furthermore, if a predicate is held by a perception verb, it is a stage level predicate (13).

13. (Kratzer 1995, 125)
We saw John *exhausted*. (stage-level predicate)
*We saw John *tall*. (individual-level predicate)

Individual-level or stage-level properties' predication can also change the interpretation of the NP's reference; consider the two sentences in 14, where subject NPs are bare plurals.

14. (Kratzer 1995, 125)
a. Firemen are *available*. (stage-level property)
b. Firemen are *altruistic*. (individual-level property)

In 14b the individual-level property is interpretable as one generic property, common to all the objects or individuals that are related to the kind or aggregate *firemen*, while the presence of the stage-level predication in 14b implicitly restricts the reference to a definite part of firemen: those that are at the moment available.

So, from this perspective, it is not very difficult to make a parallel between an individual-stage property and a kind on ontological basis.

Talking about masses, we have reported a consideration of Jackendoff on the possibility of divide indefinite events and masses into intervals and parts; the result would be subintervals and subparts of the same event or substance. This is how we can test continuity and homogeneity of an entity, and individual-level properties would positively give the same results for this test. If we predicate the property of firemen of being altruistic, it is a continuous and homogeneous property by which we are classifying the entire category of firemen, from which its stability derive; while if we predicate the property of being available, not only is it true for a few number of firemen, but it is also a non-continuous and non-homogeneous condition. In fact, such continuity and homogeneity mean an unboundeness in time, a condition that only individual-stage properties realize. For this reason, from a referential point of view, individual-stage level properties can be considered working as kinds and other abstract objects.

(e) Events and state of affairs

The distinction about the two types of events (Vendler 1967) or state of affairs (Vendler 1967; Dik - Hengeveld 1991; Svetonius 1994) that is functional with respect to referentiality is that concerning bounded or unbounded events/state of affairs²³.

²³ Cf. Boye 2010 for the definition and denomination of events, state of affairs, facts and proposition/propositional acts in philosophy and linguistics.

Langacker (2008, 147) sets a parallel between the conceptual factor responsible for the conceptualization of the count/mass distinction of entities of the real world grammatically encoded by nouns and the perfective/imperfective notions applicable to processual events, which are typically encoded in languages by verbs.

As said, all dynamic events are characterised by an evolution through time, but some of them are conceptualized as bounded in time (perfectives), while others are not specifically bounded, without an intrinsic endpoint (imperfectives).

The imperfectives are described as internally homogeneous and continuous, just as masses or properties are. In addition, they inform about a certain continuation through time that keeps the process stable in its development: they are not resultative, meaning that no new situation is expected because of the process. They are, in other words, indefinite, because nothing specific can be inferred about the duration of the process, being them temporally unbounded.

(f) Facts and propositions (*realis* and *irrealis*)

Notably, the differentiation between facts and propositions (Vendler 1967, 1972) is based on the presupposition of truth of a state of affair, which, according to Roberts (2000), represents a basic conceptual domain reflected in the structure of most natural languages.

Lyons (1977)'s semantic theory of linguistic entities led to analyse nominal complementation on the basis of the so-called *level of factivity* of propositions, e.g. the commitment of the speaker to the truth of the proposition expressed by the statement: factive, when the speaker is committed; for instance, in the statement *I know he came*, the speaker is committed to the truth of the statement *he came*; non-factive, when the speaker is committed to neither the truth nor the falsity of the proposition; for example, in the statement *I believe that he came* the speaker is committed to neither the truth nor the falsity of the statement *he came*; and contra-factive, where the speaker is committed to the falsity of the proposition; for instance, *I wish he had come*, the speaker is committed to the falsity of the statement *he had come*.

The two binary values representing the speaker's perceptions on the actualization of a state of affairs have received diverse names, besides *factive/non-factive* (Kiparsky - Kiparsky 1970), they are labelled as *real/unreal* or *actual/potential*²⁴ (Elliott 2000; Palmer 2001). Nevertheless, in the last forty

²⁴ Cf. Von Stechow 2006.

years, with the intensification of the cross-linguistic studies on modality, the more technical terms *realis* and *irrealis*²⁵ seem to have taken over and become preferred alternatives: “The *realis* portrays situations as actualized, as having occurred or actually occurring, knowable through direct perception. The *irrealis* portrays situations as purely within the realm of thought, knowable only through imagination” (Mithun 1999, 173).

Nevertheless, there is a still vivid debate about the universal meaning of *realis* and *irrealis* and about the semantic consistency of the status they express, the reality status, mainly because the latter lacks a unitary definition and a dedicated cross-linguistic encoding.

In fact, the main point of discussion is exactly whether the *reality status* should be considered an independent cognitive-semantic category or whether part of the wider frame of verbal modality. The difficulty of its definition is caused by the fact that, although abundant descriptive and typological studies confirm that natural languages proceed at structuring grammatical oppositions or markings matching the *realis/irrealis* distinction²⁶, a number of them do not differentiate these grammatical means from those marking other modal domains, such as the epistemic or deontic one, necessarily leading to question the unitary basis which would justify an independent semantic category (that of the reality status).

As Mauri and Sansò (2012) summarize, in the grammatical theory's traditions *realis* and *irrealis* are viewed in at least four ways with regards of their relationship with modality. The first (Givón 2001) considers *irrealis* as a mega-modality dimension “subsuming a number of more specific ‘sub-modes’ which share a common denominator, epistemic uncertainty” (Mauri - Sansò 2012, 99); the second views modality as the same as *realis/irrealis* domains (Lyons 1977; Foley - Van Valin 1984); the third considers *realis* and *irrealis* at the par with modal categories (Perkins - Bybee - Pagliuca 1994; De Haan 2012); finally, the fourth considers the reality status as an independent category with respect to modality (Chung - Timberlake 1985; Elliott 2000).

It is especially the *irrealis* which creates a problem in terms of single identification as a sub-category. Foley and Van Valin (1984) envision a binary distinction between *realis* and *irrealis*, but they assess that within

²⁵ Note that for the moment ‘reality status’, ‘realis’ and ‘irrealis’ are only introduced as semantic concepts. Cf. Cristofaro 2012 for the discussion about the distinction between semantic and grammatical categories of modality and mood.

²⁶ Cf. Bybee - Perkins - Pagliuca 1998; Elliott 2000; Mauri - Sansò 2012 for a typological overview.

the *irrealis* dimension many languages recognize further distinctions, whether the action is necessary, likely, or possible. The *realis-irrealis* status is then conceived as a continuum in terms of actualisation of an event, which moves from *real* to *necessary*, *probable*, *possible* and *unreal*: real ← necessary – probable – possible → unreal.

In Chapter 5, we will provide some analysis of the complementizers in French-based creole languages. Bickerton (1975, 1981) used the term *irrealis* to refer to the grammatical mood markers marking the generic dimension of *unreal*, suggesting that creole languages do not respond to the various domains of modality, but only have two grammatical functions, distributed following the *real* and *unreal* poles. This also aligns with the *realised* and *unrealised* types of complements described before, and with the often attested multifunctionality of the purposive preposition/*irrealis* mood marker/*non-realised* complementizer. However, more recent studies have demonstrated that several creoles diverge from the Bickertonian prototype, and that actually some of these languages have a rather rich markers' repertoire which differentiate the various modalities and moods (cf. Winford 2000), arguing that using the generic label *irrealis* for this type of languages also results highly unprecise.

(g) Pronouns, special quantifiers, and light nouns

Pronouns and special quantifiers, such as *something*, so much as light nouns, such as *thing* or *person*, can indeed identify an object, but they linguistically encode it hyperonymically: the lexical semantics of these items expresses only few information about the properties that characterise the referent, and thus they are suitable to refer vaguely to any other referent which shares the same properties, i.e. to a vast number of referents. In this case, although the referent can actually meet all of the *object* criteria, it is the linguistic item which refers generically, being characterised by a weak referential force.

2.

THE COLLECTION OF CREOLE DATA

1. DATA FOR CASE STUDY 1

This case study is founded on the observation of the article-agglutination morphology of nouns in French-based creole languages, arguing about what semantics and pragmatic context trigger an inflection (*alternation*) of their forms (generating the opposition agglutination/non-agglutination).

Data were elicited following two procedures, deemed suitable for each level of analysis (semantics and pragmatics).

The lexical-semantic aspect of the phenomenon is immediately discernible from the consultation of available descriptive literature for each of the French-based creoles or contact-languages considered (beside the existent argumentative literature on the specific topic of agglutination – especially prolific for Mauritian Creole), as well as of lexical repositories such as vocabularies and dictionaries. In particular, the references consulted for each language and used in this work are the following: Baker (1984), Grant (1995), Strandquist (2003) for Mauritian Creole; Crosby *et al.* (2001) for St. Lucien Creole; Corne (1989), Ehrhart (1993), Kihm (1995) for Tayo or Saint Louis Creole; Bakker (1997) for Michif; Targète - Urciolo (1993) for Haitian Creole; Bernabé (1983) for Martinican and Guadeloupean Creole; Tourneaux - Barbotin (1990; Guadeloupean Creole variety of Marie Galante), Telchid - Pouillet - Anciaux (2009) for Guadeloupean Creole; Valdman (2010) for Louisiana French; Bollé (1977), Corne (1977), de Saint Jorre - Lionnet (1999), Michaelis - Rosalie - Muhme (2009), Gillieaux (2018) for Seychelles Creole; Beniamino (1996) for Reunion Creole; Pfänder (1996, 2000, 2013) for French Guiana Creole.

Nevertheless, the data coming from these secondary sources can only provide a ground for a first partial and fragmentary analysis, but scarcely do they offer a quantitative exhaustiveness which allows a systematic com-

parison among languages. Notably, one methodological problem when working with minority languages is that most of them are not provided with a *corpus* by which the distribution of a certain linguistic phenomenon can be possibly assessed in computable terms, and this includes creole languages as well. Although we may know from previous literature that the agglutination is present in all of the ten contact-languages considered, it is difficult to evaluate its real productivity as well as its formal and functional variation, and consequently to draw wholesome conclusions on its typological status or sociolinguistic condition.

In order to have a more coherent vision on the data, we have decided to benefit of the lexical sections provided by the *An Crúbadán Project – Building a Corpus for Minority Languages*, a project that builds small *corpus* for minority languages through the use of web crawlers, so to allow access to a broad amount of lexical types retrieved from online texts. Originally designed and limited to celtic languages, it has been later extended to include various minority languages, among which some French creoles, and in particular Seychelles Creoles, Haitian Creole, and Reunion Creole.

Although only the access to the vocabulary of only three creoles out of ten is permitted by the tool (and thus our research remains limited in data number for the other creoles), at least Haitian, Reunion and Seychelles creoles represent a good enough variational sample to work with, since they can be viewed as illustrative of the two main linguistic areas which productively register the phenomenon of article agglutination, e.g. the Indian Ocean creoles (Seychelles and Reunion) and Atlantic creoles (Haitian), and partially differ in terms of genesis (for instance, substrate languages) and history¹. In addition, Reunion Creole has been interestingly claimed to be a *creoloid* rather than a full-fledged creole, so an analysis carried on Reunion Creole could account for structural differences/similarities between creoles belonging to the same area (Seychelles and Reunion).

The lexical sections of the *An Crúbadán corpus* consist of a list of lexical tokens of which the crawled texts are composed. For this work, tokens concerning agglutinated nouns have been selected and singled out, and then converted to the corresponding article agglutinated lemmas. This way, we have isolated agglutinated nouns as mere lemmas and identified their primary meaning, and then proceeded to number, count and analyse

¹ Although there is a significant difference among these creoles in terms of number of speakers: Seychelles: 100.000 ca.; Reunion: 800.000 ca.; Haitian: 11.000.000 ca. (source: Michaelis *et al.* 2013; *APiCS* online).

them according to their lexical semantics, since they appear devoid of any context of use and of inflectional morphology.

Such a list of tokens also allows to easily identify in the lexicon of a language the non-agglutinated pairs of article agglutinated nouns, and to state which types of nouns cross-linguistically undergo more frequently inflectional article agglutination, or whether the two lemmas end up referring to different concept through patterns of semantic expansion or reduction, following the underlying generic-specific meaning theory.

In conclusion, the lemmatization is a useful tool, but clearly its function is limited to the lexical-semantics analysis.

In order to proceed with the gathering of primary data and the analysis of the pragmatic context which enables the article-agglutination on a noun, we have administered questionnaires to five speakers of Guadeloupean Creole (bilinguals in French and Guadeloupean Creole). The speakers were all born and schooled in Guadeloupe and still live there (Grande Terre, Port Louis; Basse Terre; Goyave and Lamentin)², and belong to an age range which goes from 30 to 70 years.

Given twenty couples of agglutinated/non-agglutinated pairs of nouns, the questionnaire was projected to estimate the suitability of each nouns into sentences that embed the semantic [+specific (-generic)] / [-specific (+generic)] either concerning the instantiation of the referentiality of the nouns themselves, either concerning the predicate of the sentences of which the noun is syntactically the subject or object, according to the use of the nouns in the sentences. Given four types of sentences, the speakers were asked to indicate their preference regarding the agglutinated/non-agglutinated choice in each sentence, so that the results give a preliminary image of the preferentiality/grammaticality of the distribution of the agglutinated article according to the selected semantic criteria.

2. DATA FOR CASE STUDY 2

This case study was developed on data elicited through questionnaires, too. The questionnaires were built using the theoretical tools provided in Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2014), i.e. a model of sentences which involved the lexical reiteration of a cognate verb (cf. Chapter 4), and crossing it with different semantic types of stative verbs which could fill the verbal syntactic

² M.-E.D., female, 33; N.C., male, 34.; R.B., male, 45; H.P., male, 81; M.D., male, 69.

slot, taken out of Dixon (1982) and Stassen (1997)'s adjectival classification. The aim was to establish whether various types of lexical reiterations that would express evaluative adverbial modification (in particular intensification or reduction) could match adjectives expressing individual-level or stage-level properties and states, i.e. age, value, colour, dimension, physical properties, human propension, speed. The specimen of the used sentence presented the following form: [SUBJ StativeV1 evaluative modifier StativeV2].

Informants were asked to express judgements of acceptability/grammaticality about 42 sentences that presented the same reiteration structure but different predicates, and, whenever they felt sure about the acceptability and/or grammaticality of the sentence, they were asked to translate its meaning into French.

Informants were selected among Haitian Creole and Martinican Creole speakers, since these kinds of reiteration are far rarer in Guadeloupean Creole than in the other two creoles. Three of them were bilinguals of Martinican Creole/French and were currently living in France at the moment of the inquiry³, the other four were speakers of Haitian Creole and three of them were living in Haiti, while one of them was living in Belgium⁴.

3. DATA FOR CASE STUDY 3

Finally, this case study is based on the analysis of a qualitative data sample, which has been collected in a partially controlled setting of elicitation, through questionnaires. Seven selected informants in total participated in the elicitation, all bilinguals of French and Guadeloupean Creole. Five of them were born and schooled in Guadeloupe (the same consulted for case study 1), while the last two were born in France⁵.

Originally, within a wider survey on complementation in Guadeloupean Creole, a first questionnaire was built according to the theoretical lines for the description of completive clauses given in Hengeveld (2015)⁶, and was therefore composed of two parts: the first focussed on the analysis

³ C.W., female, 63; L.W., female, 33; V.-M.M., male, 65.

⁴ D.D., male, 27; R.N., female, 51; R.-L.J., male, 50; B.-L.P., male, 33.

⁵ A.S., female, 26; M.C., male, 57.

⁶ https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/tools-at-lingboard/questionnaire/complement-clauses_description.php.

of grammatical formats that the complementation could have in Guadeloupean Creole, especially inquiring direct and indirect speech constructions and finite, non-finite complement clauses, and alternative strategies. The second part of the questionnaire concerned the encoding of sentential complements according to the semantics of their complement-taking predicates (CTP). Specifically, the aim of the first part of the questionnaire was to check how French and Guadeloupean Creole speakers decided to encode activity type completive clauses in Guadeloupean Creole, expressing an ongoing activity, usually the object of perception and emotive verbs.

The second part of this questionnaire was composed of a total of 62 sentences in French, which the informants were asked to translate to Guadeloupean Creole. For every semantic class of CTPs, several representational verbs were selected (for instance, for utterance predicates, the verb *to say*, *to affirm*, *to order*). Every sentence was then proposed to the informants under different options, such as through the possibility of turning a completive sentence of a predicate of utterance from a direct speech to an indirect sentence, the possibility to negate the content of the completive clause, and the possibility to conjugate the completive verb with various tenses and moods.

As soon as the first data had been collected and analysed, the speakers were asked to answer the second of the questionnaires, which focussed more restrictedly on the grammaticality/acceptance of *kè* with various types of CTPs classes. The speakers were presented with sentences in Guadeloupean Creole featuring the presence or absence of *kè* as a complementizer, about which they could express a preference between the marked and unmarked options.

3.

CASE STUDY 1

The Semantics behind the Reanalysis of French Articles in French-based Creoles

1. THE ARTICLE AGGLUTINATION

The reanalysis into one monomorphemic word of two or more pieces of information in a lexifier/source language is a widespread feature in many pidgin and creole languages, regardless of their different origins in terms of parent languages¹. It usually involves elements that are found frequently uttered together in the lexifier language, for instance collocations of nouns/verbs and prepositions, like for the word *komot* ‘leave’ in Nigerian English Creole deriving from the English phrasal verb *come out*², or for the word *diswà* ‘evening’ in Haitian Creole, from the French prepositional phrase *de soir* ‘at night’.

Since it is so pervasive in contact languages (and indeed all kinds of contact languages, not just pidgin and creoles), such a reanalysis is often explained as an etymological feature, inherent to all systems that have undergone an intense process of relexification or morphological reanalysis.

[The] reinterpretation of morpheme boundaries is fairly common in language restructuring. [...] There is thus nothing remarkable about morpheme boundary reinterpretation in contact languages as such – on the contrary, it is precisely what we would expect from non-native parsing of utterances produced by speakers of another language. (Parkvall 2000, 81)

¹ Cf. Holm 1988; Parkvall 2000 for an exhaustive list of contact languages which host the phenomenon.

² Examples from Parkvall 2000, 81.

Among all the possible outcomes, the one known as *article agglutination*³ consists of the reanalysis into a single noun, or alternatively a pronoun, of the whole [(in)definite/partitive article + nominal lexeme] NP of the lexifier language. The examples in 1 and 2 show that the noun *diri*, meaning ‘rice’ in Mauritian Creole, lexically derives from the partitive French noun phrase *du + riz*, as well as the noun *azágua* in CapeVerdean Creole derives from the Portuguese plural and feminine form of the definite article *las* + noun *águas*, denoting ‘rainy seasons’.

1. Mauritian Creole:
French: *du riz* MC: *diri* ‘rice’
2. Cape Verdean Creole (Ladhams 2012, 33):
Portuguese: *as águas* CC: *azágua* ‘rainy seasons’

The nouns resulting from these lexicalisations are not marked for definiteness. *Table 1* below shows that the noun *lisyē*, derived from a definite plural French noun phrase (< Fr. *le(s) chien(s)* ‘the dog(-s)’) has the same syntactic behaviour of other noun phrases in Mauritian Creole, like *lapē* (‘the rabbit(-s)’), a noun which is not formed through agglutination, but that is just phonologically similar to *lisyē*, since its initial syllable is still *la-*, while it is to be reconducted to one single etymological French lexeme (< Fr. *lapin*).

Table 1. – Adapted from Grant 1995.

<i>Lisyē</i>	<i>Lapē</i>
<i>Ban lisyē</i> ‘dogs’	<i>Ban lapē</i> ‘rabbits’
<i>Lisyē-la</i> ‘the (that) dog(s)’	<i>Lapē-la</i> ‘the (that) rabbit(s)’
<i>Mo lisyē</i> ‘my dog(s)’	<i>Mo lapē</i> ‘my rabbit(s)’
<i>Dis lisyē</i> ‘ten dogs’	<i>Dis lapē</i> ‘ten rabbits’
<i>Ban ti lisyē-la</i> ‘the (those) little dog(s)’	<i>Ban ti lapē-la</i> ‘the (those) little rabbit(s)’

This chapter focusses on the lexical semantics of the article-agglutinated nouns in French creoles, on which a systematic study is still missing. The phenomenon, considered characteristic of the lexicon of French-based

³ Different labels have been proposed for the phenomenon. The most common and traditional – which is also used in this contribution – is *agglutination*. Bonami and Henri (2012) write about *article incorporation*, clarifying that the term has little to do with morphological processes. A more recent denomination proposed by Lam (2019) is *article fusion*.

pidgins and creoles (Baker 1984; Grant 1995; McWhorter - Parkvall 2002; Chaudenson 2003) has been explored in the past, but the interest was put over other aspects that were/are certainly worth studying, such as the phonetic and phonological adaptation in creole, the morphological patterns of reanalysis, and, most importantly, the substrate influence of African languages (cf. § 2).

2. PHONO-MORPHOLOGY OF THE ARTICLE AGGLUTINATION: FROM FRENCH TO CREOLE

The most productive kind of article agglutination found in French creoles is the one involving the French feminine form of the definite article *la*, incorporated in creole nouns like *lavi* ‘life’ (< Fr. *la vie* ‘the life’) or *lari* ‘street’ (< Fr. *la rue* ‘the street’) ⁴. The correspondent masculine form of the article *le* is found, too, in nouns like *lili* ‘bed’ (< Fr. *le lit* ‘the bed’) or *lelu* ‘wolf’ (< Fr. *le loup* ‘the wolf’), but it could actually also derive from the French plural *les*.

The high rate of French nouns starting (phonetically) with a vowel, receiving an agglutination in creole is also remarkable, a clear consequence of the already active phonetic initial vowel elision in French, which reduces the definite article to the sole initial consonant *l*. This French phonetic feature is inherited in the phonology of creole words, like *léglis* ‘church’ (< Fr. *l’église* ‘the church’) or *lenfè* ‘hell’ (< Fr. *l’enfer* ‘the hell’).

The other French article forms most frequently taken up in relexification are (summed up in *Table 2*):

1. The definite plural *les*, like in (*le*)*zòt* ‘other(s); you (2pl.)’ < Fr. *les autres* ‘the others’, when the French noun has a phonetic initial vowel. In fact, the occurring of a plural definite article *les* is witnessed by the remaining *-s/* sound in the creole word, correspondent to the *-z/* element in French, for reasons of vocalic harmony, that in some creole is actually the only

⁴ Comparing data from different creoles, which have developed diverse phonetic realizations of the same etymological basis (ex. Mauritian C. *lakaz*; Guadeloupean C. *lakay* ‘house’ < Fr. *la case* ‘the hut’) and/or have different graphic standards, when the language is not specified in reported lexemes within the main text, the given word is to be considered a generic phonetic and graphic rendering. We acknowledge that this might be a non-satisfactory practice with regards to the diversity of languages considered, but, since for now the focus is put on the lexical-semantic aspect of the nouns, we had to find a graphic compromise to work with.

Table 2. – Article agglutination from French to creole.

		FRENCH			CREOLE		
Functions	Forms	Examples (art. + noun)	Gloss	Forms	Examples (art. + noun)	Gloss	
1 Definite article	sg.	m. <i>le</i> le lit le loup	'the bed' 'the wolf'	li- le-	lili lelu		
		f. <i>la</i> la rue		'the street'	la-		lari
2 Definite article	pl.	m./f. <i>l' + V-</i> f. l'église m. l'éléphant	'the church' 'the elephant'	l-	léglis lelefan (lefan)	'church' 'elephant'	
		<i>les + V-</i> les autres		'the others' 'you'	lez- les- le-(?) liz- z- s-		lezòt zòt
3 Partitive article	m. <i>du</i> m./f. <i>de l' + V-</i>	du riz	'some rice'	di-	diri	'rice'	
		f. de l'eau m. de l'huile	'some water' 'some oil'	di- de- d-	dilo dlo dilwil	'water' 'oil'	
	pl. <i>des</i>	des oeufs	'some eggs'	diz-	dizèf	'egg'	
4 Indefinite article	m. <i>un</i>	un homme	'a man'	n-	nom	'man'	
	f. <i>une</i>	une âme	'a soul'		nam	'soul'	

element that survives in the agglutination. Note that, if the French noun does not start with a vocalic sound, it is practically impossible to estimate if the agglutinated article corresponds to a definite singular or plural form; according to the processes of phonological vowel reduction and change from the French vocalic system to the creole one, the agglutinated syllable *le* or *li* (as found in *lili* or *lelu*) could in fact also derive from French plurals *les lits* and *les loups*, while the outcome in creole would not change phonologically nor morphologically⁵.

2. The partitive morpheme *de*, in its declined masculine singular form *du*, like in *diri* ‘rice’, or in conjunction with the definite article (*l’*) when the French noun begins with a vowel, *dilo/delo/dlo* ‘water’ < Fr. *de l’eau* ‘(some) water’, *dilwil* ‘oil’ < Fr. *de l’huile* ‘(some) oil’. Standquist (2005, 24) reports a sole agglutinated lexeme in Mauritian Creole, *dizef* ‘egg’, which would have derived from the plural partitive French *des* agglutinated to the French plural noun *oeufs*⁶.
3. Indefinite article *un/une*, although rare, in lexemes like *nam* ‘soul’ < Fr. *une âme* ‘a soul’, and/or *nom* ‘man’ < Fr. *un homme* ‘a man’.

3. ALTERNATIONS

In most French creoles, the agglutinated nominals are not the only option in which a noun can figure, and in fact, some agglutinated nouns have non-agglutinated pairs. This matter is specifically well visible when looking at the lemmas in dictionaries or lexicons, where, when possible, the agglutinated form is accompanied by/put in relation with the non-agglutinated one (or vice versa), like in the lemmas (with meanings and context of use) reported in example 3, cited from the dictionary of Guadeloupean Creole (Marie Galante) - French by Tourneux and Barbotin 1990.

3. Guadeloupean Creole (Marie Galante) - French
 - a. *louwa* (cf. *wa*)
misyé Louwa • monsieur le Roi (personnage des contes)
 - b. *lo*² (cf. *dlo*)
a lo • à l’eau
 - c. *listwa* (cf. *istwa*)
‘Histoire, science historique’

⁵ Cf. Strandquist 2003, 8-9 on the vocalic reductions and changes in Mauritian Creole of French vocalic system.

⁶ Strangely enough, since the phonetic rendering of the word *oeufs* in French is just /ø/.

Here is an example of the distribution of agglutinated and non-agglutinated version of the same noun in Mauritian Creole.

4. Mauritian Creole (Bonami - Henry 2012, 11)
- a. Donn mwa enn liv pwason.
Give.SF 1SG.STF IND pound fish.
'Give me a pound of fish'.
- b. Komie ou dir *l*liv?
how much 2SG.FOR say.SF pound
'How much do you say the pound?'

Such an alternations concerns almost exclusively nouns that have the feminine definite article *la* or the consonantal *l* agglutinated (it is indeed very rare to find forms like 4b), leading some linguists to consider the *la-* or *l-* 'noun classes' open and productive to incorporate new lexical items, in virtue of the mobility of such prefixes (cf. Grant 1995).

As it has been argued (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014), the motivation behind these alternations is mainly of semantic order, on the basis of which the alternation of the prefix on the nouns can be interpreted as a full-fledged morphological device (§ 5).

4. PREVIOUS STUDIES

4.1. *A complex phenomenon*

There is a considerable amount of diachronic and synchronic research investigating the causes and the distribution of the article agglutination. Indeed, the phenomenon appears to be the result of a composite series of linguistic processes involving issues of structural and non-structural order.

The first relevant issue of phonotactic order concerns the syllable layout in creole languages, which tends to universally orientate towards a CV structure. This is in fact proven to be a cross-linguistic feature of pidgin and creole languages, a result of the reduction and simplification to the basic CV scheme of more complex units from the lexifier languages (Stolz 1986; Holm 1988).

The reiteration of the CV structure would explain why the article agglutination frequently concerns nouns that in French are vowel initial. In order to turn a V- or a VC- initial syllable into a CV- or a CV/C- one, speakers of the emergent pidgin would use the most highly frequent parti-

cle uttered before the noun, the article, to even out the syllable structure, unable to parse the morpheme and the lexeme apart. It would also explain why, among all creoles, French ones are those that took up the phenomenon more productively, since most determiners in French have already a regular CV structure (*la, le, de*), and the language itself spontaneously develops phonotactic strategies in certain contexts (like article vowel elision or *liaison* consonants) in order to re-establish a CV syllabic cluster. Parkvall (2000) notices that the articles of, say, the Portuguese language, which are usually not consonant initial (cf. the definite feminine plural *as* in example 2) would lead to a deviation from the CV structure in Portuguese-based creoles, and this might not have favoured the productivity of the phenomenon in such languages⁷.

Another argument is that the introduction of an extra-syllable on some nouns would have been a means of innovation to resolve many lexical ambiguities given by homophony and monosyllabic words, both resulting from the vocalic reduction of the French vocalic system to the creole one (Baker 1972). For instance, the number of distinctive vowels in French (twelve oral, four nasal) is reduced to five oral and three nasal in Mauritian Creole, giving almost the same rendering for French original word *chien* 'dog' and *chat* 'cat'. The agglutination of the article *li-* on the word *syẽ* would have at last differentiated them.

Nevertheless, Grant (1995, 158) remarks that also among agglutinated nominals the homophony remains significant, but this does not really resolve the ambiguity; a word like *lasen* in Mauritian Creole can derive from at least four French NPs: *la scène* 'the scene', *la chaîne* 'the chain', *la seine* 'the fishing-net', *la cène* 'the holy communion'.

A third explored aspect deals with the syntax of French NPs and the frequency of collocations between article and noun. It is a syntactic rule of French that only in very restricted contexts a noun can appear bare; on the contrary, a noun is almost always preceded by a determiner. Such a high frequency of collocation could have favoured the reanalysis of the article as part of the noun, more than in other creoles, whose lexifier languages count more bare nouns.

Yet, the quantitative analysis of Bonami and Henry (2012) on a large *corpus* from Mauritian Creole states that the frequency of collocation of a noun with a definite article in French is not actually an impact factor for the productivity of the phenomenon.

⁷ But also, in Dutch, Spanish, and English creoles.

4.2. *The substrate influence hypothesis*

The probably most investigated field within the research of article agglutination is that of the substrate influence, pursued mainly in the studies of Baker (1984) and Grant (1995). According to their hypothesis, French-based creole languages – especially those of the Isle de France (in Indian Ocean) – structured a number of nouns through the article agglutination tracing out Bantu languages nominal classifier system, reproducing the Bantu obligatory [(syllabic) morpheme + noun] structure⁸.

Baker (1984; Baker - Hookoomsings 1987) explain(s) that in the 18th century, the islands of Isle de France archipelago (Mauritius especially) received a high number of slaves deported from Bantu speaking African areas, who joined the population of already settled colonies, among which an early creole was already emerging. With their numeric dominance, Bantu languages speakers could exert a significant influence on the pre-existent language and affect the structure of almost a third of the nominal lexemes.

Differently, in the Atlantic colonies, the deportation of the Bantu slaves towards the end of the 18th century produced another linguistic outcome, since there the emerging creole had already partially stabilized, preventing the newcomers from reshaping such aspect of the language so radically. This would explain the numeric difference of types in the lexicon of Atlantic Creoles with respect to that of Indian Ocean Creoles.

Subsuming Baker's substrate influence idea, Grant (1995) widens the query to the vocabulary of thirteen French creoles (Indian Ocean: Mauritian C., Rodrigues C., Seychelles C., Reunion C.; Atlantic: Haitian C., Martinican C., Trinidad and Tobago C., Saint Lucien C., Louisiana C., Pacific: Tayo), confirming that Indian Ocean creoles, especially Mauritian and Seychelles Creoles, actually count the highest percentage of syllabic agglutinated nouns (an exception is Reunion Creole, which only counts a dozen in total), while among Atlantic creoles, Martinican has the highest number (although still almost half of Mauritian Creole). Grant counts the agglutinated nouns in absolute values out of existent lexical sources (dictionaries) on Creoles and relying on the *corpus* for only Mauritian Creole. Through this system, he counts a total of 637 lemmas in Mau-

⁸ Notably, in Bantu languages, every noun appears preceded by a prefix, a classifier, which signals its assignment to a noun class (every countable noun is actually assigned to two related classes, one for the singular, one for the plural). The assignment is semantically and formally motivated (cf. Creider - Denny 1975; Aikhenvald 2000).

ritian Creole, 646 in Seychelles Creoles, 337 in Rodrigues Creole, 322 in Martinican Creole, which are the highest values, while the lowest ones are registered in Caribbean Dominican Creole, in Tayo (New Caledonia) and in Reunion Creole. This quantitative study would confirm the association between the significant Bantu speakers' provision in Isle the France archipelago back in the days, in a moment when the language was still expanding.

Another crucial study developed within the framework of the substratic influence hypothesis is that of Strandquist (2003), on the phonetic/phonological correlation between the creole article agglutination and the Bantu vowel harmony principles. In brief, the author analyses the vowel harmony rules in Kikuria, a Southern Bantu language, and concludes that the article-agglutination in creole was more likely to be produced when French articles were compatible with the Bantu vowel harmony principles.

In Kikuria, there are four processes of vowel harmonization, one of which is observed in noun class prefixes: the raising of the vowels /e, o/to, /i, u/, when they are followed by a high vowel, a glide or a palatal consonant. In other words, when the classifier vowels are mid /e, o/ and are followed by a noun disposing of a high vowel /i, u/ in its root or begins with a palatal /tʃ/, /ɲ/ or a glide /j/, /w/ sound, the classifier vowels are raised to high, too; it is the case in *Table 3*, where the noun for 'young man' *múra* is followed by the first class prefix in its harmonized form *umu*.

Table 3. – Bantu (Kikuria) vowel harmony (Strandquist 2003, 97).

NOUN CLASS	EXAMPLE	GLOSS
Class 1	a. <i>Omo-sááchá</i>	'male'
	b. <i>Umu-múra</i>	'young man'

In Kikuria, only part of the noun classes prefixes exhibits this regressive vowel harmony (8 out of 20). On the other hand, in those Bantu languages where the vowel harmony is not produced (such as in Swahili, for instance), all classifiers only include low /a/ or high vowels /i, u/. On this basis, the prediction of Strandquist with respect to the article incorporated nouns in creoles is the following:

[I]f a given Bantu language doesn't have noun class prefixes with mid vowels, it is likely that a speaker of that language would tend to incorporate articles with high vowels (/i/ or /u/) and low vowels (/a/), but not mid vowels (/e/ or /o/). (Strandquist 2003, 99)

In other words, the chances for the French masculine and singular definite article *le* to be reanalysed as a classifier by Bantu speakers would have been lower than those of the feminine singular *la*, because mid vowel /e/ was not recognized as a possible classifier for not meeting the vowel harmony criteria, and thus the masculine article was dismissed before the noun. The /a/ of feminine definite article *la*, instead, did not create a problem, with the result that it was taken up as a classifier. The fact that *le*, when it is kept as agglutinated article, becomes *li* in words that have a high vowel in first position, such as *lili* ‘bed’, or *lisufler* ‘cauliflower’ (< Fr. *le choufleur*), confirms this hypothesis.

In their study, Bonami and Henry take also note of the fact that the vowel of the French masculine article is a *schwa*, and so *le* would sound identical to the gender-neutral prevocalic *l*. So, if the substrate influence hypothesis is to be embraced, non-French speakers would have less likely recognized *le* as a separate morpheme from the noun, and not picked it as a productive classifier. On the contrary, the full vowel /a/ could have been more stable, and hence preferred, to work in a syllabic noun-class marker.

Although much investigated, Baker and Grant’s substrate influence hypothesis has faced many criticisms, being partially or completely turned down in several more recent papers⁹. Although initially agreeing with Baker on the Bantu substrate (but only for what concerns Indian Ocean Creole), Parkvall (2000) argues that the phenomenon has a universal nature and see it as an effect of interrupted transmission (McWhorter - Parkvall 2002).

Chaudenson (2003) rejects the substrate hypothesis completely, arguing for many unconvincing points in Baker’s work, such as the method behind the data selection, or the fact that, among the Isle de France creoles, Rodrigues Creole does not show the same consistency of article agglutinated nouns as Seychelles and Mauritian creoles, although Rodrigues is island of the Mauritius archipelago, too, and not different in history.

Also, the presence of the article agglutination in creoles that do not have an African substrate, such as Tayo in New Caledonia (whose substrate is Melanesian, cf. Kihm 1995), or which do not necessarily have French as lexifier or parent language (but exhibit many loanwords from French), such as Bislama (Vanuatu), Sango (Central African Republic), Chinook Jargon (Canada / United States), and Michif (Canada) (Grant 1995), remains the strongest argument against the hypothesis of substrate influence.

⁹ Cf. also Ladham 2012 on this.

5. THE LEXICAL-SEMANTICS ASPECT

Crucial notes on the lexical semantics of the agglutinated nominals have been eventually given in almost all of the cited papers, confirming that the semantic aspect of the phenomenon is not secondary, but still no systematic study has been pursued in this direction.

For instance, Baker (1984, 111-112) notices that the nouns that have undergone article agglutination fall within certain semantic classes, i.e. they are nouns of places that allegedly were featured as single referents in the culture of Mauritian slaves (*lavil* ‘the city’ with reference to the one main city, *latab* ‘the table’ with reference to the only table available for meals), or nouns of items which occurred in pairs or groups, such as furniture, cutlery, body parts, or mass nouns.

Not so much later on, a study of Ndayiragije (1989) pointed out that some alternating forms of Haitian Creole showed a correspondence with as much prefix-alternating nouns in Fon, a language of the Kwa family, claimed substrate – with other West African languages – to several Caribbean creoles (Lefebvre 1986, 1998) – anyways, the languages share numerous structural traits of similarity (cf., for instance, Aboh 2006).

In Fon some nouns can acquire a syllabic or vocalic prefix, a classifier, which would transform their meaning, allowing it to go from a specific and concrete reference to a more generic and abstract one or vice versa (Table 4), too. Fon nouns that can undergo such alternations have often equivalents in Haitian (and other) creole(s).

Table 4. – *Fon/Haitian Creole (Ndayiragije 1989, 315).*

	FON	HAITIAN CREOLE	GLOSSES
a	tàn	istoua	‘story, legend’
	itàn	listoua	‘history’
b	kú	lanmò	‘death’
	mèkúkú	mò	‘human corpse’
c	ji	lapli	‘rain’
	xwéji	lepli	‘rainy season’

In a more recent analysis by Zribi-Hertz and Jean-Louis (2014), the authors account for the stable/unstable (alternating) singular definite article agglutinated nouns in Martinican Creole, suggesting that *la-* and *le-* are attached to “semantically definite DPs denoting individual terms in the

manner of definite proper names” (Zribi-Hertz - Jean-Louis 2014, 269). They adopt Löbner (2011)’s theory of definiteness as main framework, according to which the labels *sortal* and *individual* correspond to the hitherto used *kind(-referring)* and *object(-referring)* concepts and nouns.

Zribi-Hertz and Jean-Louis explain that in Martinican Creole, whenever a noun is accompanied by the French agglutinated definite article, it corresponds to an individual reading of the noun, *contra* the sortal reading that it has when it appears bare. They also notice that the article agglutination in quality of marker of definiteness is usually present on nouns denoting abstract concepts (5a), instrument markers (5b), and times and places (5c).

5. Martinican Creole (Zribi-Hertz - Jean-Louis 2014, 282-283)
- a. *(La-)doulè pran’y.
la-pain take-3SG
Lit. ‘Pain took hold of him/her’. ((S)he was suddenly in pain’.)
- b. Jan ka travèsè lanmè-a a- *(la-){ranm/ *(la-)vwèl}.
John NONP cross sea-DET INSTR la- oar/ la-sail
Lit. ‘John is crossing the sea à-la {oar/sail}’. (‘John is {rowing/sailing} across the sea’.)
- c. Mari laplaj.
Mary la-beach
‘Mary is at the beach’. (the type of place called beach)

The conclusion drawn from these various notes and analysis is that the semantic dimension concerning the generic and specific meaning of a noun (semantic definiteness for Zribi-Hertz - Jean Louis 2014), or, as it is addressed in this book (with Krifka *et al.* 1995), its reference to a kind or to an object, is a relevant aspect that must be taken into account into the investigation of the agglutinated nouns’ mechanism in French creoles, either it being encoded linguistically as a morphological feature (alternation), or it just being an inherent lexical semantics of nouns.

6. THE MORPHO-SYNTAX OF NPs DENOTING ‘ABSTRACT OBJECTS’

Every noun can refer either to an object or a kind, and it is usually the morpho-syntactic context of the NP and the meaning of the other elements in the sentence to attribute the meaning.

As mentioned before, the second type of genericity enunciated by Krifka *et al.* (1995) is the one related to the predication in a sentence,

which reports about a generic event or state instead of a specific and isolated episodic event (6).

6. English
Roses are red.

In English, a *bare* noun (Chierchia 1998; Longobardi 2001), a noun free of article, is usually read as a generic NP; in example 6, *roses* is the subject of a *characterising sentence*¹⁰, whose predication *are red* informs about a universal and characterising property of the flower *rose*, so that the subject NP cannot be but interpreted as kind-referring.

Differently, in French every noun must be preceded by an article (with few exceptions), and bare nouns are seldom tolerated, also when a kind term is subject of a characterizing sentence: the sentence in 6 is in French *Les roses sont rouges*, with the obligatory presence of a definite article, just as in any episodic sentences whose subject is a definite and object-referring NP (*Les filles sont arrivées hier soir*).

Nevertheless, in certain syntactic contexts, such as that of an indefinite specific existential sentence (7), we can find another article in front of the same noun, the partitive *des*.

7. French (Moltmann 2013, 10)
J'ai vu des roses.
1SG.subj.-have.1SG.PRES.IND. seen some rose.PL.
'I have seen (some) roses'.

Creole languages allow much less variety than French in marking both pragmatic and semantic definiteness by pronominal articles, as *Table 5* shows.

Table 5. – Adapted from Guillemin 2007, 1.

	FEATURES	FRENCH	MAURITIAN C.	ENGLISH
Count nouns	Singular [+definite]	la table	latab	the table
	Singular [-definite]	une table		a table
	Plural [+definite]	les tables		the tables
	Plural [-definite]	des tables		tables
Mass nouns	Singular [+definite]	l'eau	dlo	the water
	Singular [-definite]	de l'eau		water

¹⁰ For more on the definition of characterising sentences, cf. Carlson 1977; Krifka *et al.* 1995; Chierchia 1998; for syntactic tests of genericity, cf. also Zamparelli 2002.

As French has developed particular article forms to mark the different values that a noun expresses in terms of the semantic properties of its referents – in the table exemplified within the opposition count/mass, reflected in the language by an asymmetry in the morphological number system of nouns (mass nouns select by default the singular number) and the values it can take by its introduction in the discourse (whether it is a newly introduced referent in the discourse or whether it has been referred before; *pragmatic definiteness*), French-based creoles do not rely on pre-nominal articles or on the inflection of morphemes to convey such information, as it is clear from the two lexemes *latab* and *dlo*, which never change their form.

The postnominal definite article system in French-based creoles is widely described and discussed in a variety of papers, for instance Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2006; Déprez 2003, 2008. It is shown that the system is quite elaborate, and includes markers not just for pragmatic definiteness (usually *-la* or *-a*, lexically derived from the French locative adverb *là*), but also morpho-syntactically related markers that express plurality and/or demonstrative, i.e. features that encode or reflect semantic definiteness, and which can transform and enable interpretations of nouns as kind- or object-referring, exactly as the inflection of article forms does in French. For instance, in the examples in 8 it is shown that in Haitian Creole the adding of the plural marker *yo* after the noun for *letter*, changes the interpretation from kind-referring (8a; *lèt*, translated in English with ‘mail’ refers generically to the type of documents that Paul is writing, not to the single letters that he is writing) to object-referring (8b; the presence of *yo* already implies the definiteness of the noun and, in addition, it adds specificity as a demonstrative would do in English).

8. Haitian Creole (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2006, 259-260)
- a. Pòl ekri lèt.
Paul write letter
‘Paul is writing mail’.
 - b. Pòl ekri lèt yo.
Paul write letter *PL*
‘Paul is writing *the(se)* letters’. ≠ ‘Paul is writing letters’.

Instead, the article agglutination is rather a marker on the nominal lexeme which gives information on the lexical semantics of the referents, i.e. whether their internal structure corresponds to a representation of a kind or of an object. Nouns with agglutinated articles fall exactly in those categories that natural languages can treat differently than prototypical nouns, because their referents drift away from the nominal semantic

core, i.e. a prototypical object; they belong, in other words, to the abstract objects we have pinpointed Chapter 1 In creoles that allow alternation, the agglutinated morpheme is to be regarded as another morpho-syntactic device which marks the different use of the noun as kind- or as object-referring (just as the postnominal articles do); but in those creoles where alternations are not possible, the article agglutination takes the form and function of a classifier, i.e. it is responsible for a formal marking of noun classes, which are (mostly) motivated by semantic criteria.

7. AN ATTEMPT OF CLASSIFICATION: SEMANTICALLY
AND FORMALLY RELATED AGGLUTINATED NOUNS IN FRENCH CREOLES

7.1. *Semantic and formal correspondences*

Comparing data from the various cited lexical sources and with data from Guadeloupean Creole, we can try to make an attempt in resuming the match between the semantic categories expressed by the agglutinated nouns and one particular form of agglutinated article. *Table 6* sums up the most rated correspondences.

Table 6. – Semantic and formal correspondences in article agglutination.

AGGLUTINATED ARTICLE	SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF NOUNS
1 li-, le-, la-, l-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Properties, events, state of affairs, facts, propositions b. (Mostly) granular masses (<i>rain, sand</i>) c. Unique referents (<i>king, sun</i>) d. Locations (names of countries, geographical entities) and times e. (?) Other (some aggregates)
2 lez-, les-, le-(?), liz-, z-, s-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Aggregates (body parts, animals, plants, fruits, tools) b. Other: light nouns (<i>thing, business, affair</i>)
3 di-, de-, d-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. (Mostly) homogeneous masses (solid, liquid, gas) b. Other (properties events, state of affairs, facts, propositions)

7.2. Class 1

French creoles seem to uniformly have selected the French definite singular article to mark (class 1a) nouns for properties, events, state of affairs, facts and propositions, which are usually expressed in French by lexical nominalizations, such as *patience* ‘patience’ or *pêche* ‘(the) fishing’, resulting in creole in nouns such as *lapasians* or *lapèch*.

Interestingly, mass nouns (class 1b) that take the French article in creole, are those that express mostly granular mass concepts, such as *lapli* ‘rain’ or *lajan* ‘money’, although also homogeneous masses can be part of this category, such as *lwil* ‘oil’, that in some creole is also found in class 3 as *dlwil* ‘oil’.

Class 1c contains nouns for unique referents (cf. § 7.3), class 1d for locations and time references.

Finally, we have added a subcategory class 1e for article-agglutinated nouns that we consider as a kind of residual nouns, i.e. they would be semantically more coherent with the criteria determined for classes 2 and 3 but receive instead the definite singular article in agglutination. Some of them denote entities that we would probably expect to find categorized as aggregates, such as *laklé* ‘key’ or *lelefan* ‘elephant’, since they belong to kinds that are conceptualized as constituted by pluralities (and in fact categories as tools and animals are often marked as *aggregates*; cf. Chapter 1), but other nouns, such as *labarb* ‘beard’ or *labouche* ‘mouth’, although denoting parts of the human body or illnesses, have simply no reason to be referred to as plural concepts (while a *beard*, such as *hair*, could be seen as a mass and treated grammatically as one¹¹, it could also be conceptualized as a kind of unique referent in the domain of the human body, just as *mouth* could, since it is logically the one and only in the human body¹²).

Table 7 reports examples of nouns from eight different creoles included in the mentioned classes.

¹¹ The English *hair* corresponds in Lesser Antillean creoles to *chivé*, so with no article-agglutination.

¹² For a study on these unique referents in the human body, so unique in a defined conceptual context, cf. Guéron 1983; Vergnaud - Zubizarreta 1992; Ojeda 1993.

Table 7. – Examples for class 1.

	MAURITIAN	SEYCHELLES	REUNION	HAITIAN	LESSER ANTILLEAN	LOUISIANA	TAYO
a. Properties, state of affairs, facts, propositions	lamor 'death' lafreyer 'fear'	lidé ¹³ 'idea' lamuzik 'music'	lapasians 'patience' labiti 'habit'	lapèch 'fishing'	lanmou 'love' lanvi 'desire'	lapè 'peace'	
b. (mostly) granular masses	lapeau 'skin' larecolte 'harvest'	lafarin 'flour'	lapli 'rain' lo 'water'	lajan 'money'	lasid 'acid'	lasòs 'sauce' lwil 'oil' lagres 'grease'	lapli 'rain' larcha 'money'
c. unique referents and proper nouns	labib 'the bible'	lerwa 'the king'		lenfè 'hell'	lakatastrof 'the catastrophic' (Grant 1995)		lerwa 'king'
d. locations and times	ladress 'address' lakot 'the coast' labank 'bank'	lotèl 'hotel' labutik 'store'		lakay 'home, house'	lekòl 'school' lapòt 'space in front of the door'	lekol 'school'	lakay 'haouse'
e. Other	labarb 'beard'		labouche 'mouth' lagal 'scabies'		lelefan 'elephant' las 'acc'	lafler (?) 'flower' (Grant 1995)	lakle 'key'

¹³ Also, *nidé* (< Fr. *une idée*).

7.3. *Unique referents*

As mentioned, class 1c is reserved for nouns of *unique referents* (Russell 1905), such as *lerwà* ‘king’ or *labib* ‘bible’.

We are treating these nouns as a category apart, since the principle which seems to explain article agglutination here is rather opposite of that by which we have decided to recognize *abstract objects*, i.e. by genericity of reference, since in theory unique referents’ nouns are maximally definite.

In the theory of definiteness (Frege 1892; Christophersen 1939; Strawson 1950; Searle 1969; Hawkins 1976), unique reference is just viewed at the opposite of semantic weak referentiality, because it regards the cases in which the content of a noun is not associated priorly to a *kind*, but it denotes immediately one unique referent in the universe of discourse. So, for instance, since there is only one planet *moon* and one star *sun*, the lexemes *moon* and *sun* imply that the entity that represents the extension of the noun is only one, and thus that this is the only referent on which the reference can be potentially instantiated. In other words, unique referents dispose of maximal values of semantic referentiality or definiteness.

A logic consequence of such high values of semantic definiteness is that for what for it concerns pragmatic definiteness, nouns of unique referents are generally definite: in fact, they denote concepts that, for various reasons, are already present in the prior knowledge of the speakers, and hence do not usually represent an indefinite new information.

Due to such general strong definiteness, nouns denoting unique referents in their unmarked use are usually preceded in English by the definite singular article *the*: *the moon*, *the sun*, and in French *le*, *la*, *l’*: *la lune*, *le soleil*.

Hawkins (1967) points out that *uniqueness of reference* of a noun is a condition often validated by a special situation of utterance, which can actually involve *any* kind of noun, not only those denoting sole objects of the real world. It is in fact sufficient to have an utterance or a context which restricts the quantification of the extensional referents of a noun to only a limited set, or to only one referent.

If we consider a conversation between two people that live in the same small village, and this village only has one bar, one church and one bakery, presumably the two people will refer to those locations as to *the bar*, *the church* or *the bakery*, validating the nouns’ pragmatic uniqueness in the context, without the need of specifying more of which of the all *bars*, *churches* or *bakeries* in the world they are talking about.

In the same way, if we refer to *the King of France* or to *the Prime Minister*, we are implicitly presupposing that there exists a person that imper-

sonates the role of king or of prime minister, which we are referring to, although he/she is not the only human being that could have potentially that role, as many other people have had or will have in history. Also in the case where uniqueness of a referent is favoured by a pragmatic context of utterance, the definite form of the article *the* precedes the noun; the occurrence of the noun *King of France* with the indefinite *a* – *a King of France* – would likely correspond to a marked use of the noun phrase.

Thus, going back to the article agglutination in creoles, these unique referents' nouns could actually represent the class for which article agglutination is justified as a feature of frequency of collocation of the article before the noun in French. Some article agglutination on names of countries, for instance, can be interpreted as marking this unique referent function (ex. *Lasiri* 'Syria'), taking after the same marking in French, where for names of countries the presence of the definite article is often obligatory. This happens also with names of prominent and important cities; for instance, in Guadeloupean Creole, the name of the capital city Point-à-Pitre is *Lapwènt*, actually translate the French noun phrase *la pointe* 'the point'. Finally, Grant (1995) mentions that the noun *lakatastrof* in Martinican Creole refers to one historical episode, the massive eruption of the Vulcan Mount Pelée in May 1902, which deserved then to be marked with a unique referent marker.

However, from a theoretical point of view, it is also interesting to notice that the mechanism of *uniqueness* of reference shows some common lines with what Hawkins calls *inclusiveness* of reference, i.e. a (usually implicit) reference to all of the elements of a set (which we can imagine as an aggregate); consider the extension of the noun phrase *the wickets* in a sentence such as 9.

9. (Hawkins 1967, 160)

Fred brought the wickets in after the game of cricket.

From this sentence we deduce that, after playing crickets, Fred has collected *all* the wickets that he used for the purpose, not just some of them, and so “there are no wickets in the pragmatically restricted domain of quantification that are not included in the reference” (Hawkins 1967, 161).

In this perspective, also mass nouns can be viewed as having an inclusive profile: in fact, when we refer generically to *the sand* we are including all the instances that can possibly be described as *sand* in the domain of quantification. In a parallel way, according to Hawkins, when we refer to the Prime Minister or the King of France we presuppose that there are no other Prime Ministers or Kings of France in the shared set of reference, and that thus the reference is indeed inclusive, even if the domain of quan-

tification includes only one entity. This *inclusive* concept is for Hawkins the one really motivating the presence of the definite article before a noun in English, because either a kind-referring noun, a mass noun, a unique referent noun and a pragmatically restricted noun of aggregates require the definite article *the* as default marking.

In other words, Hawkins' considerations can be seen as a connection piece between the structure and reference of unique entities and concepts and kinds or categories, since, as explained in the Chapter 1, the conceptualization of a kind or of other entities that are construed in a similar way (masses, properties, indefinite events) happens through the same mechanism: these entities are viewed as whole and atomic entities disregarding of their internal substructure. In other words, every noun marked with a definite article expressing one of these entities (*the sand, the wisdom, the swimming*) subsume an inclusive profile, without the need of pragmatically restrict the context of utterance. This alternative view could justify, after all, the inclusion of unique referents' nouns among the creoles' article-agglutinated nouns, since they could somehow be seen as abstract objects, too.

It is fair to say, though, that Hawkins' vision has not been further developed in cognitive or semantic studies, and that unique referents are usually viewed at the opposite pole of indefinites.

7.4. Class 2 and 3

Tables 8 and 9 provide for some examples for class 2 and 3.

Without a doubt, class 2 agglutinated-articles mark nouns of aggregates, be they nouns of animals (*zanimò* 'animal', *zako* 'monkey'), of fruits (*zaman* 'almond'), of plants and flowers; be they nouns of tools (*zutil* 'tool'); of people which are referred as a group, marked with a social function – *zofisié* 'policeman', *lezòt* 'other(s), you (2pl.)'¹⁴, *zanmi* 'friend' – or connoted by a special property or characteristic¹⁵ (*zavèg* 'blind person', *zanfan* 'child'); or be it nouns for cohesive aggregates, such as body parts (*lezo* 'bone', *son* 'nail', or *zortei* 'toe').

Note that in this class *zafèr* 'business', 'thing' is also present as light noun.

¹⁴ In Lesser Antillean creoles, the word for others *zot* has grammaticalized into the second person plural personal pronoun.

¹⁵ Cf. Wierzbicka 1988 on connotations in nouns denoting kinds like *fools* or *hunchbacks*, and on shape and age as crucial determinant properties for the conceptualization of kinds (*ibid.*, 476-480).

Table 8. – Examples for class 2.

	MAURITIAN	SEYCHELLES	REUNION	HAITIAN	LESSER ANTILLEAN	LOUISIANA	TAYO
a.	lezo 'bone' zanimo 'animal' zamann 'almond'	lipié 'foot/feet' lebra 'arm' zofisié 'officer, policeman'	lezo 'bone' zanfan 'child' zako 'monkey' zaveg 'blind person'	lezót 'other'	zanfan 'child' zanmi 'friend'	zorrei 'toe' zutil 'tool'	lesot 'other' son 'nail'
b.	other		zafer 'business, thing'				

Table 9. – Examples for class 3.

	MAURITIAN	SEYCHELLES	REUNION	HAITIAN	LESSER ANTILLEAN	LOUISIANA	TAYO
a.	dibwa 'wood' dilar 'bacon' dituil 'oil'	dilo 'water'	debuà 'wood' dolo 'water'	ditè 'tea' diven 'wine'	diwi 'rice' diven 'wine'	diri 'rice'	dlo 'water'
b.	other						
							Ditò 'wrong' dibwi 'noise'

In class 3 nouns expressing mass concepts are concentrated. This class mainly reunite nouns for homogeneous masses with respect to class 1, with some exceptions, for instance nouns for granular entities such as *rice*. Note that in Réunion Creole a noun such as water, can actually feature an alternation, very difficult to find in other creoles: *dolo/lo*. While *dolo* clearly enables a generic or kind-referring reading of the referent, *lo* is used to make reference to a quantified and specific object that in French or in English would be probably encoded by allowing the plural form of the respective mass noun.

10. Réunion Creole

- a. Di pa “Fontène zamé ma boire ton lo”.
Say NEG. Fountain never 1SG drink 2SGposs. water
‘Don’t say “Fountain, I will never drink your water(s)”’.
- b. *Dolo* i pé dormi; mé zamé mon zénemi.
Water 3SG PROG. sleep but never 1SGposs. enemy
‘The water sleeps, but my enemy(-ies) never do(es)’.

Note that nouns indicating any of the instance and bounded parts of materials such as *dibwa* ‘wood’ or food, such as *dilar*, come actually from French collective nouns, that have are claimed to have an internal structure equal to that of mass nouns (Acquaviva 2003, 224), taking the same agglutinated article, too. For a similar reason, other nouns included in this class, such as *ditò* or *dibwi* – < Fr. *du tort, du bruit; injustices, abuses* and instance manifestations of noise (*noises*) viewed as one single unit –, which express properties or events are included in this class.

8. A NOUN-CLASS PRINCIPLE

Through the alternation, most of the mentioned creoles dispose of an instrument to encode a referential and a non-referential reading of a noun, exactly such as a plural morpheme on a mass noun in English would turn its reading from denoting a mass/kind entity to specific instances of the same substance (cf. 17 RC: *dolo/lo*; English: *water/waters*). Alternating agglutinated articles can thus be viewed as real morphological markers that mark the opposition for the category of semantic referentiality of a noun.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to decide which of the lexical variants of a noun disposing of alternation is the marked one. Sensibly, relying on a typological basis, we would think that it is the one actually marked with the morpheme (the one featuring the agglutination), but looking in general at

the semantic classes of nouns that take the agglutination in those languages that dispose less of alternations, it really seems that the article agglutination does not work as an inflectional morpheme, but rather as a marker of peculiar categories of nouns whose referents do not behave like objects, but that are rather keen to be conceptualized just as kinds ('abstract objects'). In a nutshell, agglutinated articles would rather work as classifiers.

Our claim is that in French-creoles there are classes of nouns that are marked with specific morphemes, classifiers according to their semantic contents, may they be mass concepts, aggregate concepts, properties or event concepts, and that each of these referents' classes receive their dedicated agglutinated-article. In fact, creole article-agglutination tick many of the boxes required from the list proposed from Aikhenvald (2000) for the theoretical identification of classifiers: their choice is based on the semantic principles; a classifier is systematically present on the noun and encoded as part of its lexical-semantic information, to express inherent semantic characteristics or properties of a noun's referent; they are a type of non-agreeing noun categorization device, so they do not match any inflectional properties of nouns with other concorded words in the sentence, being their scope the sole NP¹⁶; one noun can be used with different classifiers, enabling a change of meaning.

Now, interestingly, this last point resorts a good explanation to account for the presence of alternations in such languages. It could be possible that the opposition *reference to object* / *reference to kind* was finally grammaticalized in French-creoles as a \emptyset -agglutinated-article classifier forms, and this would also legitimate the \emptyset form as own classifier with a systemic distribution.

Alternatively, alternations could be interpreted as discourse features which are idiosyncratically sorted out pragmatically on the basis of the type of reference that the speaker wants to set, allowing to infer a referential/non-referential interpretation of the noun in a sentence, as do articles and other inflectional morphemes in Indo-European languages.

Anyway, any perspective taken, the general grounds are that, due to their semantic contents, these nouns are to be marked as less referential than prototypical nouns, and there is no doubt that the semantic classes of nouns which enable article-agglutinations are those that cross-linguistically face peculiar grammatical treatment.

¹⁶ Differently than what happens with gender morphemes, cf. Corbett 1991.

9. AFRICAN LANGUAGES

Looking through the repertoire of African languages, we find some interesting cases of classifier alternation on nouns which are parallel creole alternations. For instance, Creissels (2016) argues that in Ganja-Balant, a Niger-Congo language of the Atlantic branch (subgroup Bak), can mark a noun with a specific classifier *b-* to denote the kind concept related to the otherwise unmarked or differently marked noun intended as referring to the respective object concept.

11. Ganja-Balant

- a. *a-làante* ‘man’ / *b-làante* ‘kind of man’
 b. *gbàale* ‘house’ / *b-gbàale* ‘kind of house’

Moreover, in Ganja-Balant a specific classifier *gi-* is assigned to nominalizations of property concepts or events. These nouns share their lexical base with nouns denoting objects or individual concepts to which they are semantically related, just, the classifier is different in the two cases (in *Table 10* object-referring nouns are classifier *a-* or \emptyset).

Table 10. – Nominalizations in Ganja-Balant.

NP OBJECT-REFERRING	NOMINALIZATION
<i>a-làante</i> ‘man’	<i>gi-làante</i> ‘masculinity’
<i>a-nîn</i> ‘woman’	<i>gi-nîn</i> ‘feminility’
<i>a-fúlá</i> ‘young woman’	<i>gi-fúlá</i> ‘maidenhood’
<i>mbùutá</i> ‘child’	<i>gi-mbùutá</i> ‘childhood’

In another Atlantic Niger Congo language, Fouta-Djalon Fula, the specific morpheme *on* expresses the kind reference with respect to the lexical meaning of a noun (Caudill - Diallo 2000, *Table 11*).

Table 11. – Fouta-Djalon Fula’s morpheme.

SINGULAR	PLURAL	GENERIC	MEANING
bareeru ndun	bareeji ðin	bare on	dog

In Bantu languages, there is no evidence of classes associated to generic classifier.

In Kikuyu the only semantic types of nouns to show a different class assignment according to a generic or specific meaning are nouns of locations (*Table 12*).

Table 12. – Adapted from Englebretson - Wa-Ngatho 2015, 29.

CLASS	SEMANTIC TENDENCIES
1/2	Humans
3/4	Landscape terms
5/6	Plants, landscape terms, other
7/8	Augmentatives, other
9/10	Animals, body parts, borrowed words, other
11	String- or stick-shaped objects, other
12/13	Diminutives, other
14	Abstract concept, other
15	Body parts, verbal infinitives
16	Location (definite)
17	Location (indefinite)

According to the description given in Englebretson and Wa-Ngatho (2015), the two classifier marking classes 16 and 17 are applied on nouns denoting in the first case a specific location, of which the speaker is aware of (he/she knows where the place is): *bandu* ‘(the) place’; while in the second case, the noun denotes a non-specific location, but rather the roundabouts of a place: *kundu* ‘place’.

In Ndali (Aikhenvald 2000, 64), classes 16 and 17 host nouns denoting: (class 16, classifier *pa*) “motion to/from, situation; proximity to someone or something near the speaker” (*ibidem*), and (class 17, classifier *ku*) “motion to/from, situation; proximity to someone or something far from the speaker” (*ibidem*), suggesting and confirming the relationship in language between the specificity/definiteness concept and the spatial proximity one.

Interestingly, in Guadeloupean Creole, there are some examples of nouns that can undergo alternations, that, as outcome of such indefinite/distal semantic effect attributed the marker, create a diversification of the noun’s denotation by metonymy. So, if the word *pot* means the object ‘door’, the noun *lapot* takes a figurative locative meaning, denoting all the space around the house, the property, or the space in front of the door.

12. Guadeloupean Creole (Tourneaux - Barbotin 1990, 231)
 S’ ou pasé douvan lapòt an mwen, ou vwè pòt-la fèmé, an pa la.
 If 2sg pass in front door of 1sg 2sg see door-DEF close(d) 1sg NEG there
 ‘If you pass in front of my door and you see the door close, I am not there’.

4.

CASE STUDY 2

The Encoding of Non-prototypical Adjectives in French-based Creoles

1. THE LEXICAL REITERATION CONSTRUCTIONS AND TAM SYSTEM IN CARIBBEAN FRENCH-BASED CREOLES (REITERATION VS. REDUPLICATION)

A *reiteration* is a phenomenon by which the same linguistic form – may it be a segment, a syllable, a morpheme, a lexeme or a phrase – is repeated at least twice within the boundaries of a linguistic domain (Aboh - Smith - Zribi-Hertz 2012, 1), such as in 1.

1. Haitian Creole (Zribi-Hetz - Glaude 2014, 4)
Elsi *malad* bon *malad*.
Elsi sick real sick
'Elsi is really sick'.

The phenomenon of *reiteration* displays a clear resemblance with a much more studied and documented feature involving the repetition of linguistic elements, generally known as *reduplication*. A reduplication is a typically morphological phenomenon, consisting in the repetition of a root or stem of a word (*partial reduplication*; Haspelmath 2013, chapter 26; cf. example 2), or of an entire lexeme, in which case we can talk about *full reduplication* (cf. example 3), where a syntactically continuous string of identical words is usually occurring.

2. Haitian Creole (Michaelis *et al.* 2013)
An al fè on ti *ben(-)beny!*
IMP.1pl go do a little bath
'Let's take a little bath!'.

3. Haitian Creole (Fattier 2002, 123)
 Se ti zoranj *piti piti piti piti* yo.
 HL little orange little little little little 3PL
 ‘These are the tiny little oranges’.

Although *reduplication* and *reiteration* are both produced through the same mechanism of repetition, the need for a distinction – and the reason for which linguists came up with separate labels – derives from the acknowledgement of a main structural difference: the reduplication is merely a morphological phenomenon; it concerns the word level and affects the meaning of one only constituent of a clause or domain. The reiteration, instead, works at a clause level and concerns more than one syntactic constituent, so that two constituents in the same clause or domain have the same form but work as distinct and autonomous syntactic elements. More generally, the two reiterated items are part of a syntactic construction, but do not necessarily have a grammatical equivalence. Nevertheless, as Haspelmath himself admits, it is still sometimes very difficult to understand whether we deal with full reduplication or reiteration.

Also, the reduplication and reiteration’s functions can be compared to good extents. As Aboh, Smith and Zribi-Hertz (2012) remind, citing the copious work of Kowenberg (Kowenberg - LaCharité 2005) on reduplication on creoles, the morphosyntactic patterns of reduplications are usually structured responding to an evident iconic principle, that of form/meaning isophormy, according to which XX is semantically equivalent to *two times X*, and thus *more of X*: as the lexemes or lexical roots are doubled, the value of the lexical information carried by the reduplicated morpheme or lexeme is doubled, too, and hence augmented. In the sentence in 4, for instance, in Juba Arabic the adjective *tamàn* ‘good’ is repeated two times and means literally ‘good good’, hence ‘very good’.

4. Juba Arabic (Manfredi - Petrollino 2013, 57)
 maál tamán tamán.
 place good good
 ‘A very good place’.

Notably, this doubling pattern can create various meanings according to the different types of lexical denotations, namely whether a lexeme denotes an object, a property, or an action. The reduplication of a noun can convey mainly a distributional or pluralized meaning, that of verb an iterative meaning, while that of an adjective an intensive meaning (Rubino 2013). *Table 13* summarizes the main functions and meanings of reduplication attested in creole languages for each lexical category.

Table 13. – Main functions and meanings of reduplication in creoles;
adapted from Bakker–Parkvall 2005, 513.

PART OF SPEECH	MEANING OF R	FUNCTION OF R
Verb	intensive/augmentative ‘to V a lot’	evaluative of gradualness
	aspectual ‘to V continuously/regularly’	aspectual (iteration)
	spatial/distributive ‘to V in several places’	distributive
Noun	attenuating ‘to V a bit’	evaluation of gradualness
	distributive ‘various N’ totality ‘every N’	distributive/pluralizing
Adjective	Intensifying ‘very ADJ’ Attenuating ‘somewhat, little ADJ’	evaluation of gradualness

As illustrated in the table, the functions and meanings of reduplication do not always follow the iconicity principle, producing several variations, sometimes of completely opposite value.

Reduplicated adjectives, for instance, can both have an intensified and attenuated meaning, and the right interpretation often depends on pragmatic factors and intonation (Kowenberg 2003). In Haitian Creole, for instance, the sentence in 5 is ambiguous between ‘he speaks English very badly’ and ‘he speaks English not so bad’.

5. Haitian Creole
 Li pale anglé mal mal.
 3SG speak English bad-bad
 ‘He/she speaks English not so well’.

2. PREDICATE REITERATION IN HAITIAN AND OTHER LESSER ANTILLEAN CREOLES

2.1. Syntactic types of predicate reiteration

In Haitian Creole and in other lesser Antillean creoles, the patterns of reiteration only involve the verbal phrase, and, specifically, the reiterated lexeme is the head of the VP. Hitherto, we will refer to the verbal head and to its copy as P1 (predicate 1) and P2 (predicate 2).

Zribi-Hertz (2012) analyses three types of predicate-reiteration constructions.

The first one is referred to, after Lefebvre (1998), as the *Verb Fronting with Doubling* (VFD) type¹, i.e. the syntactic construction requires that P2 is in an antecedent syntactic position than that of P1, specifically in a *focus* position. The VFD construction involves sentences such as the ones in 6 and 7, being the P2 in 6 a *bare* predicate, while in 7 inserted in a proper predicate cleft, introduced by a copula/presentative morpheme *sé* (< Fr. *c'est*).

6. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi Hertz 2012, 77)
 Malad m te malad.
 Sick 1SG ANT sick
 P2 P1
 'I was sick (not lazy)'.
7. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi Hertz 2012, 77)
 Sé malad m te malad!
 SE sick 1SG ANT sick
 P2 P1
 'I was actually sick (not lazy)!'.
 'I was *really* sick!'.

As it can be noticed, the focus imposed on the P2 in both cases produces primarily a contrastive meaning of the reiteration, since the P2 in first position introduces the new and prominent information (translatable in English respectively with expressions such as 'sick, I was' or with the it-cleft 'it's sick that I was')², allowing the presence of a counter-argument ('not lazy'). Only in the second case, the reiteration can have a function of intensification, too: 'I was *really* sick!'.

In order to have intensification from *bare* VFD construction, an element expressing quantity/quality must be added before P2, for instance *ala* 'what/how'.

8. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi Hertz 2012, 77)
 Ala bèl li te bèl!
 Ala pretty 3SG ANT pretty
 'She was *sooo* pretty!'.

¹ The author cites abundant bibliography on this topic, among which I am reporting here some of the main titles.

² Contrastive function is not new as effect of reduplication in natural languages, nor is it in English (Ghomeshi *et al.* 2004).

The second and third types of predicate-reiteration do not include a predicate-fronting. P2 is in a syntactic unmarked position (following) with respect to P1. Sentences in 9 and 10 are an example.

9. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi Hertz 2014, 243)

Kité Djo kouri kouri l.
Let Djo run run 3SG
P1 P2

Lit. 'Let Djo run (in) his own way'.
'Let Djo run if/as much as he pleases'.

10. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi Hertz 2014, 243)

Djo kouri yon ti kouri.
Djo run one small/mediocre run
P1 P2

Lit. 'Djo ran/runs one small/mediocre run'.
'Djo ran/runs for a little bit/pathetically'.

2.2. Predicate-cognate objects

In the studies of Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2014) on Haitian Creole's constructions, the P2 in the last two types of constructions (examples 9 and 10) are analysed as having the syntactic and semantic status of cognate objects with respect to P1³.

The term *cognate object* (Quirk *et al.* 1972; Jones 1988; Höche 2009, among others) designates a special kind of syntactic object, whose peculiarity is that to be semantically and formally (although not always) related to its predicate. An example in English is the object of the sentence *he lived a peaceful life*, where *life* is a nominalization derived from the verb *to live* – the predicate in the sentence –, and used as the direct object of that same verb. Typically, a cognate object is selected by intransitive verbs, and this is one of the main reasons why linguists interpret cognate objects' (semantic) function not as that of a true predicate's arguments, but as that of an adjunct, specifically as an adverbial modifiers of manner/quality and quantity. In fact, the information contained in the mentioned phrase *a peaceful life* could be expressed by the adverb *peacefully*, giving no different results in terms of the general meaning of the sentence (*he lived a peaceful life/peacefully*).

³ This is also the opinion of Bernabé (1983)'s on Martinican and Guadeloupean reiteration constructions.

Clearly, in creole languages, we can have formally few indications about the syntactic category/part of speech to which P2 belongs, since morphological derivation is definitely less productive than in French⁴. The arguments in favour of the cognate objects accounting for P2 in Caribbean French-creoles comes firstly from the evidence that P2 shows some syntactic features that are not typically of a verb, but rather of a noun, such as it can be modified by a possessive morpheme, such as in 9, *kouri l*, where *kouri* is the lexeme which expresses the action of running, and *l* is a third person possessive form; lit. ‘his run(ning)’. Equally, the lexical material occurring in 10 between P1 and P2, *yon ti* ‘a small’, is only a nominal modifier, since *yon* has the value of an indefinite article ‘a’, followed by *ti* ‘small’ which only can be used as an adjective⁵.

In addition, no TAM markers can be placed before P2, but only before P1. As 11 shows, *te*, the Haitian marker of past/anteriority can only be placed before the first *kouri*, because, if placed between the two *kouri*(s), it would turn the sentence ungrammatical.

11. Haitian Creole (Zribi Hertz - Glaude 2014, 244)
- a. Djo/li (te) kouri byen kouri.
 Jo/3sg ANT. run well run
 ‘Jo/(s)he runs/ran (had run) really well’.
- b. *Djo/li (te) kouri te byen kouri.
 Djo/3sg ANT. run ANT. well run

2.3. *The multifunctionality of verb-cognate reiteration constructions*

Looking at the cognate verbs (or predicates) in sentences 10 and 11, we can see that the reiteration usually plays more than one function at a time, triggering polysemy and/or ambiguity in terms of the sentence’s general meaning.

The reiteration in 9, for instance, can be viewed to retain a delimitative/concessive function, adding information on both the quantity and the

⁴ As said, P2 is usually a morphological nominalization in Indo-European languages like English or French, since the content of the nominal is usually eventive and not referential. In French creoles, though, it is not uncommon to find lexemes that are lexified out of French morphological nominalizations, and that can hence have a different form than the corresponding verb. Nevertheless, they are not included as P2 in these constructions.

⁵ In this case, there is a diversification of adjective and adverbial form: *ti* is the adjective and is the adverb.

quality of the action's performance. The literal meaning of the noun phrase *kouri l*, 'his (own) running', discloses a series of metaphorical interpretations, which depend on various factors, such as the will/control of the agents on the action (a concession: *let him, if he pleases!*)⁶, or the aspectual-temporal and manner extents of the action 'as much as he pleases' or 'in his own way'.

In 10, the reiteration construction involves the presence of the dimensional adjective *ti* 'small' between P1 and P2; this adjective gives information on the *small* quantity and quality of the action, which is intended respectively in short duration of a process ('he ran a short run / for only a little bit'), also implying that the action is perfective, and at the same time it can be intended as an evaluation of the manner in which the action was performed, namely a scarce and poor manner 'he ran pathetically'.

Koev (2017) identifies a category of adverbs, which he calls *adverbs of change*, such as *quickly* or *slowly*, which could be viewed as manner adverbs, but really modify the verb expressing the rate at which the process evolves, either expressing the time until a change occurs, or specifying the instant or gradual pace of a change. The same category is called by Ernst (2004) aspect-manner adverbs⁷, confirming that the two dimensions are deeply semantically intertwined. It is also noticed by Koev that these adverbs give rise to a range of different alternative interpretations, that he summarizes in four types: rate, duration, narrative, deictic/indexical.

Turning to the manner-aspectual meaning conveyed by reiterations in creoles, we are concerned with Koev's first two types of adverbs: a *change* adverbial such as *quickly* in English, apparently just gives information about the manner of doing something (i.e. in a quick way), but actually it informs on the time quantity and duration of the process, too (i.e. suddenly / in a short amount of time; Eszes 2009). Similarly, locutions such as *as much as he pleases* or *a little bit* give information on the manner and quantity (i.e. freely, in a moderate way/quantity), but also, on the time and duration of the dynamic event. The semantic property which allows to distinguish between the double readings triggered by the modification is indeed the processual aspect, which is at the base of the distinction of individual-level and stage-level properties, also.

⁶ This concessive function/interpretation clearly depends on the presence of *kite* 'let' as the main verbo in the sentence.

⁷ *Motion adverbs* by Cresswell (1978) and *celerative adverbs* by Cinque (1999). Cf. Jackendoff 1972 for adverbs as variable operators.

Indeed, it is not unusual for a syntactic structure involving repetition of lexemes to express more than one function/meaning at once, but the most prolific literature dedicated to the topic mainly covers morphological reduplication, viewed as a parallel and additional mean to derivational morphology in inflected languages (Dressler - Barberesi 1994; Dal 1997; Grandi 2002; Fradin - Montermini 2009; Amiot - Stosic 2011; Grandi 2015). The ability of combining more functions in one element is referred by Amiot and Stosic (2011) as *multifunctionality*. In reduplication, typically aspectual (iterative, frequentative, continuative), evaluative (diminutive, attenuative, augmentative, intensive), and pragmatic (depreciative, ameliorative, hypocoristic) meanings and functions can be combined, and as far as we have deduced by the examples above and by the arguments of Zribi-Hertz and Glaude, it is reasonable to say that also reiteration in creoles shares this ability.

2.4. *The aspectual-evaluative function*

We turn now to the type of reiteration construction illustrated in the example 10, the one with an aspectual/manner function and meaning⁸.

As said, in Haitian Creole, there is some lexical material between P1 and P2 that syntactically has the role of P2 modifier, and which, from the semantic point of view, is responsible for the meaning/function of the whole predicate modification.

Table 14 provides an overview of all the possible modifiers that can occur between P1 and P2, and of the semantic effect they trigger. The modifiers can specify an information about an event either of intensive or augmentative manner ('very well', 'really', 'quite a bit'), or, on the opposite, of attenuative or diminishing manner ('pathetically', 'awfully', 'a little bit'); also, the information can concern the limited or extended duration of an event ('for a little bit', 'for quite a bit'), and/or its telicity (it can turn an indefinite event to an *accomplishment* : 'for good', or into a semelfactive event: 'at one go'; Vendler 1957).

⁸ Cf. Ernst 2004.

Table 14. – Reiteration modifiers by Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014, 255.

LEXICAL MATERIAL PRECEDING THE COGNATE HEAD	LITERAL MEANING	SEMANTIC EFFECT	TRANSLATION OF COGNATE PHRASE
bon	‘good’ or ‘well’	intensive truth value	‘for good’, ‘for real’, ‘really’
bon + ti	‘good + small’	highish quantity	‘quite a bit’
byen	‘well’	intensive positive manner	‘very well’, ‘really well’
yon + ti	‘one + small/mediocre’	singular event (<i>yon</i>) + brief duration or mediocre quality (<i>ti</i>)	‘for a little bit’, ‘pathetically’
yon + bon + ti	‘one + good + small’	singular event (<i>yon</i>) + highish quantity (<i>bon+ti</i>)	‘for quite a little bit’

Some examples given in the mentioned paper by Zribi-Hertz and Glaude are reported below (12-16).

12. Djo kouri byen kouri. (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014, 243)
 Djo run well run
 ‘Djo runs/ran really well’.
13. Djo kouri yon sèl kouri. (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014, 257)
 Djo run a single run
 ‘Djo ran at one go/all of a sudden’.
14. Djo malad bon malad (la). (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014, 256)
 Djo sick good sick CDET
 ‘(This time) Djo is sick for good!’.
15. Djo malad yon sèl malad. (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014, 257)
 Djo sick a single sick
 ‘Djo is awfully sick’.
16. Kannòt la koule bon koule (a). (Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2014, 256)
 Boat DET sink good sink (DET)
 ‘(This time) the boat has/is sunk for good’.

In Guadeloupean and Martinican Creole, the reiteration constructions are not as productive as in Haitian. The one which involves a cognate object, described in Bernabé (1983), features an *it*-cleft introduced by the presentative/copular negative expression *a pa* ‘it is not’ + the P2 modifier *ti* ‘small’ (17), giving mainly an intensifying/augmentative meaning to the event and/or expressing a durative aspectual function.

17. Guadeloupen Creole

A pa ti kouri Djo kouri.

It.is-NEG small run Djo run

Lit. 'It is not a small run that Djo ran/runs'; 'Djo ran/runs for quite a bit/a lot'.

In addition, in Martinican Creole, the adjective *gwo* 'big' can appear as modifier before P2, expressing intensive manner (18).

18. Martinican Creole

Pyè malad gwo malad.

Pyè sick big sick

'Pyè is extremely/seriously sick'.

3. COMPATIBILITY OF REITERATION CONSTRUCTIONS WITH ADJECTIVAL PREDICATES

3.1. *Verbs and adjectives*

As anticipated, we wish to verify if adjectives are accepted as P1/P2 elements in reiteration constructions in Haitian Creole and in the other French lesser-Antillean creoles, and if yes, which semantic classes of adjectives are compatible with the constructions.

But first, one theoretical issue need clarification.

This issue is the distinction between verbs and adjectives in creole languages, which is not clear-cut as it might be in a language like French.

In the studies on French-based creoles, it is long-debated⁹ whether some linguistic elements denoting properties could be indeed defined semantically and syntactically as *adjectives*, or whether they must be regarded as hybrid elements between verbs and adjectives. Scholars who deny the existence of a real adjectival class in both Atlantic and Indian Ocean French creoles (Taylor 1968; Hazaël-Massieux 1978, 1983; Corne 1981; Véronique 1983, 2000; DeGraff 1992; Daïmoseau 1996)¹⁰ state this on the evidence of the fact that some words denoting states or properties such as Haitian

⁹ The debate here reported actually fits into a much wider and complex one, which has to do with the morphological types of inflected and (predominantly) isolating languages (as creoles are), and the question of definition of lexical categories or parts of speech in these languages (Ramat 1990).

¹⁰ *Contra* Capron-Cäid 1996, Ludwig 1996, Chaudenson 2000, who claim the opposite.

konten ‘happy’, *piti* ‘small’, *malad* ‘sick’, cannot be placed in front of a noun as attributive modifier, but they can only follow the noun as predicative. For instance, the sentence in 19a is not grammatical, while 19b is.

19. Haitian Creole

- a. *On *malad* manman
 A sick mother
 *‘A sick mother’.
- b. On manman (ki) *malad*
 A mother REL sick
 Lit. ‘A mother who is sick’; ‘A sick mother’.

These non-attributive (or only-predicative) elements behave in the manner of other stative predicates, which usually express perceptive states or conditions, such as *wont* ‘be ashamed’, *bezwan* ‘need’, *fan* ‘be hungry’, *swaf* ‘be thirsty’, *pè* ‘be afraid’ (they lexically derive from French nouns mostly nominalizations) *honte*, *besoin*, *hunger*, *thirst*, *fear*. These nouns in French are necessarily combined with the copula *avoir* ‘have’ to express a subject’s state or condition (ex. Fr. *J’ai soif* ‘I’m thirsty’, *j’ai honte* ‘I am ashamed’), and they are usually used alone as attributes (**Une honte maman*). On the contrary, in creoles, a sentence could have one of these words as the head of the predicate, and actually as the only element that constitute a predicate *An swaf* ‘I’m thirsty’. Because all these Haitian words, although denoting a state or a property, tend to behave syntactically like verbs rather than as adjectives, Véronique (2000) coined the label *verbadjectiveux* (‘verb-adjectives’) to denote them.

According to Bernabé (1983, 989), also in Guadeloupean Creole adjectives can be distinguished between those that are both attributive and predicative those that only allow the second option. The list in *Table 15* illustrates some of these occurrences.

Table 15. – Attributive and predicative adjectives in Guadeloupean Creole.

ATTRIBUTIVE AND PREDICATIVE POSITION AND FUNCTION	ONLY PREDICATIVE POSITION AND FUNCTION
<i>pandi</i> , <i>modé</i> , <i>chèpè</i> , <i>mamal</i> , <i>granbidim</i> , <i>gwobidim</i> ‘big, enormous’	<i>blé</i> ‘blue’, <i>wouj</i> ‘red’
<i>ti</i> ‘small’	<i>djòk/djaka</i> , <i>vavan</i> ‘strong, vigorous’
<i>mal</i> , <i>matou</i> ‘strong’	<i>vina/pyète</i> ‘stingy’
<i>pov</i> ‘poor’	
<i>vyè</i> ‘old’	

It is possible to hypothesize from the list in the table that the distinction between full-fledged adjectives and only predicative adjectives has a semantic motivation, i.e. some semantic classes of ‘adjectives’ might more likely associate to a prototypical syntactic adjectival behaviour compared to other ‘adjectives’ denoting other types of properties. Interestingly, Véronique (2000) makes a step in this direction, arguing that adjectives that in French creoles occur before a noun usually express physical properties, and that they modify the noun providing an intensive or attenuative meaning.

In other words, we wonder if any member of any class of adjectives can take the place of *malad*, or whether adjectives such as this one must be viewed as possessing some semantic characteristics that separate them from other more functionally attributive adjectives, which in return would not fit into the reiteration construction.

3.2. Individual-level properties and stage-level properties

In the definition of semantic types of predicates that allow intransitive predication, Stassen (1997) distinguishes between predicates that locate an entity in a concrete spatial location and predicates which assign an abstract non-physical and non-spatial locations to their subjects. The latter type can be further subcategorized based on various semantic parameter, among which temporality and time stability.

Notably, according to Givón (1984), properties are characterized by gradeability and by a mid-position in the time stability scale, a parameter which measures an entity’s change or permanence over time. Entities that are stable in time, that hence occupy a closer position to the maximal stability pole of the scale, are typically lexicalized in languages as nouns, while entities that are dynamic and processual tend to be lexicalized in languages as verbs. Nevertheless, it has been showed that generalizations about the time-stability parameter of properties can be misleading since some sub-kinds of properties might be conceptualized as more time stable than others.

As explained in the Chapter 1, stage-level properties or predicates are conceived as triggering a processual relation (Langacker 2008), i.e. a change through time, or at least the implication of a change, either induced and volitional¹¹, while individual-level properties or predicates are

¹¹ For instance, control/volitionality of the subject or the argument structure (Kratzer 1995). According to Stassen, volitionality of the subject of a stative predicate is a correlated

atemporal or non-processual, so, with respect to the time-stability scale and Givón's theory, stage-level properties and predicates are more likely to be lexicalized as verbs in natural languages¹².

3.3. *Semantic types of properties*

In a famous typological contribution on adjectives and adjectival classes, Dixon (1982) distinguishes between languages with a major class Adjective and those with a minor class Adjective. While some languages express most 'adjectival' concepts, i.e. properties, through grammatical elements that are in fact adjectives, other languages do not have an adjective class at all, or, in the case of a minor class Adjective, they allot only a selected number of properties to be expressed by adjectives, redistributing the others towards a verbal or nominal encoding.

Starting from the English language, Dixon lists seven semantic types of adjectives, with respective morphological and syntactic behaviour, each related to or reflecting semantic primitive concepts (*Table 16*).

Table 16. – Dixon's semantic classes of adjectives.

AGE	New, young, old [...]
VALUE	good, bad [...]
COLOUR	black, wide, red [...]
DIMENSION	big, large, little, small, long, short, wide, narrow, thick, fat, thin [...]
PHYSICAL PROPERTIES	hard, soft, heavy, light, hot, cold [...]
HUMAN PROPENSION	jealous, happy, clever, kind, generous, proud, wicked [...]
SPEED	fast, quick, slow [...]

According to Dixon's typological analysis, languages systematically encode as *adjectives* those lexemes that express the first four semantic classes of properties, thus age, value, colour and dimension, while only languages

parameter to time-stability and presents different values between stage-level predicates (which he calls *states*) and individual-level predicates (*property-concepts*), being more active in stage-level predicates. Although both are stative predicates, there is a difference in volitionality of the subject and time stability of the state in *John is sitting on the couch* and *John is sad*.

¹² Cf. Chierchia 1995; Kratzer 1995; Meienborn 2004.

with a major class Adjective will provide adjectives to also express the other types of properties.

Such a division between core adjective class and peripheral adjective class seem to be related to the division between individual- and stage-level properties. In fact, Stassen (1997) argues that properties can be evaluated through a *permanency parameter*, since there are some property concepts that will rarely be imagined as being non-permanent, such as *wooden* or *silver*, while there are others that are conceptualized as transitory; for instance, mental and physical states, *thirsty*, *sick*, *angry*, depict an attitude or a condition that is particularly likely to change through time, and in fact stage-level properties of the latter type are those more keen to be encoded in languages by a switch from the adjectival encoding to the verbal encoding.

Properties conceptualized as stage-level also possess several other inherent qualities that conceptually make them similar to events and that are linked to Time-Stability. For instance, these properties, although not being *per se* dynamic entities (Vendler 1959), are implicitly ingressive, i.e. the existence of a dynamic phase that led to the creation of the actual stage-level state or condition is included in their conceptualization, contrary to individual-level properties, which are viewed as forever static and stable.

Adapting Dixon's classification, Stassen (1999, 169) sets up a hierarchy that shows to what degree classes of properties are likely to be encoded by a verbal or an adjectival strategy (the *Adjective Hierarchy*), reported below in *Table 17*.

Table 17. – The Adjective Hierarchy (Stassen 1997, 169).

VERB		ADJECTIVE		
Hum. prop.	Physical prop.	Dimension	Value	Material
		Colour	Age	Gender
			Form	

4. DEGREE ACHIEVEMENT WITH IMPERFECTIVE MARKER

Writing about the *verbadjectivaux* in French-based creoles, Véronique (1982) comments on some interesting data on Mauritian Creole and Seychelles Creole provided by Corne, arguing that in these language the imperfective markers *fin* and *pe*, which express a non-telic and durative

event (20), could be positioned before stative predicates to express a progressive meaning, transforming a stative predicate into a dynamic durative and telic¹³ predicate, a *degree achievement* or *partial completion* predicate (Dowty 1979; cf. 21a-b).

20. Seychelles Creole (adapted from Véronique 1982, 65)
 Li pe maz so diri ek so kiri.
 3SG IMPV eat 3SG.POSS. rice and 3SG.POSS. curry
 'He eats/is eating his rice and his curry'.
21. Seychelles Creole (adapted from Véronique 1982, 65)
 a. Li pe mor.
 3SG IMPV die/dead
 'He is dying'.
 b. Li pe toke.
 3SG IMPV fool
 'He is becoming fool'.

Typically, a degree achievement predicate lexicalizes a two-point scale of a process, subsuming a gradual change of state that can have two aspectual outcomes, depending on the semantic properties of the stative event. In theory, the change can reach a final point, and thus be fully telic; for instance, the semantics of the verb *to die* suggests that the process of dying will trigger in the end a change of state *alive* > *dead*. Also, English adjectival predicates of the type [to become + adj.] are considered telic, since they are resultative, giving implicit information of an accomplished change.

On the other hand, the process can be atelic, or only partially telic, reaching an intermediate point of change (Declerck 1979; Bertinetto - Squartini 1995; Hay - Kennedy - Levin 1999; Kennedy - McNally 2005; Rappaport Hovav 2014). Incremental themes such as *to increase*, *to broaden*, *to widen* are classic examples of atelic predicates, but also those of the format [to become + *more* adj. -*er*], such as *to become taller*, *to become more beautiful*, those being processes described with respect to a starting point, but unless a sentence context is given, no explicit or implicit information of the ending point can be inferred by the lexical semantics of the verb or verb phrase.

In Guadeloupean Creole, a degree achievement predicate derived from a stative property predicate is typically realized by adding the light verb *vin*, lexically from French *devenir* 'to become', which grammatically works as a progressive copula.

¹³ Cf. Hay - Kennedy - Levin 1999 for telicity in degree achievement.

22. Guadeloupean Creole

- a. Bèf i pa ka jouké ka vin move.
 Cow 3SG NEG IMPV yoke IMPV become evil
 ‘An unyoked cow becomes evil’.
- b. Ou ka vin mèchan lè famn a’w depansé tròp.
 2SG IMPV become wicked when wife of-2SG spend too much
 ‘You get wicked when your wife spends too much money’.

It can though be observed that before some predicates expressing properties, especially mental and physical states or conditions, human propensities, and physical properties, *vin* is not necessarily present, and the sole imperfective marker *ka* is enough to convey a progressive aspect, just as it happens in Mauritian and Seychelles Creole (21). Sentences 22b and 23b have the same meaning, i.e. they are grammatical with or without the featuring of *vin*.

23. Guadeloupean Creole

- a. An ka (vin) malad lè an ka manjé bouden.
 1SG IMPV sick when 1SG IMPV eat pudding
 ‘I become sick when I eat pudding’.
- b. Ou ka mèchan lè famn a’w depansé tròp.
 2SG IMPV wicked when wife of-2SG spend too much
 ‘You get wicked when your wife spends too much money’.
- c. Ou ka (vin) bèl lè ou makiyé’w.
 2SG IMPV (become) beautiful when 2SG make up-2SG
 ‘You become beautiful when you put on some make up’.

In other words, stage-level properties can be encoded in progressive aspect predicates according to a strategy typically dedicated to lexemes expressing dynamic events, i.e. only by adding the imperfective marker.

5. COMPATIBILITY OF INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL PROPERTIES ‘ADJECTIVES’
 WITH INTENSIVE REITERATION CONSTRUCTIONS

5.1. *Intensification of ‘adjectives’*

In a note of the cited paper by Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2014), the authors mention the fact that in Haitian Creole there is incompatibility between some modification expressing an intensive and positive manner such as *byen* ‘well’ and adjectives expressing individual-stage properties, such as *kout* ‘short’, with or without it being inserted in a reiteration structure.

The sentences in 24 would not make sense in Haitian Creole, nor would it in French or English.

24. Haitian Creole
- a. *Djo byen kout.
 - b. *Djo kout byen kout
'Djo is short well'.

Instead, intensification for a property such as *short* can be indeed expressed with concern to its grade, for instance 'Djo is very short'. Interestingly, in French-creoles the more productive construction to express a grade of intensification for both individual-level and stage-level properties is the one where the correspondent lexeme is reduplicated/reiterated twice or more than twice contiguously (Bernabé 1983; cf. 25); alternatively, focus-clefting is needed on the model of the sentences reported in 7 and 8.

25. Haitian Creole
- Djo kout kout.
 - Djo short short
 - 'Djo is very short'.

5.2. Compatibility with intensive modifier *bon*

Let us consider for Haitian Creole the results of compatibility registered between a syntactic reiteration construction where P1 and P2 express individual-level and stage-level properties, and the modifier *bon* lit. 'good', conveying intensive truth value, being thus translated adverbially with 'very/really'.

[SUBJ P1 *bon* P2] is acceptable with predicates expressing physical conditions, such as *sick*, *tired* or *pregnant* in 26.

26. Physical Condition
- a. Pyè malad bon malad.
Pyè sick good sick
'Pyè is very/really sick'.
 - b. Pyè las/fatigé bon las/fatigé.
Pyè tired good tired
'Pyè is very/really tired'.
 - c. Mari plènn bon plènn.
Mari pregnant good pregnant
'Mari is very/really pregnant'. (she is at a final point of her pregnancy)

It is also acceptable with predicates expressing human propension and speed (27 and 28).

27. Human propension
- a. Pyè kontan/tris bon kontan/tris.
Pyè happy/sad good happy/sad
'Pyè is very/really happy/sad'.
 - b. Djo janti/mechan bon janti/mechan.
Djo kind/evil good kind/evil
'Djo is very/really kind/evil'.
28. Speed
- a. Pyè rapid/mol bon rapid/mol
Pyè fast/slow good fast/slow
'Pyè is very/really fast/slow'.

Finally, it is compatible with predicates expressing physical properties and dimensions (29 and 30).

29. Physical properties
- a. Bwèt la léjè/lou bon léjè/lou.
Box DEF light/heavy good light/heavy
'The box is very/really light/heavy'.
 - b. Kafé la cho/fwèt bon cho/feèt.
Coffee DEF hot/cold good hot/cold
'The coffee is very/really hot/cold'.
30. Dimension
- a. Kaz la piti bon piti.
House DEF small good small
'The house is very/really small'.
 - b. Kaz la gran bon gran.
House DEF big good big
'The house is very/really big'.
 - c. Baton la kout bon kout.
Stick DEF short good short
'The stick is very/really short'.

On the contrary, the construction [SUBJ P1 bon P2] is not accepted with predicates expressing age (31), value (32) and colour (33).

31. Age
- *Pyé vyè bon vyè.
Pyè old good old
'Pyè is very/really old'.
32. Value
- *Bouden la mové bon mové.
 pudding DEF bad good bad
'The pudding is very/really good'.

33. Colour

*Chivé a Lora nwè bon nwè.
 Hair of Lora black good black
 'Lora's hair are very/really black'.

Table 18 summarizes the compatibility and acceptability of [SUBJ P1 bon P2] with the various semantic classes.

Table 18. – Compatibility of *bon* reiteration with semantic classes.

SEMANTIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES			BON RC
Age	<i>jenn</i> 'young', <i>vyé</i> 'old'	Adjectival semantic core	X
Value	<i>mové</i> 'bad', <i>bon</i> 'good'		X
Colour	<i>wouj</i> 'red', <i>blan</i> 'white', <i>nwè</i> 'black'		X
Dimension	<i>gwo</i> 'big', <i>piti</i> 'small', <i>gran</i> 'tall', <i>kout</i> 'short'		✓
Physical properties	<i>léjè</i> 'light', <i>lou</i> 'heavy', <i>cho</i> 'hot', <i>fwèt</i> 'cold'		✓
Human propension	<i>kontan</i> 'happy', <i>tris</i> 'sad', <i>mové</i> 'unkind, rude', <i>janti</i> 'kind'	Adjectival semantic periphery	✓
Speed	<i>rapide</i> 'fast', <i>mòl</i> 'slow'		✓
Physical and mental state or conditions	<i>malad</i> 'sick', <i>las/fatigé</i> 'tired', <i>plenn</i> 'pregnant'		✓

6. COMPATIBILITY OF INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL PROPERTIES 'ADJECTIVES' WITH ATTENUATIVE REITERATION CONSTRUCTIONS

6.1. Strategies to express attenuation of a property

In Haitian, the only modifier placed between property-denoting P1 and P2 which can convey an attenuative meaning to the reiteration construction is *yon ti*, in a sentence such as that in 34.

34. Haitian Creole

Djo malad yon ti malad.
 Djo sick a little sick
 'Djo is a bit sick'.

Indeed, these kinds of reiterations are much less productive than reiteration constructions expressing intensification of a property, and they are not the preferred syntactic strategy to express such meaning. When it comes to predication of properties, in fact, the adverbial *yon ti jan* is sufficient to express the attenuation.

35. Haitian Creole
 Djo yon ti jan tris.
 Djo a little sort sad
 'Djo is a bit/kind of sad'.
36. Haitian Creole
 Djo yon ti jan wrouj.
 Djo a little sort red
 'Djo is a bit/kind of red'.

6.2. Yon ti

Yon ti, lexically from French *un + petit*, is in Haitian Creole grammar a nominal modifier.

Interestingly, its function is different if it happens to modify a noun denoting a bounded concept or a noun denoting an unbounded entity, such as an indefinite event or a mass-concept.

The first element of the locution, i.e. *yon*, is *per se* an indefinite specific morpheme, just as French *un*, allowing an object-referring interpretation of the noun which follows. *Ti* lit. 'small', thus, works in this case as an attributive adjective which modifies the following noun simply adding a dimensional information, such as *ti kay* 'small house' in 37.

37. Haitian Creole (Targète - Urciolo 1993, 74)
 Gan yon gro fotèy pay devan yon ti kay.
 Have/there is a big armchair straw in.front.of a little house
 'There is a big straw armchair in front of a little house'.

Instead, when *yon ti* occurs before mass nouns or other nouns denoting unbounded concepts, it works as a partitive quantifier, as in 38 and 39.

38. Haitian Creole (Targète - Urciolo 1993, 105)
 Ban'm yon ti krazè.
 Give 1SG a little money
 'Give me a little money'.
39. Haitian Creole (Targète - Urciolo 1993, 176)
 Batize manje a ak yon ti sèl.
 Baptize eat DEF. with a little salt
 'Baptize eats it with a bit of salt'.

Note that a noun phrase such as *yon ti anbeli* ‘a little improvement’ (39), where the noun actually denotes an incremental theme event, being thus gradably evaluable, the actual function of *yon ti* is ambiguous between the first [specific + dimensional information] and a partial (read: gradable) quantifier. Also in English, using the expression *a little*¹⁴, which makes quite the parallel with *yon ti* in Haitian, we could say ‘a little improvement’ meaning that the grade of improvement has partially risen, giving as a matter of fact an aspectual information about the event.

40. Haitian Creole (Targète - Urciolo 1993, 7)
 Depi maten lapli ap tonbe, fèk gen yon ti anbeli.
 Since morning rain IMPV fall just have/there is a little improvement
 ‘It has been raining since this morning; it has just cleared a little’.

6.3. *Reiteration constructions with yon ti to express completion and attenuation*

Yon ti in reiteration constructions with dynamic events conveys primarily an aspectual reading, adding a meaning of completion and ending to the process. In fact, if a durative event such as an *activity* (Vendler 1957) is modified by an expression such as ‘for a little bit’, the latter adds a temporal and telic dimension to the unbounded process, affirming that it lasted for a while, but that it eventually ended. The result is then a durative but telic process that according to Vendler is an accomplishment (cf. 41; activity: *Djo runs* → accomplishment: *Djo runs/ran for a little bit*, and 42).

41. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014, 263)
 Li kouri yon ti kouri.
 He/she run a little run
 ‘She runs/ran for a little bit’.
42. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014, 256)
 I gadé yon ti gadé television.
 3SG look a little look television
 ‘She/he watches/-ed TV for a little bit’.

The reiteration construction is also compatible with *achievement* predicates, such as *bwè* ‘to drink’ in ‘to drink a glass of something’ version. In this case, if a direct object is included in the verb phrase, such as ‘to drink water, wine, a liquor’, the modifying effect of the predicate reiteration concerns the object referent rather than the process itself, by informing

¹⁴ Cf. Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014.

on the (small, reduced) quantity of the object; so, the action of drinking moderately and of drinking a small quantity of something is as a matter of fact the same, and therefor expressed by the same syntactic structure.

43. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014, 256)
 Pyè bwè Kleren yon ti bwè Kleren.
 Pyè drink Kleren a little drink Kleren
 'Pyè drinks/has drunk a little of (a little glass of) Kleren'.

The second interpretation given by the *yon ti* reiteration construction is the attenuative one. In particular, the meaning conveyed is that of poor/low quality of the event performance (pathetically, idly, moderately, poorly, ...), as the sentences in 41, 42 and 43 show.

44. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014, 263)
 Djo kouri yon ti kouri.
 Djo run a little run
 'Djo runs/ran pathetically'.

45. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014, 256)
 I gadé yon ti gadé television
 3SG look a little look television.
 'She/he watches/-ed TV idly'.

46. Haitian Creole (Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014, 256)
 Pyè bwè Kleren yon ti bwè Kleren.
 Pyè drink Kleren a little drink Kleren
 'Pyè drinks/has drunk Kleren moderately'.

6.4. *Compatibility of yon ti with property predicates*

With respect to the *bon* reiteration constructions to express intensification, *yon ti* reiteration constructions are much less acceptable with property predicates. The only acceptable combination is with physical and mental states and conditions, such as in 47.

47. Haitian Creole
 Bèf la plenn yon ti plenn.
 Cow DEF pregnant a little pregnant
 Lit. 'The cow is a bit pregnant'. (the cow has just begun her pregnancy)

According to Stassen's hierarchy, the semantic class of physical and mental states and condition is placed to the closest to the verbal pole, and is constituted by stage-level properties, which intrinsically imply a continuous transformation. The conditions of being pregnant, being sick or being

tired usually imply a degree value and a gradual change, that can eventually end or develop into another state (giving birth, die or getting healthy or rested). Quantity/grade – reduced or increased – can be indeed expressed on these predicates but also imply an information about the stage of a developing process.

48. Haitian Creole
Pyè malad yon ti malad.
Pyè sick a little sick
'Pyè is a bit sick'.

49. Haitian Creole
Djo las yon ti las.
Djo tired a little tired
'Djo is a bit tired'.

Hence, the *yon ti* modification works well for this well-represented class of stage-level properties, as it works for durative processes as incremental themes and activities, as well. On the contrary, for the other semantic classes, the use of such reiteration is highly improbable.

5.

CASE STUDY 3

The ‘Fact Type’ Complementizer in Guadeloupean Creole

1. COMPLEMENTIZERS IN CREOLE LANGUAGES

It is largely documented by linguistic theoretical and descriptive works that a common feature of creole languages is to display of two (or more) forms of complementizers, which alternate according to whether the complete clause is of fact type or of potential type (Dixon 2006)¹.

Usually, the role of complementizer is fulfilled by a grammatical or lexical element already present in the language and already covering more than one function; for fact type complement (see English and Dutch based creoles) it can often be the word for the verb *say*, while for potential type complements, purposive preposition and/or *irrealis* mood marker can fulfil the role, as exemplified in 1 by the Haitian word *pou*².

1. Haitian Creole

- a. Preposition (Koopman - Lefebvre 1980, 203)

Pote sa *pou* mwen
Carry this for me
‘Bring this for me’.

- b. TAM marker (Koopman - Lefebvre 1980, 209)

Nou pa te *pou* wè sa
1PL NEG ANT MD see this
‘We did not have to see this’.

¹ Bickerton (1981, 59) refers to these two types of complements as to *realised* and *unrealised* complements.

² Cf. also of *foe* in Sranan (Jansen - Koopman - Muysken 1980), *fi* in Jamaican Creole (Winford 1985), *fò* in Hawaiian Creole English (Siegel 2000), *pu* in Mauritian Creole (Baker 1972), with similar distribution.

- c. Complementizer (Dionne 2007, 33)³

Li_i vle *pou* i_{ij} vini.
 3SG want COMP 3SG come
 'He/she wants to come'⁴.

Sometimes, the sole presence of one form of complementizer can determine if the speaker is introducing a fact or a potentiality in the completive clause. The examples in 2 from Mauritian Creole show how adding the element *pu* (glossed as 'for' by Baker) is crucial in turning the meaning of the sentence from 'she decided to put a fish in it', where the taking place of 'to put a fish in it' is positively presupposed by the speaker, to 'she has decided to put a fish in it', where nothing is suggested about the actual taking place of the action.

2. Mauritian Creole (Baker 1972, 35)

- a. Li desid al met posoh ladah
 she decide go put fish in it
 'She decided to put a fish in it'. (the speaker reports that she did already)
- b. Li desid *pu* al met posoh ladah
 she decide for go put fish in it
 'She has decided to put a fish in it'. (the speaker reports that she has not yet done/she maybe will)

Guadeloupean Creole belongs to the Lesser Antillean creoles, but, whereas no phonologically realized form of complementizer is documented in the other French-based Lesser Antillean creoles (Michaelis *et al.* 2013; cf. Martinican Creole in 3), in Guadeloupean Creole the word *kè*, lexically from French *que*, is found to work as a complementizer alongside the zero form (4).

3. Martinican Creole (Dionne 2007, 15-16)

- a. Piè di \emptyset [Pol pati].
 Piè say COMP Pol leave
 'Piè said that Pol left'.
- b. Piè té ké simyé \emptyset [Pol pati].
 Piè ANT FUT prefer COMP Pol leave
 'Piè would prefer Pol to leave'.

³ Cited from Sterlin 1989, 131.

⁴ This sentence could also be interpreted as 'he/she wants him/her to come'.

4. Guadeloupean Creole ⁵
- a. An vé Ø [Jan vin].
1SG want COMP Jan come
'I want Jan to come'.
- b. An ka esperé [kè Jan ké vin].
1SG IMPF hope COMP Jan FUT come
'I hope that Jan will come'.

Unlike Haitian *pou* in 1, *kè* does not cover the function of a purposive preposition or that of a verb; it rather replicates the complementizer form and function of the lexifier language, suggesting a full grammatical and lexical borrowing from French rather than a simple borrowing of lexical material.

According to Bernabé (1983), *kè* is not to be considered a stable resource in the Guadeloupean Creole's system (at least in the *Gwo Kreyòl*'s, the basilectal one), but instead a sociolinguistic variant of the zero form, selected according to the communicative situation; with French as the high variety and creole as the low one, the borrowing of *kè* is selected within a higher diaphasic situation, while in basilect creole complementizers remain just zero forms.

In this chapter we show that, beside the sociolinguistic account, a more systematic distribution for the complementizer *kè* can be determined, as it appears in grammatical opposition to the zero form. The presence of the complementizer is associable with the 'fact type' semantics of the complement taking predicates, and so do other elements that are featured in the completive clause when the complementizer *kè* is present.

2. COMPLEMENT TYPES AND COMPLEMENT-TAKING PREDICATES

2.1. *Fact type, activity type and potential type complements*

As explained in Chapter 2, data from Guadeloupean Creole are analysed according to Dixon (2006)'s model for classification of complements. This model is set up in continuity with the previous functional tradition of the complementation syntactic theory developed by Givón (2001) and Noonan

⁵ The source for data in this and next chapters, is always personal data collection, where not otherwise specified.

(1985), where the complementation strategies and the morpho-syntactic encoding of the completive clauses are analysed in relation to the semantics of the completive-taking predicates. Dixon integrates this approach with an extensive typological enquiry and comes out as a result with three cross-linguistic types of complement clauses: the fact type complements, the activity type complements, and the potential type complements.

The fact type complements usually refer to a fact (Vendler 1967), an event that is asserted or presupposed of having taken place. This kind of complement is usually encoded as a full completive clause (i.e. sentential complement), which is built with a parallel structure to that of the main clause.

5. English (Dixon 2006, 27)
 I_A noticed <that Mary had weeded the garden>₀.

In the terminology of Givón (2001), the event encoded in this kind of completive clauses, although having a relationship of subordination with the main one, has a low level of *semantic integration* with it⁶, meaning that its occurrence does not have a strong dependence and bond on the main event.

Linguistically, the completive clause exhibits its own set of grammatical markers. For instance, tense-aspect and negation markers can be on the verb, and not necessarily dependent from the main one. In 5, <Mary had weeded the garden> refers to a past and perfective action, whose occurrence has happened previously of the speaker noticing, and conceived as not contingent on it.

In head-marking languages, the subject can be marked by a bound morpheme, and, finally, the two clauses are linked by a dedicated and full-realized form of complementizer (on a par with *that* in English, 5).

The second type, the activity type complements, generally refers to an ongoing activity. The main complementation strategy is the noun phrase, so, in other words, (morphological or syntactic) nominalizations (cf. 6 compared to 5 for English). Consequently, compared to the main clause, some typical verbal markings, such as tense-aspect or negation, are less probable to appear on an activity complement. The time reference of the completive event might be different than the one in the main clause, and if it is not possible to aggregate TAM markers on the encoding structure, a dedicated lexical mean must be used to express implicit time reference (like

⁶ “The strength of the bond between the two events coded in the main and complement clause” (Givón 2001, II, 40).

in 6, where the English participle form *weeding*, not overtly marked for tense, can set a present or a past time reference with respect to *I noticed*).

6. English (Dixon 2006, 27)
 I_A noticed <Mary(s) weeding the garden>_O.

In head-marking languages, the activity type complement clause might not include bound pronouns as the main clause, and in the case of subject coreference with the latter, the subject form can be omitted.

The potential type complements generally refer to the possibility of the subject of becoming involved in an activity. On the complementation strategy, the potential type can be expressed with object completive clauses, but when it does, it shows a higher degree of morpho-syntactic integration with the main clause, which means that the verb does not usually have (independent) tense-aspect markings nor are bound pronouns possible in head-marking languages. The time reference is undefined with respect to the one expressed by the main clause, and the verb that encodes it sometimes takes a dedicated morphological form (for instance, the *infinitive* in Indo-European languages; Noonan 1985); the complementizer can be specific or zero form (7). Lastly, the subject form of the completive verb is often omitted.

7. English (Dixon 2006, 31)
 They forced John <to go>.

Clearly, the repertoires of complement types in the languages of the world show a big deal of variation: there are languages that encode all three types in their systems, some that have a way richer and more particular typology, and others that only encode one or two of the presented types.

Dixon's classification of complements' types has been confirmed suitable for analysing complementation data of creole languages, since in many of them the existent grammatical oppositions can be traced down to mark the two types of fact type and potential type complements. A rich bibliography on complementation and complementizers in creoles confirms this trend of distribution: see, for instance, Jansen - Koopman - Muysken 1980, Plag 1993 and 1995 on Sranan; Damonte 2002, Byrne 1987 and Veenstra 1996 on Saamaka; Winford - Migge 2013 on Surinamese Creole; Winford 1985 on Jamaican Creole; Siegel 2000 on Hawaiian Creole English; Baker 1972 on Mauritian Creole; Koopman - Lefebvre 1992 on Haitian Creole; Lefebvre - Loranger 2006 on Saramaccan.

2.2. The complement-taking predicates

The complement-taking predicates that select completive clauses as their objects are called *primary verbs* by Dixon, because they represent the prototypical complement-taking predicates in every language. As explained above, the association between a fact type complement and the strategy of the completive clause is the most probable, but activity type and potential type complements can be expressed by a clause, too.

That said, the complement-taking predicates that represent the prototype for a fact-type object completive clause are⁷: verbs of *utterance* (or *speaking*) (*to say, to tell, to report, to describe, to refer, to order, to command, to inform*); verbs of *cognition* (*to know, to understand, to believe, to suspect*); *evaluative verbs* (*to be true, to be sad, to be important*), and some verbs of *propositional attitude* (or *thinking*) (*to think, to consider, to suppose, to assume, to remember, to forget*).

Besides, a fact type complement can also be required by some *perception verbs* (*to notice, to see*); some *emotive* (or *of liking*) verbs (*to like, to love, to prefer*); and finally some *desiderative verbs* (*to want, to wish, to desire*).

Most verbs of *perception* (or *of attention*) (*to hear, to see, to smell, to show*), *emotive verbs* (*to like, to enjoy, to fear, to love*) take an activity type complement, whereas, when the potential type complement is realized under the form of a completive clause (called secondary concepts by Dixon), the classes of predicates that prototypically introduce them are: most *desiderative verbs* (*to hope, to wish, to hope for, to intend, to plan for*); *manipulative verbs* (*to force, to make to, to convince*); *modal verbs* (*can, should*); *phasal verbs* (*trying verbs and beginning verbs for Dixon 2006*) (*to try, to attempt, to begin, to start, to continue, to stop*).

Table 19 schematically resumes the matches between complement-taking predicates and types of completive clause.

⁷ The types here listed are taken from Dixon 2006; nevertheless, some of the denominations of the CPT semantic classes are taken from Noonan 1985 (for instance *utterance predicates* instead of *speaking*). The reason is that Noonan 1985 exhibits a more detailed list of classes, which allows a generally finer distinction. Also, the evaluative *factive* predicates listed and analysed in Kiparsky - Kiparsky 1970, but absent in Dixon 2006, have been taken into account, in comparison with the scheme in Winford - Migge 2013, that has been particularly useful as a reference.

Table 19. – Complement-taking predicates and types of completive clauses.

CTP CLASS	PREDICATES	TYPES OF COMPLETIVE CLAUSE	
Utterance	to say, to tell, to report, to describe, to refer, to order, to command, to inform	Fact type	Activity type
Cognition	to know, to understand, to acknowledge, to suspect		
Propositional attitude	to think, to consider, to suppose, to assume, to remember, to forget		
Evaluative	to be true, to be sad, to be important		
Perception	to notice, to see, to hear, to smell, to show		
Emotive	to like, to enjoy, to fear, to love		
Desiderative	to hope, to wish, to hope for, to intend, to plan for		
Manipulative	to force, to make to, to convince		
Phasal	to try, to attempt, to begin, to start, to continue, to stop		
Modal	can, must, should		

In addition, the table outline graphically defines the prototypical core complement-taking-predicates for each type of completive clause. The scheme can in fact to be read as a *continuum* shifting from the two poles of *fact type* and *potential type*, passing through the stage of *activity type*. The core predicates which are associated almost exclusively with the fact type completive clause, i.e. predicates of utterance and cognition, are placed in the top position in the chart. Those that represent the semantic core for the activity type clauses' selection are perception and emotive predicates, which are placed in a mid-position in the chart. The semantic core predicates for potential type clauses, manipulative and phasal, are placed to the very bottom of the chart. The other predicates, for which there are

more variation in types, are placed within the *continuum* according to their degree of attraction to the fact type or potential type pole.

In fact, although assuming that a complement-taking predicate class associates with one complementation strategy according to a prototypical behaviour, for most predicates various element of semantic and syntactic variation must be considered. This might account for more than one type of completive clause matching the same complement taking predicates.

This is what happens when a predicate is, for instance, polysemic. Having several meanings, it can be interpreted as belonging to more than one semantic group of predicates, and consequently it is compatible with different types of objects, selecting different forms of completive clauses.

For instance, a perception verb such as *to see* has a strong epistemic semantics and, in many languages, it is seen as an expansion of meaning⁸. Its primary meaning expresses the action of seeing something, in other cases the verb is found to express an acquired knowledge of a fact, becoming a synonym of predicates of cognition such as *to acknowledge*, *to understand*. Typically, in the first case, the selected completive clause is of activity type, while in the second case of fact type.

8. English (Boye 2010, 391)
- a. Paul saw Santa Claus kiss mummy.
 - b. Paul saw (that) Santa Claus kissed mummy.

The examples from Boye (2010) help understand such a difference. In 8a what is reported is just the ongoing activity of Paul witnessing Santa Claus kiss mummy, while in 8b the meaning of *saw* slides metaphorically to the meaning of 'to realize, to acknowledge', and it asserts the realization by Paul of the fact that Santa Claus kissed mummy. In fact, when *to see* is intended as a verb of acquired knowledge, a full-fledged completive clause of fact type is present, as it is shown by the conjugated verbal form, the possibility of adding the complementizer *that*, and that the two participants (Santa Claus and mummy) are arguments of the verb *kissed*.

Another remarkable case of the possibility of multiple classification concerns desiderative verbs such as *to hope*, *to want*, *to wish*, which can select as objects various semantic types of referents: (1) the desire for something that has not happened yet, which fully matches with a potential type event (*I hope that John will come*: Noonan 1985, 132); (2) a hope for something to have happened in the past, but whose actual realization is

⁸ Cf. Noonan 1985; Dik - Hengeveld 1991; Schüle 2000; Boye 2010 on the semantic expansion and recategorization of perception verbs.

still unknown to the speaker (*I hope that John came*); (3) a counter-factuality: the desire that something that has not actually happened, did (or the opposite) (*I wish that John had come*)⁹. In the last two cases, although the sentences still express a potentiality, the completive clause encodes an event conceived as a fact, and for this reason it is often found in natural languages coded as a fact type completive clause (cf. *Table 19*).

3. THE SYNTAX OF THE FACT-TYPE AND POTENTIAL-TYPE COMPLETIVE CLAUSE IN GUADELOUPEAN CREOLE

In this section, I will analyse the values in Guadeloupean Creole for three features present in sentential complements, that are identified in the theory of Givón and Dixon as indicative of the level of semantic and syntactic integration between the main event/clause and the completive event/clause, and that might change according to whether the clause is of fact, activity or potential type (cf. § 2.1). These are: (1) the distribution of the forms of complementizers (§ 3.1); (2) the distribution of TAM markers on the main and completive verbs (§ 3.3); (3) the possibility for the main and completive clauses to overtly mark two distinct subject forms in case of subject coreference (§ 3.4, ‘subject coreference’).

3.1. *The distribution of the forms of complementizers*

In Guadeloupean Creole, the complementizer *kè* is quite regularly eligible after predicates of utterance (9), cognition (10) and *factual* evaluatives (11). From these categories of the CTP core for a fact type completive clause selection, it feels safe to say that the complementizer *kè* shows a good association with the fact type completive clause profile.

9. Utterance
- a. Mari anonsé *kè* [i ké pati].
Marie announce COMP 3SG FUT leave
‘Marie announced that she will leave’.
 - b. An ka régrété *kè* [an pa manti].
1SG IMPV regret COMP 1SG NEG lie
‘I regret that I haven’t lied’.

⁹ On syntax of counterfactual sentences, cf. Comrie 1986; Palmer 1986; Iatridou 2000.

10. Cognition

- a. An konstaté *kè* [Jan pati].
 1SG acknowledge *COMP* Jan leave
 'I acknowledged (that) Jan left'.
- b. An ka dekouvé *kè* [i té ni on not nomn].
 I IMPV find.out *COMP* 3SG PST have another man
 'I found out (that) he/she had another man'.
- c. An sav *kè* [ou ka ri mwen].
 I know *COMP* 2SG IMPV laugh 1SG
 'I know (that) you make fun of me'.

11. Evaluative

- a. Sa vè di on biten *kè* ou vin vwè mwen.
 This want say a big.deal *COMP* 2SG come see 2SG
 'It means a lot that you came see me'.
- b. An senten *kè* Pyè ké fe-y mal.
 1SG sure *COMP* Pierre FUT do-3SG bad
 'I am sure Pierre will hurt him'.

Note that a fact type completive clause can also make reference to an event that has either not yet taken place or is currently taking place, as long as the presupposition of its truth – the speaker's positive perception or implication of its actualisation (Kiparsky - Kiparsky 1970) – remains valid. It is the case for a predicate of utterance such as *anonsé* 'to announce', that selects a fact type completive clause also when the event's time reference is in the future (9a, 11b). The action of reporting and commenting on an event, so as that of expressing an evaluation or to acknowledge it, does not have a direct effect on the taking place of the event itself, which remains an independent process. The semantics of the CPT just imply that it occurs.

The same effect is produced with a negation on the main predicate or completive verb, which does not affect whatsoever the status of fact of the completive event (12).

12.

- a. Pyè vin savé *kè* Mari ka twompé-y.
 Pierre come know *COMP* Marie IMPV cheat-3SG
 'Pierre came to know that Marie cheats on him'.
- b. Pyè savé *kè* Mari té twompé-y.
 Pierre know *COMP* Marie PST cheat-3SG
 'Pierre knew that Marie cheated on him'.
- c. Pyè pa savé *kè* Mari ka twompé-y.
 Pierre NEG know *COMP* Marie IMPV cheat-3SG
 'Pierre didn't know that Marie cheated on him'.

A remarkable exception to this trend regards the utterance predicate *di* 'to say', which is not well compatible by the complementizer *kè* (13).

- 13.
- a. Mari di \emptyset /*(kè)* [Jan pati]
 Mari say *COMP* Jan leave
 ‘Mari said that Jan left’.
 - b. Yo di laradjo \emptyset /*(kè)* [Jan pati]
 3PL say radio *COMP* Jan leave
 ‘They said on the radio that Jan left’.

In the syntax of creole completive clauses, ‘to say’ is not a predicate such as the others. As briefly mentioned in the introduction, in many pidgin and creole languages, the fact type complementizer form indeed derives from the reanalysis of the verb ‘say’; in Sranan Tongo (Plag 1992, 1995) and in Surinamese Creole (Winford - Migge 2013), for instance, *taki* ‘say’ fulfils many functions besides that of a simple verb, among which that of a quotative element to introduce direct speech, that of a subordinator to introduce purpose clauses, and, of course, that of a complementizer introducing complements to verbs of propositional or cognitive content (that is fact type complements; 14).

14. Sranan Tongo (Plag 1995, 131)
 En den alamala sabi heri boen *taki* Alanfanti de wan heiden suma
 And they all know very well *say* A. is a heathen person
 ‘And they all knew very well *that* Alanfanti was a heathen’. (King 1973, 139)

This last association confirms the strong bound between the semantics of the predicate (and of the other fact type CPT core) and the selection of a fact type complement as its object.

Indeed, such multifunctionality is not usually attested for *di* in French-based creoles (Michaelis *et al.* 2013; Michealis 2016), but this surely is one of the elements that undergo grammaticalization more often in creole languages – especially those for which the West African substrate is stronger (Aboh 2002, 2006 on Gbe; Güldemann 2001; also cited in Winford - Migge 2013) – as well as cross-linguistically (Heine - Kuteva 2005), which would suggest that more detailed research on the behaviour of the verb *di* is needed.

As soon as the fact type CPT core is not fully centred, the complementizer *kè* exhibits a less systematic distribution. For some propositional attitude predicates, for instance, it becomes optional, as in 15; it may be produced or not, appearing to be featured in free distribution with the zero form. Although a verb such as *kwè* in 15a and *pansé* in 15b express a quite positive judgement about the truth of the event in the completive clause, there is no way to acknowledge its real occurrence, and this seems demonstrated by the optionality of *kè*.

15. Propositional attitude

- a. An ka kwè Ø/ké sé mwen ki kasé vè-la.
 1SG IMPV believe COMP it.is 1SG REL break glass-DEF
 'I believe (that) it was me who broke that glass'.
- b. Pyè ka pansé Ø/ké i réisi légzamen.
 Pyè IMPV think COMP 3SG succeed exam
 'Pierre thinks (that) he passed the exam'.

In the same way, predicates that theoretically select an activity type complete clause are characterized by a very random selection of the form *kè*. For perception (16) and emotive (17) verbs it is possible to have clauses with either *kè* or the zero form, with no systematic predictability.

16. Perception

- a. Ou tann Ø/ké [yo té ka pale de-w]?
 2SG hear COMP 3PL PST IMPV talk of-2SG
 'Have you heard that they are talking about you?'
- b. An ka vwè Ø/ké [i vlè fè mwen mal].
 1SG IMPV see COMP 3SG want do 1SG bad
 'I see that he wants to hurt me'.
- c. An vwè Ø/ké [i té ka pati pa koté-lasa].
 1SG see COMP 3SG PST IMPV leave towards side-that
 'I saw him leaving in that direction'.

16 (a-b) present two sentences in which a knowledge-cognition reading can actually be attached to the first-two perception predicates *tann* 'hear' and *vwè* 'see', the first meaning 'have you understood that they are talking about you?', and the second 'I know/have understood that they want to hurt me'. Nevertheless, these sentences are also fully accepted when introduced by a zero form complementizer, with no apparent change of meaning.

17. Emotive

- a. I ka krenn Ø [sa rivé].
 3SG IMPV fear COMP that come.
 'He is afraid that this (could) happen(s).'
- b. An ka krenn Ø/ké [ou tonbé].
 1SG IMPV fear COMP 2SG fall
 'I am afraid that you (could) fall'.
- c. An pè Ø [lapli ka-y tonbé].
 1SG fear COMP rain COND. fall
 'I am afraid that it will (could) rain'.

CPTs that usually associate with the potential type complete clause, such as manipulatives and desideratives, seldom select the complementizer *kè* to introduce the complete clause; instead the zero form is preferred.

18. Desideratives

- a. An vé \emptyset [Jan vin].
 1SG want *COMP* Jan come
 'I want Jan to come'.
- b. An ka espére $\emptyset/kè$ [Jan ké vin].
 1SG IMPV hope *COMP* Jan FUT come
 'I hope that Jan will come'.
- c. An ka swété-w \emptyset [ou pè achté kaz la-sa].
 1SG IMPV wish-2SG *COMP* 2SG can buy house DEF-SPEC
 'I wish you to be able to buy this house'.
- d. Mari di Jan \emptyset [pati].
 Mari say (ask) Jan *COMP* leave
 'Mari asked/ordered Jan to leave'.

19. Manipulatives

- a. Jan fosé Mari \emptyset [tapè Roscoe].
 Jan force Mari *COMP* hit Roscoe
 'Jan forced Mari to hit Roscoe'.

Note that the verb *di* can work as a desiderative verb when it takes the meaning of 'to ask, to order' (as a synonym of *mandé* 'to order, to demand'); in this case a potential type completive clause usually follows. Because *di* rarely selects *kè* as complementizer also when it is intended as an utterance predicate, the encoding of a sentence with *di* as the main verb holding a potential type, or a fact type completive clause is the same. In 20 the only difference between the two sentences is that in 20a *Jan* is an argument of the verb *pati*, while in 20b of the verb *di*.

20.

- a. Mari di \emptyset [Jan pati].
 Mari say (report) *COMP* Jan leave
 'Mari said that Jan left'.
- b. Mari di Jan \emptyset [pati].
 Mari say (ask) Jan *COMP* leave
 'Mari asked/ordered Jan to leave'.

Finally, also modal and phasal predicates, which prototypically select a potential type complement, usually select the zero form.

21. modals/phasals

- a. Mari pè \emptyset [manjé on pizza entyé].
 Mari can/be able *COMP* eat one pizza whole
 'Mari can eat a whole pizza'.
- b. Jan kontinué \emptyset [manjé].
 Jan continue *COMP* eat
 'Jan continued to eat'.

Table 20 sums up the distribution of forms of complementizers according to the CTPs classes and their prototypical type of completive clause. The CTP classes are ordered from the top to the bottom respecting the order given in Table 19.

Table 20. – CTPs, completive clauses and complementizers.

CTP	TYPE OF COMPLEMENT CLAUSE	FORM OF COMPLEMENTIZER IN GC
Utterance		
Cognition		
Evaluative	Fact type	kè
Propositional attitude		
Perception		
Emotive	Activity type	kè/∅
Desiderative		
Manipulative		
Phasal	Potential type	∅
Modal		

The table visually summarizes at least three points: (1) the fact type completive clauses are associated with *kè* as a complementizer, while the potential types with the zero form; (2) for the activity type sentential complements there seems to be no dedicated form of complementizers, instead *kè* or zero form are assigned quite freely (together with point 1 this would suggest that Guadeloupean Creole marks only two types of completive clauses with dedicated complementizers); (3) free assignment is possible also for predicates that are closer to the activity type edge, although being *a priori* included in the fact type or potential type categories.

3.2. The distribution of TAM markers on the main and completive verbs

Whether in creole languages there are non-finite verbs (and clauses) is a controversial subject¹⁰.

¹⁰ Cf. Mufwene - Dikhoff 1989, who, after analysing the verbal forms of five different creoles (Haitian, Papiamentu, Gullah, Jamaican, Sranan) conclude in favour of the view that in creole languages there is no *infinitive* completive clause.

In his study on complementation in Martinican Creole (2007), Dionne argues that the verb of the completive clause is always marked with TAM markers¹¹, irrespective of the semantics of the main verb. However, he also briefly adds that one class of main predicates, so-called *effectives*, selects as object what seems to be a non-conjugated completive clause, a sort of infinitive clause (24, where Dionne cites Damoiseau 1999).

24. Martinican Creole (Damoiseau 1999, 15)
 Met là kité [sé timnamay la jwé].
 Teacher DEF let pl child DEF play
 ‘The teacher let the children play’.

These effective predicates – the term is taken from Rochette (1999) – are those “*décrivant une relation entre un sujet et la performance d’une action*” (Dionne 2007, 9), and coincide with modal and aspectual (phasal) verbs, core potential type CTPs.

In Guadeloupean Creole, such as in other creole languages, it can be quite challenging to say whether a verb with no TAM markers is actually finite or non-finite. In fact, an unmarked verbal form does not correspond automatically to a non-finite semantics; on the contrary a dynamic verb, if not overtly marked, can be by default interpreted as referring to a past and perfect action.

22. Papiamentu Creole (Mufwene - Dikhoff 1989, 298)
 a. Mi a wak Maria kore.
 I PERF see Maria run
 ‘I saw Maria run’.
 b. Nan a bin ku algun piesa, pa baila riba dje.
 They PERF. bring along some records, to dance on RP_i
 ‘They (have) brought some records to dance to’.
23. Haitian Creole (Koopman 1986, 240)
 Li vle vini.
 He/she want come
 ‘He/she wants/wanted [to] come’.

According to the authors, the clauses in 22 and 23 can be classified as *finitive* because all show a subject and a specific complementizer. These two features usually appear overtly marked in finite clauses, in opposition to the infinitive ones, where both elements are usually absent. Nevertheless, nothing is specifically said about the conjugation of the verb of the completive clause.

¹¹ Dionne uses the term *conjugated* to refer to the marked verb or to a verb that expresses finite values for what concerns tense, aspect and mood (finite). The term *conjugated*, as well as the term *finite* will be used with the same meaning throughout this section and in the rest of the chapter.

However, since the CTP of a potential type completive clause does imply that the event has not taken place, it is unlikely that, about the event itself, the speaker could give specific temporal or aspectual information. Rather, it would remain semantically unspecified and, thus, grammatically non-finite.

This is proven by the possibility to aggregate TAM markers on the completive verb: in fact, although it is possible to place before a perfective/past marker (*té*), an imperfective marker (*ka*), a future (*ké*) or a conditional (*té ké*) marker to a completive verb when the clause is of fact type, the same process would turn a potential type completive clause ungrammatical.

Example 25 adapts the two sentences already presented in 20, where the verb *di* ‘to say’ has the functions in a. of utterance predicate (selecting a fact type completive clause), in b. of desiderative predicate (selecting a potential type completive clause).

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 25. Guadeloupean Creole (same as 20) | |
| a. Mari di [Jan <i>té/ka/ké</i> pati]. | FACT TYPE |
| ‘Mari said [that Jan has left/is leaving/will leave].’ | |
| b. Mari di Jan [<i>*(ka/ké)</i> pati]. | POTENTIAL TYPE |
| ‘Mari asked Jan to leave.’ | |

In the fact type sentence 25, [Mari said] and [Jan has left/is leaving/will leave] occur as two individual actions whose performance is not necessarily characterized by the time reference, aspectuality or modality. As a result, the subordinate verb can be marked with different TAM markers with respect to the main verb, without resulting in being ungrammatical.

On the contrary, when a marker is featured on the completive verb of a potential type clause (such as *té* on the dynamic verb *pati* in 26), it has adjusted to the TAM markings present on the CTP, and this implies that the two expressed actions have a bond of dependency (in the terminology of Givón 2001, they show *event integration*).

26. I *té* vé kè [an *té* pati].
 3SG PST want COMP 1SG PST leave
 ‘He wanted me [to have left/to leave].’

3.3 Subject coreference

In some potential type completive clauses in Guadeloupean Creole, the subject of the completive verb can be omitted when it coincides with that of the main verb. This is a strategy of cohesion that aims at a syncretism

of the two clauses, that is universally valid (it is one of the properties of potential type clauses for Dixon, cf. § 2.1), and thus present also in French and in other Indo-European languages, as the charts below show (*Tables 21 and 22*).

Table 21. – French.

NO SUBJ COREFERENCE	SUBJ COREFERENCE
1. Je veux que Jean vienne. 'I want Jean to come'.	2. Je veux venir. 'I want to come'.
3. *Je veux Jean venir. 'I want Jean to come'.	4. *Je veux que je vienne. 'I want me to come'.

Table 22. – Guadeloupean Creole.

NO SUBJ COREFERENCE	SUBJ COREFERENCE
1. An vé Jan vin. 'I want Jan to come'.	2. An vé vin. 'I want to come'.
	3. *An vé mwen vin. 'I want me to come'.

In case of no subject coreference, in French the subject form (the noun *Jean* in *Table 21*, 1) is necessary, and the infinitive form of the completive verb is not allowed (*Table 21*, 3). In case of subject coreference (*Table 21*, 2), instead, the completive clause has an infinitive verb and takes no complementizer.

In Guadeloupean Creole things are not different: except for the fact that an infinitival (and in general non-finite) form of the verb is not available. In case of subject coreference, it is not possible to reintroduce a subject in the completive clause (*Table 22*, 2).

This is particularly evident with potential type CTPs such as phasals and modals, whose completive clauses seldom have other subject than that of the CTP.

27.

- a. Jan konmansé manjé.
'Jean started to eat'.
- b. Jan pé manjé on pizza antyé.
'Jean can eat an entire pizza'.

In fact, these verbs usually work as auxiliaries to add information about time, aspect and modality in relation to the event expressed by the comple-

tive verb, a function that in other languages can also be assigned to specific morphological markers, and are then more keen to be placed in an adjacent position to the completive verb.

On the contrary, when a CTP usually selects a fact type completive clause, in the case of coreference a subject form (lexical or pronominal) must be present in each clause and is not omitted (cf. in 28 the third person pronoun *i*, as an *anaphora* of Jan).

28. Jan jiré kè [i ké pati].
Jean swear COMP 3SG FUT leave
'Jan promised he would leave'.

CONCLUSIONS

The big project behind this contribution was to understand how the philosophical notion of *abstract objects* is translated into the language, but, due to the complexity of the topic, this purpose is most certainly far from attaining. Instead, we have reasonably opted for providing a narrow glimpse of the reasons why *abstract* is often intended as a synonym (or actually as an hypernym) of *generic*, *vague* and *non-prototypical* in French creoles, an association confirmed by typological trends.

We have showed that French-based creoles are endowed with grammatical oppositions which mark the dichotomy specificity/genericity at several levels and concerning various linguistic elements. In fact, we have presented three case studies, each dedicated to relevant language-specific phenomena that (we think) could tell something about the way creoles deal with genericity both grammatically and pragmatically.

Case study 1 deals with the interesting phenomenon of article-agglutination, which we claim to be (partially) motivated by the generic semantics of nouns. The agglutinated articles have the function of morphological markers for kind-referring nouns *contra* their bare form being object-referring. Ultimately, the agglutinated articles can be viewed as noun classifiers, which diversely mark nouns exhibiting a non-prototypical semantic profile.

Case study 2 is concerned with the (non-)prototypicality of property concepts and their encoding.

We have investigated some syntactic and morpho-syntactic behaviour of predicates semantically expressing stage-level properties. Using the time-stability scale designed by Stassen (1997), we have showed that stage-level properties predicates grammatically dispose of a bigger overlapping with typically verbal syntactic structures. In Haitian Creole, the predicate cognate reiteration construction allows to express simultaneously aspectual and evaluative information about a process, and, in addition, in Guadeloupean Creole stage-level property predicates can be marked with the sole

progressive marker *ka* to turn a stative predicate into a degree achievement predicate.

Case study 3 regards the distribution of the *kè* complementizer in Guadeloupean Creole. According to our analysis, *kè* is a fact type complementizer, in opposition to the zero form which is featured in the potential type completive clause.

In particular, speakers typically select *kè* with complement-taking predicates belonging to the core semantic classes typologically associated with a fact type clause, in line with the most traditional semantic and syntactic theories of complementation.

Other grammatical elements concur to shape this opposition: the fact type completive clauses' verbs can be marked with all the range of TAM markers, independent from the marking that the complement-taking predicate receives; on the opposite the potential type completive clauses' verbs do not usually receive a TAM marking, and are implicitly interpreted along with the complement-taking predicate's values for what concerns time reference, aspectuality and mood. Also, in Guadeloupean Creole a fact type completive clause must have a subject form expressed in case of coreference with the complement-taking predicate's subject, while this would be ungrammatical in potential type clauses where a co-referent subject is never phonologically expressed.

From a theoretical point of view, all of these features would generally testify for a major clause union with the main clause (in the terminology of Givón 2001) and consequent reduction of grammatical markings in potential type sentential clauses while, on the contrary, a major clausal independency in fact type completive clauses.

We hope, above all, to have provided some interesting cues of reflection and discussion, aware and confident that this project could be improved by further work of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aboh 2002 E. Aboh, "Morphosyntax of the Left Periphery in Saramaccan and Gbe", Paper presented at *Conference of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics (SPCL)* (San Francisco, 3-6 January, 2002).
- Aboh 2006 E. Aboh, "Complementation in Saramaccan and Gungbe: The Case of C-type Modal Particles", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24 (2006), 1-55.
- Aboh - Smith - Zribi-Hertz 2012 E. Aboh - N. Smith - A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *The Morphosyntax of Reiteration in Creole and Non-Creole Languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2012.
- Acquaviva 2008 P. Acquaviva, *Lexical Plurals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Acquaviva 2018 P. Acquaviva, "Categorization as Noun Construction: Gender, Number, and Entity Types", in É. Mathieu - M. Dali - G. Zareikar (eds.), *Gender and Noun Classification*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018, 41-66.
- Aguilar-Guevara - Le Bruyn - Zwarts 2014 A. Aguilar-Guevara - B. Le Bruyn - J. Zwarts (eds.), *Advances in Weak Referentiality*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2014.
- Aikhenvald 2000 A. Aikhenvald, *Classifiers: A Typology of Noun Categorization Devices*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Amiot - Stosic 2011 D. Amiot - D. Stosic, "Sautiller, voleter, dansoter. Évaluation, pluriactionnalité, aspect", dans E. Arjoca-Ieremia - C. Avezard-Roger - J. Goes - E. Moline - A. Tihu (éds.), *Temps, aspect et classes de mots. Études théoriques et didactiques*, Arras, Artois Presses Université, 2011, 277-297.
- Anciaux - Telchid - Pouillet 2009 F. Anciaux - S. Telchid - H. Pouillet, *Dictionnaire Français-Créole*, Le Détéville (Guadeloupe), PLB Éditions, 2009.

- Asher 1993 N. Asher, *Reference to Abstract Objects*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishing, 1993.
- Ašić - Corblin 2014 F. Ašić - T. Corblin, "Telic Definites and Their Prepositions: French and Serbian", in A. Aguilar-Guevara - B. Le Bruyn - J. Zwarts (eds.), *Weak Referentiality*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2014, 183-211.
- Baker 1972 P. Baker, *Kreol: A Description of a Mauritian Creole*, London, Hurst & Company, 1972.
- Baker 1984 P. Baker, "Agglutinated Nominals in Creole French: Their Evolutionary Significance", *Te Reo* 27 (1984), 89-129.
- Baker - Hookoomsing 1987 P. Baker - V.Y. Hookoomsing, *Morisyen-English-Français. Diksyoner Kreol Morisien. Dictionary of Mauritian Creole. Dictionnaire Créole Mauricien*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1987.
- Bakker 1997 P. Bakker, *A Language on Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of Canadian Métis*, New York - Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Bakker - Parkvall 2005 P. Bakker - M. Parkvall, "Reduplication in Pidgins and Creoles", in B. Hurch (ed.), *Studies on Reduplication*, Berlin - New York, Mouton De Gruyter, 2005, 511-531.
- Beniamino 1996 M. Beniamino, *Le Français de la Réunion. Inventaire des particularités lexicales*, Paris, Edicef, 1996.
- Bernabé 1983 J. Bernabé, *Fondal Natal. Grammaire basilectale approchée des Créoles Guadeloupéen et Martiniquais*, I-II-III, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1983.
- Bertinetto - Squartini 1995 P.M. Bertinetto - M. Squartini, "An Attempt at Defining the Class of Gradual Completion Verbs", in P.M. Bertinetto - V. Bianchi - J. Higginbotham - M. Squartini (eds.), *Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actuality: Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 1995, 11-26.
- Bickerton 1975 D. Bickerton, *Dynamics of Creole Systems*, London, Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Bickerton 1981 D. Bickerton, *Roots of Language*, Ann Arbor (MI), Karoma, 1981.
- Bollée 1977 A. Bollée, *Le créole français des Seychelles. Esquisse d'une grammaire-textes-vocabulaire*, Tübingen, Niemeyer Verlag, 1977.

- Bonami - Henri 2012 O. Bonami - F. Henri, "Predicting Article Agglutination in Mauritian", Paper presented at *Formal Approaches to Creole Studies 3* (Universidade de Lisboa, November 15-16, 2012).
- Borer 2005 H. Borer, *In Name Only*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Borik - Espinal 2012 O. Borik - T. Espinal, "On Definite Kinds", in A. Mari (ed.), *New Perspectives on Genericity at the Interfaces*, Vincennes, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes (Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes 41), 2012, 123-146.
- Boye 2010 K. Boye, "Reference and Clausal Perception-Verb Complements", *Linguistics* 48 (2010), 391-430.
- Bromhead 2017 H. Bromhead, "The Semantics of Water Places in English, French and Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara", in Y. Ze (ed.), *The Semantics of Nouns*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Bybee 1998 J.L. Bybee, "'Irrealis' as a Grammatical Category", *Anthropological Linguistics* 40 (1998), 257-271.
- Bybee - Perkins - Pagliuca 1994 J.L. Bybee - R. Perkins - W. Pagliuca, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Byrne 1987 F. Byrne, *Grammatical Relations in a Radical Creole*, Amsterdam, John Benjamin, 1987.
- Caïd-Capron 1996 L. Caïd-Capron, "La classe adjectivale en créole mauricien et réunionnais", dans D. Véronique (éd.), *Matériaux pour l'étude des classes grammaticales dans les langues créoles*, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1996, 163-192.
- Carlson 1977 G. Carlson, *Reference to Kinds in English*, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1977 (Diss.).
- Carlson 2010 G. Carlson, "Generics and Concepts", in F.J. Pelletier (ed.), *Kinds, Things and Stuff: New Directions in Cognitive Science Series*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010, 16-35.
- Carlson - Pelletier 1995 G. Carlson - F. Pelletier, *The Generic Book*, Chicago - London, The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Carlson - Sussman 2005 G. Carlson - R. Sussman, "Seemingly Indefinite Definites", in S. Kepser - M. Reis (eds.), *Linguistic Evidence: Empirical, Theoretical, and Computational Perspectives*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter, 2005, 71-85.

- Carlson *et al.* 2006 G. Carlson - R. Sussman - N. Klein - M. Tanenhaus, "Weak Definite Noun Phrases", in C. Davis - A.-R. Deal - Y. Zabbal (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th North East Linguistic Society*, Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press, 2006, 179-196.
- Cartwright 1970 H.M. Cartwright, "Quantities", *The Philosophical Review* 79 (1970), 25-42.
- Caudill - Diallo 2000 H. Caudill - O.B. Diallo, *Learner's Guide to Pular (Fuuta Jallon)*, Guinea, Peace Corps, 2000.
- Chaudenson 1981 R. Chaudenson, *Textes créoles anciens. La Réunion et Ile Maurice: comparaison et essai d'analyse*, Hamburg, Buske, 1981.
- Chaudenson 2003 R. Chaudenson, *La créolisation. Théorie, applications, implications*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2003.
- Chierchia 1995 G. Chierchia, "Individual-level Predicates as Inherent Generics", in G.N. Carlson - F.J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*, Chicago - London, The Chicago University Press, 1995, 176-224.
- Chierchia 1998 G. Chierchia, "Plurality of Mass Nouns and the Notion of Semantic Parameter", in S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishing, 1998, 53-103.
- Christophersen 1939 P. Christophersen, *The Articles: A Study of Their Theory and Use in English*, København, Munksgaard, 1939.
- Chung - Timberlake 1985 S. Chung - A. Timberlake, "Tense, Aspect and Mood", in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, III, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, 202-258.
- Cinque 1999 G. Cinque, *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Clark 1975 H. Clark, "Bridging", in R.C. Schank Nash - B.L. Webber (eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing*, New York, Association for Computing Machinery, 1975, 9-27.
- Comrie 1986 B. Comrie, "On Conditionals", in E.C. Traugott - A. Ter Meulen - J. Snitzer Reilly - C.A. Ferguson (eds.), *Conditionals: A Typology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, 77-100.

- Corbett 2000 G. Corbett, *Number*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Corblin 2011 F. Corblin, “Des définis para-intensionnels. Être à l’hôpital, aller à l’école”, *Revue Langue Française* 171 (2011), 55-75.
- Corne 1977 C. Corne, *Seychelles Creole Grammar: Elements for Indian Ocean Proto-Creole Reconstruction*, Tübingen, TBL Verlag Gunter Narr, 1977.
- Corne 1981 C. Corne, “A Re-evaluation of the Predicate in Ile-de-France Creole”, in P. Muysken (ed.), *Generative Studies on Creole Languages*, Dordrecht, Foris Publications, 1981, 103-124.
- Cresswell 1978 M.J. Cresswell, “Adverbs of Space and Time”, in F. Guenther - J. Schmidt (eds.), *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Languages*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1987, 171-199.
- Cristofaro 2012 S. Cristofaro, “Descriptive Notions vs. Grammatical Categories: Unrealized States of Affairs and ‘irrealis’”, *Language Sciences* 34 (2012), 131-146.
- Crosby *et al.* 2001 P. Crosby - D. Frank - E. Leon - P. Samuel, *Kwéyòl Dictionary*, Castries (Saint Lucia), SIL International, 2001.
- Dahl 1975 Ó. Dahl, “On Generics”, in E. Keenan (ed.), *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975, 99-111.
- Dal 1997 G. Dal, *Grammaire du suffixe -et*, Paris, Didier Érudition, 1997.
- Damoiseau 1996 R. Damoiseau, “Les adjectivaux en créole haïtien”, dans R. Véronique (éd.), *Matériaux pour l’étude des classes grammaticales dans les langues créoles*, Aix-En-Provence, Publications de l’Université de Provence, 1996, 151-161.
- Damoiseau 1999 R. Damoiseau, *Éléments de grammaire comparée français-créole*, Petit-Bourg (Guadeloupe), Ibis Rouge Éditions, 1999.
- Damonte 2002 F. Damonte, “The Complementizer Layer in Saramaccan”, in M. Leonetti - O. Fernández Soriano - V. Escandell-Vidal (eds.), *Current Issues in Generative Grammar: 10th Colloquium on Generative Grammar* (Alcalà de Henares, Universidad de Alcalà, April 12-14, 2002), 31-50.

- Danny - Creider 1976 P.J. Danny - C.A. Creider, "The Semantics of Noun Classes in Proto-Bantu", *Studies in African Linguistics* 7 (1976), 1-30.
- Dayal 2004 V. Dayal, "Number Marking and (In)definiteness in Kind Terms", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27 (2004), 393-450.
- Declerck 1979 R. Declerck, "Aspect and the Bounded/Unbounded (Telic/Atelic) Distinction", *Linguistics* 17 (1979), 761-794.
- DeGraff 1992 M. DeGraff, *Creole Grammar and the Acquisition of Syntax: The Case of Haitian*, Pennsylvania State University, 1992 (Diss.).
- De Haan 2012 F. De Haan, "Irrealis: Fact or Fiction?", *Language Sciences* 34 (2012), 107-130.
- de Saint-Jorre - Lionnet 1999 D. de Saint-Jorre - G. Lionnet, *Diksyonner kreol-franse. Dictionnaire créole seychellois-français*, Bamberg - Mahé, Helmut Buske, 1999.
- Dik 1997 S.C. Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar*, I-II, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter, 1997.
- Dik - Hengeveld 1991 S.C. Dik - K. Hengeveld, "The Hierarchical Structure of the Clause and the Typology of Perception-Verb Complements", *Linguistics* 29 (1991), 231-259.
- Dionne 2007 C. Dionne, *La complémentation en créole martiniquaise*, Université du Québec, 2007 (MA Diss.).
- Dixon 1982 R.M.W. Dixon, *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? And Other Essays in Semantics and Syntax*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter, 1982.
- Dixon 2006 R.M.W. Dixon, "Complement Clauses and Complementmentation Strategies in Typological Perspective", in R.M.W. Dixon - A. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Complementation: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, 1-46.
- Dobrovie-Sorin - Pires de Oliveira 2007 C. Dobrovie-Sorin - R. Pires de Oliveira, "Bare Singulars in Brazilian Portuguese Are Names of Kinds", in A. Gronn (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 12, Oslo, ILOS, 2007, 107-121.
- Dowty 1979 D.R. Dowty, *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*, Dordrecht - Boston - London, Kluwer Academic Publishing, 1979.

- Dressler -
Merlini Barbaresi 1994 W.U. Dressler - L. Merlini Barbaresi, *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German, and Other Languages*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter, 1994.
- Ehrhart 1992 S. Ehrhart, "The Development of the Preverbal Markers in St-Louis-Creole: The Formation of a TAM System?", *Language Sciences* 14 (1992), 233-247.
- Elliott 2000 J.R. Elliott, "Realis and irrealis: Forms and Concepts of the Grammaticalization of Reality", *Linguistic Typology* 4 (2000), 55-90.
- Englebretson -
Wa-Ngatho 2015 R. Englebretson - W.M. Wa-Ngatho (eds.), *A Basic Sketch Grammar of Giküyü: A Special Issue of Rice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4 (2015), <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~reng/kik/sketch.pdf>.
- Ernst 2004 T. Ernst, *The Syntax of Adjuncts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Espinal - McNally 2007 M.T. Espinal - L. McNally, "Bare Singular Nominals and Incorporating Verbs", in G. Kaiser - M. Leonetti (eds.), *Definiteness, Specificity and Animacy in Ibero-Romance Languages. Proceedings of the III NEREUS International Workshop* 124, Konstanz, Konstanzer Online-Publikations-System, 2007, 45-62.
- Espinal - McNally 2011 M.T. Espinal - L. McNally, "Semantic Diversity in Event-related Nominals: Evidence from Spanish and Catalan Object Bare Nominal Constructions", in N. Pomino - E. Stark (eds.), *Mismatches in Romance. Proceedings of the V NEREUS International Workshop* 125, Konstanz, Konstanzer Online-Publikations-System, 2011, 1-12.
- Eszes 2009 B. Eszes, "Aspect and Adverb Interpretation: The Case of Quickly", in K. Kiss (ed.), *Adverbs and Adverbial Adjuncts at the Interface*, Belin - New York, Mouton De Gruyter, 2009, 269-294.
- Farkas 2002 D. Farkas, "Specificity Distinctions", *Journal of Semantics* 19 (2002), 213-243.
- Farkas - de Swart 2004 D. Farkas - H. de Swart, "Incorporation, Plurality and the Incorporation of Plurals: A Dynamic Approach", *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 3 (2004), 45-73.
- Farkas - de Swart 2007 D. Farkas - H. de Swart, "Article Choice in Plural Generics", *Lingua* 117 (2007), 1657-1676.

- Fattier 2002 D. Fattier, "Lexique. Approche synchronique à propos de l'haïtien", dans C. Bavoux - D. de Robillard (éds.), *Linguistique et créolistique. Univers creoles*, Paris, Éditions Economica-Anthropos, 2002, 111-128.
- Fine 2002 K. Fine, *The Limits of Abstraction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Fooley - Van Valin 1984 W.A. Fooley - R.D. Van Valin, *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.
- Fradin - Montermini 2009 B. Fradin - F. Montermini, "La morphologie évaluative", dans B. Fradin - F. Kerleroux - M. Plénat (éds.), *Aperçus de morphologie du français*, Vincennes, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2009, 231-266.
- Frege 1892 G. Frege, "Über Sinn und Bedeutung", *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* 100, 1 (1892), 25-50.
- Furukawa 2010 N. Furukawa, "Article défini, son emploi 'intensionnel' et énoncé tautologique", *Bulletin d'études françaises* 41 (2010), 51-71.
- Garcia-Carpintero - Marti 2014 M. Garcia-Carpintero - G. Marti, *Empty Representations: Reference and Non-existence*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Gillieaux 2018 C. Gillieaux, *Dictionary and Guide to Seychelles Creole, Kreol Seselwa*, Victoria (Seychelles), Pangea Portraits Ltd, 2018.
- Givón 1984 T. Givón, *Syntax: A Functional-typological Introduction*, I-II, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1984 (1990).
- Givón 2001 T. Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction*, I-II, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2001 (1981).
- Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2012 H. Glaude - A. Zribi-Hertz, "Verb Focus in Haitian: From Lexical Reiteration to Predicate Cleft", in E. Aboh - N. Smith - A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *The Morphosyntax of Reiteration in Creole and Non-Creole Languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2012, 77-134.
- Glaude - Zribi-Hertz 2014 H. Glaude - A. Zribi-Hertz, "Verb Cognates in Haitian", *The Linguistic Review* 31 (2014), 241-294.
- Goddard - Wierzbicka 2002 C. Goddard - A. Wierzbicka, *Meaning and Universal Grammar: Theory and Empirical Findings*, I-II, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2002.

- Gomeshi *et al.* 2004 J. Ghomeshi - R. Jackendoff - N. Rosen - K. Russell, “Contrastive Focus Reduplication in English (The Salad-Salad Paper)”, in J.A. Legate (ed.), *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22, 1 (2004), 307-357.
- Grandi 2002 N. Grandi, *Morfologie in contatto. Le costruzioni valutative nelle lingue del Mediterraneo*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2002.
- Grandi - Körtvélyessy 2015 N. Grandi - L. Körtvélyessy, *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2015.
- Grant 1995 A.P. Grant, “Article Agglutination in Creole French: A Wider Perspective”, in P. Baker (ed.), *From Contact to Creole and Beyond*, London, University of Westminster Press, 1995, 149-176.
- Guéron 1983 J. Guéron, “L’emploi possessif de l’article défini en français”, *Langue Française* 58 (1983), 23-35.
- Guillemin 2011 D. Guillemin, *The Syntax and the Semantics of a Determiner System: A Case Study of Mauritian Creole*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2011.
- Güldemann 2008 T. Güldemann, *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 34), 2008.
- Hale 1987 B. Hale, *Abstract Objects*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Harbour 2011 D. Harbour, “Descriptive and Explanatory Markedness”, *Morphology* 21 (2011), 223-240.
- Haspelmath 1997 M. Haspelmath, *Indefinite Pronouns*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Hawkins 1978 J. Hawkins, *Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A Study of Reference and Grammaticality Prediction*, London, Croom Helm, 1978.
- Hay - Kennedy - Levin 1999 J. Hay - C. Kennedy - B. Levin, “Scalar Structure Underlies Telicity in ‘Degree Achievements’”, in T. Matthews - D. Strolovitch (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 9*, Ithaca (NY), CLC Publications, 1999, 127-144.
- Hazaël-Massieux 1978 G. Hazaël-Massieux, “Mots et partie du discours en créole (Guadeloupe)”, *Cahiers de Linguistique, d’Orientalisme et de Salvistique* 11 (1978), 257-295.

- Hazaël-Massieux 1983 G. Hazaël-Massieux, “*Les parties du discours en créole de la Guadeloupe*”, dans G. Hazaël-Massieux (éd.), *Les créoles. Problèmes de genèse et de description*, Aix-en Provence, Publications de l’Université de Provence, 1983, 269-281.
- Heine - Kuteva 2005 B. Heine - T. Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hengeveld 1992 K. Hengeveld, *Non-verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony*, Berlin - New York, Mouton De Gruyter, 1992.
- Hengeveld 2015 K. Hengeveld, “Complement Clauses”. In *Typological Tools for Field Linguistics*, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2015.
https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/tools-at-lingboard/questionnaire/complement-clauses_description.php
- Hengeveld - Mackenzie 2008 K. Hengeveld - J.L. Mackenzie, *Functional Discourse Grammar: A Typologically-based Theory of Language Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Higginbotham 1994 J. Higginbotham, “Mass and Count Quantifiers”, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 17 (1994), 447-480.
- Höche 2009 S. Höche, *Cognate Object Construction in English: A Cognitive-Linguistic Account*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 2009.
- Holm 1988 J. Holm, *Pidgins and Creoles*, I-II, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Iatridou 2000 S. Iatridou, “The Grammatical Ingredients of Countefactuality”, *Language Inquiry* 31 (2000), 231-270.
- Jackendoff 1991 R. Jackendoff, “Parts and Boundaries”, *Cognition* 41 (1991), 9-45.
- Jansen - Koopman - Muysken 1978 B. Jansen - H. Koopman - P. Muysken, “Serial Verbs in the Creole Languages”, *Amsterdam Creole Studies* 2 (1978), 125-159.
- Jennings - Pfänder 2015 W. Jennings - S. Pfänder, “French Guianese Creole: Its Emergence from Contact”, *Journal of Language Contact* 8 (2015), 36-69.
- Jones 1988 M.A. Jones, “Cognate Objects and Case-filter”, *Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1988), 89-110.

- Kennedy - Levin 2007 C. Kennedy - B. Levin, “Measure of Change: The Adjectival Core of Degree Achievements”, in L. McNally - C. Kennedy (eds.), *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, Semantics and Discourse*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, 156-182.
- Kennedy - McNally 2005 C. Kennedy - L. McNally, “Scale Structure, Degree Modification, and the Semantics of Gradable Predicates”, *Language* 81 (2005), 345-381.
- Kihm 1995 A. Kihm, “Tayo: The Strange Bird from New Caledonia. Determiners and Tense-aspect in Tayo and Their Implications for Creolization Theories”, *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 10 (1995), 225-252.
- Kiparsky - Kiparsky 1970 P. Kiparsky - C. Kiparsky, “Fact”, in M. Bierwisch - K.E. Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in Linguistics*, The Hague, Mouton De Gruyter, 1970, 143-173.
- Kleiber 1990 G. Kleiber, *Sémantique du prototype. Catégorie et sens lexical*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1990.
- Kleiber 1994 G. Kleiber, *Nominales. Essais de sémantique référentielle*, Paris, Colin, 1994.
- Kleiber 2001 G. Kleiber, “Indéfinis. Lecture existentielle et lecture partitive”, dans G. Kleiber - B. Laca - L. Tasmowski (éds.), *Typologie des groupes nominaux*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2001, 47-98.
- Koev 2017 T. Koev, “Adverbs of Change, Aspect, and Underspecification”, in D. Burgdorf - J. Collard - S. Maspong - B. Stefánsdóttir (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 27*, Ithaca (NY), CLC Publications, 2017, 22-42.
- Koopman - Lefebvre 1982 H. Koopman - C. Lefebvre, “*Pu* marqueur de mode, préposition et complémenteur”, dans C. Lefebvre - H. Magloire-Holly - N. Piou (éds.), *Syntaxe de l’Haïtien*, Ann Arbor, Karoma, 1982, 64-91.
- Kouwenberg - LaCharité 2005 S. Kouwenberg - D. LaCharité, “Less Is More: Evidence from Diminutive Reduplication in Caribbean Creole Languages”, in B. Hurch (ed.), *Studies on Reduplication*, Berlin - New York, Mouton De Gruyter, 2005, 533-545.
- Kratzer 1995 A. Kratzer, “Stage-level and Individual-level Predicates”, in G.N. Carlson - F.J. Pelletier, *The Generic Book*, Chicago - London, The Chicago University Press, 1995, 125-175.

- Krifka *et al.* 1995 M. Krifka - F.J. Pelletier - G.N. Carlson - A. Ten Meulen - G. Chierchia - G. Link, "Genericity: An Introduction", in G.N. Carlson - F.J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*, Chicago - London, The Chicago University Press, 1995, 1-124.
- Krifka 2004 M. Krifka, "Bare NPs: Kind-referring, Indefinites, Both or Neither?", in R.B. Young - Y. Zhou (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 13*, Ithaca (NY), CLC Publications, 2004, 180-203.
- Ladhams 2012 J. Ladhams, "Article Agglutination and the African Contribution to the Portuguese-based Creoles", in A. Bartens - P. Baker (eds.), *Black through White*, London, Battlebridge Publications, 2012, 31-50.
- Lam 2019 C.D. Lam, *Determiner-noun Fusion in Haitian Creole: A Statistical Learning Approach*, Paper presented at *The Annual Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics Summer Meeting* (Universidade de Lisboa, June 17-19, 2019).
- Langacker 1986 R. Langacker, "Nouns and Verbs", *Language* 6 (1986), 53-69.
- Langacker 1991 R. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, I-II, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Langacker 2008 R. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Lefebvre 1986 C. Lefebvre, "Relexification in Creole Genesis Revisited: The Case of Haitian Creole", in P. Muysken - N. Smith (eds.), *Substrata versus Universals in Creole Genesis. Papers from the Amsterdam Creole Workshop* (April 1985), Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1986, 279-300.
- Lefebvre 1998 C. Lefebvre, *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar: The Case of Haitian*, Cambridge - New York, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Lefebvre - Loranger 2006 C. Lefebvre - V. Loranger, "On the Properties of Saramaccan *fu*: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective", *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 21 (2006), 275-336.
- Lefebvre - Ritter 1993 C. Lefebvre - E. Ritter, "Two Types of Predicate Doubling Adverbs in Haitian Creole", in F. Byrne - D. Winford (eds.), *Focus and Grammatical Relations in Creole Languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1993, 55-91.

- Li 2015 J. Li, “Nouns and Noun Phrases”, in R. Englebretson - W.M. Wa-Ngatho (eds.), *A Basic Sketch Grammar of Gikūyū* (Rice Working Papers in *Linguistics* 4, Special Issue), 2015, <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~reng/kik/sketch.pdf>.
- Löbner 1985 S. Löbner, “Definites”, *Journal of Semantics* 4 (1985), 279-326.
- Löbner 2002 S. Löbner, *Understanding Semantics*, London, Arnold Publishers, 2002.
- Löbner 2011 S. Löbner, “Concept Types and Determination”, *Journal of Semantics* 28 (2011), 279-333.
- Longobardi 1994 G. Longobardi, “Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-movement in Syntax and Logical Form”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 25 (1994), 609-665.
- Ludwig 1996 R. Ludwig, “L’adjectif en créole guadeloupéen. Une approche prototypique”, dans D. Véronique (éd.), *Matériaux pour l’étude des classes grammaticales dans les langues créoles*, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 1996, 137-149.
- Lyons 1977 J. Lyons, *Semantics*, I-II-III, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Manfredi 1993 V. Manfredi, “Verb Focus and the Typology of Kwa/Kru and Haitian”, in F. Byrne - D. Winford (eds.), *Focus and Grammatical Relations in Creole Languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1993, 3-51.
- Manfredi - Petrollino 2013 S. Manfredi - S. Petrollino, “Juba Arabic Structure Dataset”, in S. Michaelis - P. Maurer - M. Haspelmath - M. Huber, *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, 54-66.
- Mari - Beyssade - Del Prete 2013 A. Mari - C. Beyssade - F. Del Prete (eds.), *Genericity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Mauri - Sansò 2012 C. Mauri - A. Sansò, “What Do Languages Encode when They Encode Reality Status?”, *Language Sciences* 34 (2012), 99-106.
- McKay 2006 T. McKay, *Plural Predication*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
- McWorther - Parkvall 2002 J. McWhorter - M. Parkvall, “Pas tout à fait du français. Une étude créole”, *Études créoles* 25 (2002), 179-231.

- Meierborn 2004 C. Meienborn, “A Pragmatic Explanation of the Stage/ Individual Level Contrast in Combination with Locatives”, in B. Agbayani - V. Samiian - B. Tucker (eds.), *Proceeding of the Western Conference on Linguistics* 15, California State University, Fresno, 2004, 158-170.
- Mel’čuk 1994 I. Mel’čuk, *Cours de morphologie générale*, Montréal, Presses de l’Université de Montréal - CNRS Éditions, 1994.
- Michaelis 2016 S. Michaelis, *Complex Sentences in Pidgin and Creole Languages*, Conference talk in *Labex* (Paris, 2016).
- Michaelis et al. 2013 S. Michaelis - P. Maurer - M. Haspelmath - M. Huber, *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- S. Michaelis - P. Maurer - M. Haspelmath - M. Huber (eds.), *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online (APiCs Online)*, Leipzig, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2013, <http://apics-online.info/language/35>.
- Michaelis - Rosalie - Muhme 2009 S. Michaelis - M. Rosalie - K. Muhme, “Loanwords in Seychelles Creole”, in M. Haspelmath - U. Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World’s Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter, 2009, 215-229.
- Milsark 1974 G. Milsark, *Existential Sentences in English*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 1974 (Diss.).
- Mithun 1999 M. Mithun, *The Languages of Native North America*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Moltmann 1997 F. Moltmann, *Parts and Wholes in Semantics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Moltmann 2013a F. Moltmann, *Abstract Objects and the Semantics of Natural Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Moltmann 2013b F. Moltmann, “On the Distinction between Abstract States, Concrete States and Tropes”, in A. Mari - C. Beyssade - F. Del Prete (eds.), *Genericity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, 293-311.
- Moltmann 2016 F. Moltmann, “Plural Reference and Reference to Plurality: Linguistic Facts and Semantics Analysis”, in M. Carrara - A. Arapinis - F. Moltmann (eds.), *Unity and Plurality: Logic, Philosophy and Linguistics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, 93-120.

- Mueller-Reichau 2006 O. Mueller-Reichau, *Sorting the World: On the Relevance of the Kind-level/Object-level Distinction to Referential Semantics*, Universität Leipzig, 2006 (Diss.)
- Mufwene 1987 S. Mufwene, “An Issue on Predicate-clefting: Evidence from Atlantic Creoles and African Languages”, in P. Mauer - T. Stolz (eds.), *Varia Creolica*, Bochum, Brockmeyer, 1987, 71-89.
- Mufwene 2013 S. Mufwene, “Kikongo-Kituba Structure Dataset”, in S. Michaelis - P. Maurer - M. Haspelmath - M. Huber (eds.), *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online*, Leipzig, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2013, <http://apics-online.info/language/35>.
- Mufwene - Dijkhoff 1989 S. Mufwene - M. Dijkhoff, “On the So Called ‘Infinitive’ in Atlantic Creoles”, *Lingua* 77 (1989), 319-352.
- Musan 1997 R. Musan, *On the Temporal Interpretation of Noun Phrases*, New York - London, Garland, 1997.
- Ndayiragije 1997 J. Ndayiragije, “La source du déterminant agglutiné en créole haïtien”, *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 34 (1989), 313-317.
- Nicolas 2008 D. Nicolas, “Mass Nouns and Plural Logic”, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31 (2008), 211-244.
- Noonan 1985 M. Noonan, “Complementation”, in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, II, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, 42-141.
- Ojeda 1991 A. Ojeda, “Definite Descriptions and Definite Generics”, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14 (1991), 367-397.
- Ojeda 1993 A. Ojeda, *Linguistic Individuals*, Stanford, Center for the Study of Language and Information - CSLI Publications (Lecture Notes 31), 1993.
- Palmer 2001 F.R. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Parkvall 2000 M. Parkvall, *Out of Africa: African Influences in Atlantic Creoles*, London, Battle Bridge Publications, 2000.
- Pelletier 1979 F. Pelletier, “Non-singular Reference: Some Preliminaries”, in F. Pelletier (ed.), *Mass Terms: Some Philosophical Problems*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1979 (1975), 1-14.
- Pfänder 1996 S. Pfänder, “Il n’y a pas d’Histoire... L’expression du temps passé en créole guyanais”, *Études Créoles* 19 (1996), 31-46.

- Pfänder 2000 S. Pfänder, "Le créole guyanais. Témoin d'une phase plus ancienne de la créolisation?", *Études Créoles* 23 (2000), 101-116.
- Pfänder 2013 S. Pfänder, "Guyanais", in S. Michaelis - M. Haspelmath - M. Huber - P. Maurer (eds.), *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Languages (APiCS)*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, 220-228.
- Pinalie - Bernabé 1999 P. Pinalie - J. Bernabé, *Grammaire du créole martiniquais en 50 leçons*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1999.
- Plag 1993 I. Plag, *Sentential Complements in Sranan: On the Formation of an English-based Creole Language*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1993.
- Plag 1995 I. Plag, "The Emergence of *taki* as a Complementizer in Sranan: On Substrate Influence, Universals and Gradual Creolization", in J. Arends (ed.), *The Early Stages of Creolization*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1995, 113-148.
- Poesio 1994 M. Poesio, "Weak Definites", in M. Harvey - L. Santelmann (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 4*, Ithaca (NY), CLC Publications, 1994, 282-299.
- Pustejovsky 1995 J. Pustejovsky, *The Generative Lexicon*, Cambridge (MA), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Press, 1995.
- Quine 1960 W.V.O. Quine, *Word and Object*, Cambridge (MA), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Press, 1960.
- Quine 1961 W.V.O. Quine, *From a Logical Point of View*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press, 1961 (1953).
- Quirk *et al.* 1972 R. Quirk - S. Greenbaum - G. Leech - J. Svartvik, *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London, Longman, 1972.
- Rappaport Hovav 2014 M. Rappaport Hovav, "Building Scalar Changes", in A. Alexiadou - H. Borer - F. Schäfer, *The Syntax of Roots and the Roots of Syntax*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Rijkhoff 1991 J. Rijkhoff, "Nominal Aspect", *Journal of Semantics* 8 (1991), 291-309.
- Rijkhoff 2002 J. Rijkhoff, *The Noun Phrase*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.

- Rochette 1988 A. Rochette, *Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Romance Sentential Complementation*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 1988 (Diss.).
- Rosch 1978 E. Rosch, "Principles of Categorization", in E. Rosch - B.B. Lloyd (eds.), *Cognition and Categorization*, Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978, 27-48.
- Rosen 2001 G. Rosen, *Abstract Objects*, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Archive, 2017 (2001), <https://stanford.library.sydney.edu.au/archives/spr2017/entries/abstract-objects/>.
- Rubino 2013 C. Rubino, "Reduplication", in M. Dryer - M. Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Leipzig, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2013.
- Russell 1905 B. Russell, "On Denoting", *Mind* n.s. 14 (1905), 479-493.
- Scannell 2007 K. Scannell, *An Crúbadán: Corpus Building for Under-resourced Languages*, 2007, <http://crubadan.org/>.
- Schüle 2010 S. Schüle, *Perception Verb Complements in Akatek, a Mayan Language*, University of Tübingen, 2010 (Diss.).
- Searle 1969 J.R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Siegel 2000 J. Siegel, "Substrate Influence in Hawai'i Creole English", *Language in Society* 29 (2000), 197-236.
- Stassen 1997 L. Stassen, *Intransitive Predication*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Sterlin 1989 M.D. Sterlin, "Les caractéristiques de *pou*. Un modal en position de complémenteur", *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 18 (1989), 131-147.
- Strandquist 2003 R.E. Strandquist, *Article Incorporation in Mauritian Creole*, University of Victoria, 2003 (Diss.).
- Strawson 1950 P.F. Strawson, "On Referring", *Mind* n.s. 59 (1950), 320-344.
- Strawson 1959 P.F. Strawson, *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*, London, Routledge, 1959.
- Stump 1985 G. Stump, *The Semantic Variability of Absolute Constructions*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishing, 1985.

- Swartz 2014 J. Swartz, “Functional Frames in the Interpretation of Weak Nominals”, in A. Aguilar-Guevara - B. Le Bruyn - J. Zwartz (eds.), *Weak Referentiality*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2014, 265-285.
- Targète - Urciolo 1993 J. Targète - R.G. Urciolo, *Haitian Creole-English Dictionary*, Kensington (MD), Dunwoody Press, 1993.
- Taylor 1968 D.R. Taylor, “Le créole de la Dominique”, dans A. Martinet (éd.), *Le langage*, Paris, Gallimard, 1968, 1022-1049.
- Tourneaux - Barbotin 1990 H. Tourneaux - M. Barbotin, *Dictionnaire pratique du Créole de Guadeloupe (Marie-Galante)*, Paris, Karthala, 1990.
- Valdman 2010 A. Valdman, *A Dictionary of Louisiana French: As Spoken in Cajun, Creole and American Indian Communities*, Jackson, University Press of Mississippi, 2010.
- Veenstra 1996 T. Veenstra, *Serial Verbs in Saramaccan: Predication and Creole Genesis*, The Hague, Holland Academic Graphics, 1996.
- Vendler 1957 Z. Vendler, “Verbs and Times”, *The Philosophical Review* 2 (1957), 143-160.
- Vendler 1967 Z. Vendler, *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca (NY), CLC Publications, 1967.
- Vendler 1972 Z. Vendler, *Res Cogitans*, Ithaca (NY), CLC Publications, 1972.
- Vergnaud - Zubizarreta 1992 J. Vergnaud - M. Zubizarreta, “The Definite Determiner and the Inalienable Constructions in French and English”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 23 (1992), 595-652.
- Véronique 1983 D. Véronique, “Existe-t-il une classe adjectival en Mauricien?”, dans D. Véronique - S. Kriegel (éds.), *Les parties du discours*, Aix-En-Provence, Presses Universitaires de Provence (Travaux du CLAIX 1), 1983, 201-203.
- Véronique 2000 D. Véronique, “Note sur les ‘adjectifs’ dans quelques créoles français”, *Langages* 30 (2000), 61-69.
- Von Fintel 2006 K. Von Fintel, “Modality and Language”, in D.M. Borchert (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Detroit, MacMillan, 2006.
- Wetzel 2009 L. Wetzel, *Types and Tokens: On Abstract Objects*, Cambridge (MA), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Press, 2009.

- Wierzbicka 1988 A. Wierzbicka, *The Semantics of Grammar*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1988.
- Wierzbicka 1996 A. Wierzbicka, *Semantics: Primes and Universals*, Oxford - New York, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Winford 1985 D. Winford, "The Syntax of *fi* Complements in Caribbean English Creoles". *Language* 61 (1985), 588-624.
- Winford 2000 D. Winford, "Irrealis in Sranan: Mood and Modality in Radical Creole", *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 15 (2000), 63-125.
- Winford - Migge 2013 D. Winford - B. Migge, "Fact-type Complements in Gbe and Surinamese Creole", *Lingua* 129 (2013), 9-31.
- Zalta 1983 E. Zalta, *Abstract Objects: An Introduction to Axiomatic Metaphysics*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1983.
- Zamparelli 2000 R. Zamparelli, *Layers in the Determiner Phrase*, New York, Garland, 2000.
- Zamparelli 2002 R. Zamparelli, "Definite and Bare Kind-denoting Noun Phrases", in C. Beyssade *et al.* (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2002, 305-342.
- Zribi-Hertz - Glaude 2006 A. Zribi-Hertz - H. Glaude, "Bare NPs and Deficient DPs in Haitian and French: From Morphosyntax to Reference Construal", in M. Baptista - J. Gueron (eds.), *Noun Phrases in Creole Languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2006, 265-300.
- Zribi-Hertz - Jean-Louis 2014 A. Zribi-Hertz - L. Jean-Louis, "From Noun to Name: Definiteness Marking in Modern Martinikè", in P. Cabredo Hofherr - A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Studies on Noun Phrase Structure and Reference*, Leiden - Boston, Brill, 2014, 269-315.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincerest thanks go to my family, to whom this book is dedicated. I thank Cédric and Alexandra for their constant love, moral and psychological support of these last few years.

I am thankful to all the informants, especially to Maxime for his availability in discussing data with me.

Thank you to Raffaele Simone, Carlo Consani, Francesca Guazzelli and Carmela Perta for helping me begin and deliver this book, and to my dear friend and colleague Federica, without the encouragement of whom I would have not achieved many academic goals.

IL SEGNO E LE LETTERE

Collana del Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Culture moderne
dell'Università degli Studi 'G. d'Annunzio'

CLASSICI

R. Guitton • *Il Principe di Dio. Sulle tracce di Abramo*

L. Paesani • *L'opera drammaturgica (1970-2015). Con un saggio di Giorgio Patrizi*

SAGGI

J. Santano Moreno • *De morfología y sintaxis españolas. Dos estudios interpretativos*

S. Ciccolone • *Lo standard tedesco in Alto Adige. L'orientamento alla norma dei tedescofoni sudtirolesi*

B. Delli Castelli • *Acronimi e altre forme di abbreviazione nel DDR-Deutsch*

L. Paesani • *Porta Bertati Da Ponte: Don Giovanni*

F. D'Ascenzo • *I fratelli Goncourt e l'Italia*

Autotraduzione. Teoria ed esempi fra Italia e Spagna (e oltre) • A cura di M. Rubio Árcuez
e N. D'Antuono

Riscritture dell'Eden. Poesia, poetica e politica del giardino. Vol. VII • A cura di A. Mariani

C. Perta - S. Ciccolone - S. Canù • *Sopravvivenze linguistiche arbëreshe a Villa Badessa
Culture del Mediterraneo. Radici, contatti, dinamiche* • A cura di E. Fazzini

Ricerca drammaturgica, letterature e culture moderne • A cura di L. Paesani

Riscritture dell'Eden. Il ruolo del giardino nei discorsi dell'immaginario. Vol. VIII • A cura
di A. Mariani

Orizzonti mediterranei e oltre. Prospettive inglesi e angloamericane • A cura di L. Marchetti
e C. Martinez

M. Russo • *Iosif Brodskij. Saggi di letture intertestuali*

Contatto interlinguistico fra presente e passato • A cura di C. Consani

*Ricerche e prospettive di Teatro e Musica. Linguaggi artistici, società e nuove tecnologie. Quaderni
del Master in Teoria e Pratica di Teatro e Musica* • A cura di E. Fazzini e G. Grimaldi

Il paesaggio americano e le sue rappresentazioni nel discorso letterario • A cura di C. Martinez

D. Allocca • *BerlinoGrafie: letteratura nomade e spazi urbani. I percorsi di Emine Sevgi Özdamar
e Terézia Mora*

K. de Abreu Chulata • *Il traduttore. Mito e (de)costruzione di una identità*

La prose française et l'espace • Sous la direction de F. D'Ascenzo

Aspetti della variazione linguistica. Discorso, sistema, repertori • A cura di C. Consani

Incontri fra Russia e Italia. Lingua, letteratura, cultura • A cura di G. Moracci

L'amicizia nel Medioevo germanico. Studi in onore di Elisabetta Fazzini • A cura di E. Cianci

P. Petricca • *Semantica. Forme, modelli e problemi*

L. Tramutoli • *'Abstract Objects' in Creole Languages. A Study on Guadeloupean Creole and Other
French-based Creoles*

Il catalogo aggiornato di LED - Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto è consultabile all'indirizzo web <https://www.lededizioni.com>, dove si possono trovare anche informazioni dettagliate sui volumi sopra citati: di tutti si può consultare il sommario, di alcuni vengono proposte diverse pagine in lettura, di altri è disponibile il testo integrale. Tutti i volumi possono essere ordinati online.