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A la recherche du “superstrat”

What North American French can and cannot tell us about the input to creolization*1

Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh
University of Regensburg

Within the field of French creolistics it is above all Robert Chaudenson who, in various publications, has emphasized that a better knowledge of the “marginal Frenches” in North America may help to answer certain questions concerning the European input into creolization. On the basis of data collected for a research project on the varieties of Acadian French I will try to show that a closer investigation of Acadian French does indeed shed light on the language spoken by the settlers, one major component of the “feature pool” (Muflene) accessible to the slaves, and thus provides the source of numerous specific creole forms and structures.

Apart from being a linguistic “window to the past”, the varieties of North American French enable us to discern areas within French grammar that are particularly prone to intrasytemic changes. The question, however, remains as to what extent the phenomena observed in Acadian French can be usefully applied in explaining the creolization process, especially since some of the developments that are particularly interesting from a creolist’s point of view are rather recent. On the basis of some examples, I will show that the heuristic value of a close examination of marginal Frenches lies above all in retracing the source of specific phenomena.

*1 I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of this article, and to Susanne Michaelis for their helpful suggestions on the analysis and presentation of this article.

1. The word superstrate is put in quotation marks for good reasons. Both terms substrate and superstrate were originally used within Romance linguistics to denote the languages in contact with Latin, substrates being those languages first spoken and finally given up by the people conquered by the Romans and superstrates being the languages first spoken by the Germanic invaders and then also gradually given up in favour of Latin (von Wartburg 1950). However, since both terms are frequently used in creole studies – they were also part of the conference title –, the term superstrate in the sense of ‘the varieties of French the slaves were exposed to in the colonies’ has been kept, although this does not mean the same as it does in diachronic Romance linguistics.
1. Introduction

It is a well established fact in French diachronic linguistics that research on the varieties of North American French (NAF) may provide information about the spoken French of the 17th and 18th centuries (Mougeon & Beniak 1994). As to the relevance of the NAF varieties for creole studies, it is the French creolist Robert Chaudenson who has repeatedly emphasized the interest that the overseas varieties of French have for this discipline. The French varieties of North America – in particular the “marginal” varieties like Louisiana Cajun French, Missouri French and the patois of St. Barthélemy – constitute the state of French that is closest to the terminus a quo of creolization, which “actually lay in varieties of non-standard French from the north and west of France” (Chaudenson 2001: 146) and can thus be considered an open window to the French spoken by the settlers at the time of colonization – i.e., the European “input” into French creoles. To gain an impression of the linguistic competence of the French colonists, about which our knowledge is limited, the analysis of NAF varieties provides a good research tool.

On the basis of data from Acadian French I will try to show that a closer look at NAF can indeed be helpful in understanding the French input, but that its importance should not be overestimated.

2. The role of North American French in the study of creolization

Why do NAF varieties constitute a critical reference point in the study of creolization?

3. For the crucial issues of the terminus a quo of creolization, cf. also Chaudenson (2001: 151–152, 163–164; 2003: 145f). It was Chaudenson who coined the term ‘français marginal’, which will be kept here, although ‘français périphérique’ might be another option.

i. These varieties, which go back to popular and dialectal French of the 17th and 18th centuries, provide some clues as to what Robert Chaudenson calls the “construction material” of the French creoles (2003: 177), or, in Mufvene’s words, the European part of the “feature pool” that slaves were exposed to in a multilingual society (2005: 71). Since the NAF varieties have always been essentially oral and were never exposed to normative pressure, they still show considerable variability and thus – according to Chaudenson – allow several hypotheses concerning both the highly variable European linguistic input into French creoles, as well as those areas of French grammar that are particularly susceptible to linguistic variability.

ii. Again according to the French scholar, these varieties also help us to better understand what he calls “self-regulating processes” (processus autorégulateurs, Chaudenson 2003: 183), i.e., a bundle of internal language change processes that were going on primarily in the French spoken by the colonists during the early stages of the homestead phase, i.e., before creolization proper.

Leaving aside for the moment the epistemological reservations that may arise from the term “self-regulating processes”, it becomes apparent that this scenario incorporates two processes that should initially be kept apart:

- universal processes of internal language change such as reanalysis, grammaticalization, or analogy, which produce certain language-specific internal changes;
- contact-induced changes such as dialect levelling and koinization.

With regard to the first set of changes, it is tempting to assume that NAF varieties have undergone certain processes of language development, which may

4. Chaudenson’s definition of the term is wide: “The bulk of the linguistic material, word order, and semantic values, is common to all regional and/or older folk French varieties, marginal French varieties, and creoles” (2001: 180).
7. Cf. Chaudenson (2003: 158) and also Chaudenson & Mougeon & Beniak (1993: 16), who speak of ‘restructurations à caractère assumé optimisation’ and refer to Frei’s universal “needs” for brevity, expressiveness and invariability (Frei 1929).
also have operated similarly within the language of the colonists during the initial phase of colonization. It should, however, be kept in mind that these varieties have been in contact with English for a long time, and that Cajun French especially has been exposed to a language attrition process. Both factors certainly had effects on the specific evolution of these varieties.

As far as the main external cause of language change, language contact, is concerned, it is very likely that dialect levelling took place in early colonial times that led to a reduction in differences between the different French dialects and hence a gradual homogenization of the vernacular speech in the colonies. It cannot be assumed with any certainty, however, that within the colonies a stabilized contact variety developed, let alone a koiné characterized by a certain degree of uniformity (Kerswill 2002). For that, the demographic conditions on the individual islands were much too diverse.

iii. It is important to separate from those restructuring processes that French underwent during the homestead phase a second set of "self-regulating" processes which took place after the emergence of the creole languages and which were responsible for making French creoles new, autonomous systems with respect to their base language, "an autonomy that American French varieties do not have" (Chaudenson 2001: 148).

According to Chaudenson, creolization is thus essentially the result of the complex interplay of three sets of overlapping processes:

1. The "radicalization" and "transmission" of restructuring processes for which 'marginal' French varieties offered variants and provided the direction. These varieties are, in some ways, the missing links in the reconstruction of an evolution that goes from French to creoles, affecting some aspects of the system but not the whole system.\(^{10}\)

2. The emergence (outside of français zéro\(^{11}\)) of structures not attested in French varieties spoken in communities where French is transmitted as a native language. These new structures are due to readjustments tied to language learning and linguistic contact [...].

3. Internal evolution linked to the system's own dynamics [...] (2001: 171).

It is generally accepted that creolization occurs through a complex interplay of universal processes of language change, contact-induced changes as well as strategies of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), which took place at different points in time. More controversial, however, is the question of to what extent these "self-regulating processes" within the French input could have actually been "transmitted" into the new languages and to what extent they could "radicalize". Can there actually be "the continuation of forms and processes" (my italics), which were, and occasionally still are, present in certain French varieties" (Chaudenson 2001: 182)?\(^{12}\) I shall return to this problem at the end of my article.

At this point, I would simply like to claim that NAF varieties do provide data on non-standard French that were previously unknown. A better knowledge of these varieties may help to evaluate the degree of material and functional continuity in the French creoles with respect to their European base language (Dettges 2002), and they may also help to identify those creole phenomena for which vernacular French does not provide an explanation.\(^{13}\) If it should turn out (and it will in fact) that certain varieties of French have "creole-like" restructurings in their morphosyntax that are not necessarily due to recent language erosion, the debate on the role of the "superstrates" within creolization will have to take that into account.

8. With respect to our Acadian data, it is interesting to note that most of the specific Acadian features are not attested in the French creoles (je-collectif, the demonstrative pronoun c'i, the interrogative pronoun quoi). This is not really surprising since the settlers leaving for Nova Scotia at the beginning of the 17th century came from a rather restricted area in western France (cf. Massigson 1962), while the colonists leaving for the colonies in the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean came from all over northern and western France.

9. The questions which naturally arise here are that of distinguishing between regional dialect levelling and koinéization on the one hand, and on the other, that of the interrelatedness of language-internal and/or universally induced change and change resulting from substrate influence, this latter being far more complex methodologically (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2005: 243).

10. "It is evidently in this area that the slaves' languages can be claimed to have influenced their appropriations of the target language" (Chaudenson 2001: 183).

11. The term français zéro (FZ) is a variation model that refers to variability within French. According to Chaudenson, it is the "set of variables, which depending on place and time, will be recognized as variants [...] Of course, for a given variety of French, not all the variables will necessarily be involved. [...] Creolization begins when variability extends to parts of the system located outside" (2001: 170).

12. According to this theory, the tendency toward invariability, the tendency to prefer salient or expressive forms are "possibilités d'évolution du français qui s’est pleinement réalisé en créole parce qu’elles n’ont jamais rencontré aucun obstacle en chemin" (Fattier 2000: 117).

13. Or as DeGraff (2005: 300) puts it with respect to Haitian Creole: "Notwithstanding pervasive etymological and structural continuities between Haitian Creole and French, there exist striking and robust morphosyntactic differences between the two languages".
3. Sociohistorical background on North American French

This article is based on data collected within a research project whose aim is a comparative grammar of the varieties of Acadian French still spoken in Canada in the Maritime Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince-Edward-Island and on the Peninsula of Port-au-Port on Newfoundland as well as in Louisiana. Like other varieties of North American French – as for example the French spoken in the New England States and Missouri and like the French of St. Barthélemy – these varieties have developed ever since the 17th century without any normative pressure in relatively isolated and very distant regions. Being perfect representatives of what Chaudenson calls "marginal Frenches", their description promises interesting insights into the French spoken at the time of colonization and – at least tentatively – the "feature pool".

The Acadian diaspora has its origin in the "Great Migration" (Grand Dérangement, 1755–1762), one of the first instances of ethnic cleansing in modern times. In the course of the colonial wars between France and England, the Acadians, whose ancestors came from the Poitou region in Western France and had settled in Nova Scotia ever since 1604, were expelled by the British for political and religious reasons. This happened more than fifty years after this part of La Nouvelle France had become part of the British colonies in the Treaty of Utrecht 1713. While only some of the Acadians sought refuge in the woods of today's New Brunswick and in Quebec, most of the refugees fled to the New England States. Others sought refuge in Newfoundland, on the West Indies or in France. After an odyssey of several years' duration, about 3,000–4,000 Acadians found a new home in Louisiana, where they have been living as "Cajuns" since 1765. Those Acadians who returned to their homelands from New England and Quebec after 1764 are the ethnic basis of today's Franco-Canadians in the Maritime Provinces.

The contemporary situation of the Acadians may be described thus: In the Maritime Provinces of Canada, most francophones live in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince-Edward-Island in a non-compact settlement structure. While the Acadian population has special cultural and linguistic rights in New Brunswick the situation of the Acadians in Nova Scotia is less favorable. In this province, French is still spoken in four non-connected regions (Baie Ste. Marie, Pubnico, Île Madame and Chéticamp), but here the vitality of French is much weaker than it is in New Brunswick. The situation of the Acadians in Newfoundland is precarious (King & Butler 2005).

The situation in Louisiana has always been even more complex. From the very beginning the Acadian refugees were in close contact with other francophone groups who spoke different varieties of 18th century French, one of the consequences being dialect levelling. In those parishes especially where Acadians and non-Acadians lived in close proximity to one another, language contact caused the early loss of characteristic Acadian features, for example, the so-called je-collectif (i.e., the use for the pronoun je instead of the 1pl pronoun nous). Other Acadian features, however, continue to coexist with "standard" forms in certain parishes even today. Contemporary Cajun French – some scholars try to avoid this term and prefer Louisiana French instead – thus appears as the variety of Acadian French that has been at least partly "decadecianized". In spite of the so-called Cajun Renaissance, Louisiana French is an endangered language today: with the exception of a few older speakers, all francophone Louisianians are bilingual (Dubois 2001). The loss of language is drastic, especially among the young; but even among speakers of other generations, the number of semi-speakers is high.

---

14. Financed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, this project is directed by Raphaëlle Wiesmath (Munich) and myself in collaboration with Patrice Brasseur (Avignon). We use the following abbreviations after the examples: NB = Nouveau Brunswick (New Brunswick), NE = Nouvelle Écosse (Nova Scotia), IPE = Île du Prince Édouard (Prince Edward Island), TN = Terre Neuve (Newfoundland), LOU = Louisiana. Several corpora collected by ourselves or made available to us by other researchers constitute the data base. For New Brunswick we have had access to the corpus of R. Wiesmath, for Newfoundland to the corpus of P. Brasseur (cf. also Brasseur 2001). As far as Louisiana is concerned, we have worked with the data of Stäbler (1995a), Guibean (1950), Smith (1994) and Rottet (1995, 2001) as well as with the corpus of A. Valdman and his research group (L(louisian)F(french)L(language)D(atabase)). In addition, we have relied on already existing analyses of Acadian French.


16. New Brunswick is the only officially bilingual province in Canada since 1968. The percentage of monolingual French speakers is 2% in New Brunswick and 0.1% in Nova Scotia (Wiesmath 2006: 41).

17. A good example of the coexistence of the inanimate interrogatives qui and quoi, both meaning 'what'. While the latter is the truly Acadian form, inanimate qui was frequent in other varieties of 18th century French and seems to be the basis of the corresponding Louisiana Creole pronouns (Rottet 2004).

18. A semi-speaker is "someone whose competence in the minority language was flawed from the very outset, because of incomplete acquisition due to the interruption of language transmission; i.e., the semi-speaker has not learned his or her language by way of normal acquisition processes (...) but rather "by chance", by interacting more than usual with elderly members of the community" (Rottet 1995: 36–37). The linguistic consequences of language erosion in Louisiana have been described by Rottet (1995, 2001) and Dubois (2001, 2005).
In Louisiana as well as in the Maritime Provinces language attrition is closely connected to the English influence on Acadian French. Apart from code-switching and intensive lexical borrowing, interferences can also be observed on the structural level (Perrot 1995; King 2000). The methodological problem which presents itself here has already been indicated: An analysis of the varieties of North American French must distinguish carefully between the respective traditional varieties, which may indeed be something like an "open window" to the terminus a quo of creolization, and the contemporary varieties, such as the Cajun spoken by semi-speakers for example. Since some of the developments in the varieties of North American French that are particularly interesting from a creolist's point of view have only recently been observed, especially in moribund Louisiana Cajun, it would be unwise to draw any hasty conclusions with regard to the possible European input into creolization.

4. Three case studies

On the basis of our Acadian French data base (see n. 14), three examples will be analyzed in this section in order to illustrate the interest that the varieties of North American French can have for creole studies: the subject pronouns (§4.1), the object pronouns (§4.2), and the syntax of pour (§4.3).

4.1 The subject pronouns

Personal pronouns are of special interest for our purpose, since it can be shown not only that the different creole pronouns can easily be traced back to the regional French forms still alive in the NAF varieties, but also that the pronoun paradigms of NAF have undergone certain restructuring processes which have close parallels in the French creoles such as the generalization of tonic pronouns and the abandonment of the gender distinction.19

The inventory of pronominal forms is complex in Acadian French, especially as far as the plural is concerned. In the 3rd person plural, polymorphism is especially marked: while the atomic standard form ils (and its allomorphs) is rare in all three varieties, the forms eusse [es], ieusses [iøs], ieux [iø(z)], eux-autres and zeux [ze] all going back to French tonic forms, show a regional distribution (Neumann-Holzschuh et al. 2005).20


---

20. [es] has been attested in popular French since the 17th century (cf. Thurot vol. II 1881: 35). The pronoun eux [e] is rare in Acadian French. For a dialectological comment on ieux and ieaux, see Brasseur (2001).

21. As in the singular, ça, ç', ç can replace the other 3rd plural pronouns with animate and non-animate referents, especially in New Brunswick and in Louisiana.

22. Cf. Rottet (1995, 2001). Dubois (2001) shows convincingly that there is in fact an age-continuum as to the use of je (older generation) – moi je (middle generation) and mon (young people with reduced exposure to traditional Cajun).
Moi a deux 'lis enfants.
1SG.SBJ have.3SG. two. little.PL. child.PL.
'I have two little children.' (LOU - Dubois 2001: 150)

Mon a déjà acheté zen.
1SG.SBJ AUX.3SG. already buy.FF ADV.
'I have already bought of them.' (LOU - Rottet 2001: 194)

Toi peux donner du gombo à euxse?
2SG.SBJ can.2SG. give-INF part okra to them.
'Can you give them some okra?' (LOU - Rottet 2001: 212)

Discussion
If the hypothesis is accepted that the inventory of forms we find in marginal Frenches provides a certain idea of the "feature pool" which was available to the slaves, then Chaudenson is right when he claims that (non seulement les créoles peuv en leur émergence, choisir dans le "feature pool" du français ou dans le français zéro [...] des variantes différentes pour une même variable, mais ils peuvent aussi, pour une même variante, opter pour des traitements différents) (2003: 401).23 Thus the 3rd person plural Acadian French pronouns can easily be correlated with their corresponding creole pronouns: yo/ye (creoles of the American-Caribbean region) go back to a dialectal form iex* as attested in Newfoundland; the forms zot (Indian Ocean creoles, old Haitian Creole) derive from eux-autres.24 As far as the 1st and 2nd person singular pronouns are concerned, however, the loss of the atomic pronouns is a recent development in the speech of semi-speakers of Cajun. In the language of the early settlers, the current forms were undoubtedly moi je and toi tu.25

Nevertheless, with regard to the importance of NAF for the research on creolization, this means first of all only the following:

23. "During their emergence, the creoles may not only choose different variants for one and the same variable in the "feature pool" of French or français zéro, but they can also opt for different treatments of one and the same variant."

24. I do not believe, however, that "koineized French" had just the form ye zot, from which the Caribbean creoles took the first element ye and the Indian Ocean creoles the second part zot (Chaudenson 2005b: 21).

25. Chaudenson (2001: 176) states with respect to the colonial society: "In such contact settings, the native speaker has a tendency to over-use the person markers, as for example in the distribution of tasks: Toi tu fais ça, moi je fais ça, eux (or rather eux-autres) i font ça, etc."

Apart from these conclusions it is impossible to ascertain from the Acadian data:

i. what determined the selection of the different forms in the different areas;
ii. what brought about specific developments in the creole languages such as the fact that the second- and third-person plural forms of the subject pronouns are identical in the Indian Ocean creoles, i.e., zot, which can also be the possessive determiner 3rd person plural (cf. Chaudenson 2001: 176–177, 183–184) or that the 1st and 2nd person plural pronoun is identical in Haitian Creole (now).

It is precisely at this point that explanatory parameters must be brought to bear which take into account the particular language acquisition situation in the colonies and in the African substrate languages.

i. As far as the generalization of the tonic pronouns is concerned, research on language acquisition has shown that stressed, expressive and phonologically salient forms are learnt preferably, a development that was reinforced in the process of non-guided SLA such as we find it in the plantation society.27

ii. With regard to the use of zot as subject pronoun for the 2nd and 3rd person plural, the fact that the element [zot] appears both in vous-autres as well as in eux-autres may have favoured the generalization of zot in the Indian Ocean creoles, but most likely because Malagasy provided the structural model (Chaudenson 2001: 183–184, 2003: 307–308). Otherwise it would be difficult to explain why

26. The preference for nonclitic over the traditional clitic pronouns in enclave language settings and situations of language erosion is described by Rottet (2001: 220f.) for Louisiana and by King (1983) for Newfoundland. King assumes that this change may be partially due to influence of English. From a more general point of view Stieweckers (2004: 281) however notes that "it is not always easy to determine whether a particular change in person marking is due to the influence of another language or to language internal factors."

27. For the acquisition of French L1 cf. Clark (1985: 714); cf. also Mather (2006). Chaudenson's description is based on a metaphor: "How does language appropriation proceed (in acquisition and learning)? The acquirer or learner proceeds by identifying perceptible elements in utterances of the target language to which he/she has been exposed. He/she grasps them, rather as a shipwrecked person holds on to floating driftwood or other objects and organizes these elements into a communication system. Understandably, the individual appropriating the language will identify elements that are frequent, salient, meaning bearing, etc." (2001: 158).
The French creoles of the Caribbean have different 2nd and 3rd person plural pronouns (2PL zot, 3PL yè). This is because the European base language cannot easily provide an explanation for the use of subject pronouns as possessive determiners or for the formal identity of 1st and 2nd person plural in Haitian Creole. Apart from that, it should be kept in mind that the development of the inventory of pronominal forms was gradual in each individual creole and that more diachronic research is necessary in order to fully understand the interplay of substrates and superstrates in this area.

4.2 The object pronouns

The cooccurrence of atonic and tonic forms is also characteristic of the object pronouns in Acadian French. Although the pattern with preverbal clitics is still the most frequent one, examples of the postverbal tonic pronouns in the function of a direct or indirect object (with and without a "redundant" preverbal clitic) can be found in all varieties of Acadian French. Other phenomena to be observed are the weakening of gender and the weakening of case in the 3rd person plural. It cannot be excluded that these patterns were widespread in the settlers’ language that thus provided the model for analogical patterns in the emerging creoles. "It is also quite possible that the French varieties that were fed into the genesis of H[aitian] C[rapele] were more like Cajun French and Missouri French than Standard French vis-à-vis cliticization possibilities" (DeGraff 2005: 334).

(a) with preverbal clitic

(9) Y a un qui m’ a attrapé moi
ADV have.3SG someone who 1SG.OBJ aux.3SG catch.pp 1SG.OBJ
par en arrière.
from behind
‘There was someone who caught me from behind.’ (LOU – Stäbler 1995a: 37)

(b) without preverbal clitic

(14) mais il dit a moi
but he say.3SG PREP 1SG.OBJ
‘but he says to me...’ (LOU – LFLD, Evangeline)

(15) Mon pére i parle à elle.
my father he talk.3SG PREP 3SG.OBJ
‘My father talks to her.’ (LOU – Corpus Dubois)

(16) Son amie venait ici trouver elle.
her/his friend come.3SG.IPFV here find.INF 3SG.OBJ
‘Her/his friend came here to get her.’ (TN – Corpus Brasseur)

(17) je gardais tout le temps eux.
I take care.1SG.IPFV all the time 3PL.OBJ
‘I was taking care of them all the time.’ (NB – Motapanye 1997: 41)

Some Missourian and Ontarian data confirm that object pronoun position in the marginal Frenches may differ considerably from the French patterns.

(18) Quand j’teur parle là, i comprend moi en français.
When I them talk.1SG DM he understand.3SG.1SG.OBJ in French
‘When I talk to them, he understands me in French.’ (ONT – Nadasdi 2000: 72)

(19) M’ as manger lui.
I aux.1SG eat.INF 3SG.OBJ
‘I will eat him.’ (MIS – Thogmartin 1970: 67)

(20) La pollution commence à détruire nous-autres.
the pollution begin.3SG to destroy.3INF 1PL.OBJ
‘Pollution begins to destroy us.’ (ONT – Nadasdi 2000: 71)

31. I am grateful to Sylvie Dubois who gave me access to her Cajun database in 2005.

32. Cf. also Mather (2006: 260) for the same structures in L2 French in Togo.

28. Cf. Lefebvre (1998: 141f) and Fattier (2002) for a possible substratal explanation of this phenomenon. We have, however, found the following examples in Acadian French: amenes vous-autres bébélles en-dedans pour esse pas être trempée ‘Bring in your toys that they don’t get wet’ (LOU – Rottet 2001: 202) and eux poisson ‘their fish’ (TN – Brasseur 2001: 254).

29. Thus, the generalization of zot was not yet given at the end of the 18th century in Reunion Creole according to A. Bollée (personal communication). Cf. also Fattier (2002) for the gradual evolution of the Haitian Creole pronominal system.

Although it can be assumed that these structures occur more frequently in the speech of semi-speakers, the postverbal object pronoun is nevertheless not a recent phenomenon in Acadian French. Its appearance in many varieties of NAF as well as attestations from the 17th century French permits the conclusion that these constructions belonged to the linguistic repertoire of the French settlers in the 17th century. The fact that they are more frequent in the speech of bilinguals may, of course, be due to the prolonged contact with English, where object pronouns are placed postverbally.

In negative imperative constructions, the object pronouns can follow the verb in the Acadian varieties like in popular French (Riegel et al. 1994: 204):

Demande -moi pas.
ask.2SG.IMP 1SG.OBJ NG
'Don't ask me.' (TN – Brasseur LI)

Frappe -nous pas.
hit.2SG.IMP 1PL.OBJ NG
'Don't hit us.' (LOU – Papen/Rottet 1996: 244)

Discussion

As far as the syntactic behavior of the object pronouns is concerned, French creoles, which consistently place the object pronoun behind the verb, differ considerably from their French input. As in other creole structures, the generalization of the V-ObjPro pattern was certainly due to the interplay of several causes.

i. Even if we admit that the postverbal object position is a structural option in the varieties of overseas French, our contemporary data, for which the influence of English cannot be completely excluded, does not allow any hasty conclusions as to the "feature pool" accessible to the slaves. The language of the settlers certainly contained non-standard V-ObjPro-constructions, but still and all, hypotheses on the settlers' language remain vague without more diachronic and dialectological research in this domain.

ii. The postverbal object pronoun position is in line with the dominant V-ObjPro pattern in some African languages such as Fon (Lefebvre 1998: 149f, Fattier 2003: 13). "(C)urrent results in acquisition research make it quite likely that VO patterns in the substratum would have favored the adoption by L2 learners of congruent VO patterns into the incipient creole" (DeGraff 2005: 336).34

iii. It must also be taken into account that the specific communicative situations on the plantations favoured certain types of speech acts. In the colonies, speech appeared almost exclusively in its "pragmatic mode", i.e., in functionally restricted utterances, closely linked to the situational context and nonverbal communication. In view of the fact that the speech act of commanding was particularly frequent in colonial societies, imperatives and their formal and syntactic peculiarities may be an additional factor in the explanation of certain creole structures such as the postposition of the object pronouns (Bruyn & Muysken & Verrips 1999; DeGraff 2005).35

4.3 The syntax of pour

In Acadian French pour can be used in two ways:

i. as a preposition that corresponds to standard French pour, à and de.36

(24) Là, la mère restait avec cinq enfant pour elle there the mother stay.3SG.IMP with five child.PL PREP 3SG
'The mother was left behind with five children.' (LOU – LFLD, Acadia)

(25) Ils ont raison pour ça.
they have.3PL right PREP this
'They are right there.' (LOU – LFLD, Évangéline, Mamou)

34. Cf. Fattier (2002: 116): "Les apprenants africains on mis fin à l'exception que les pronoms constituent en régularisant la langue-cible". Furthermore, "the avoidance of clitics in L2 French may be a general SLA strategy" (Mather 2006: 260).


In the French creoles, the modal marker pou can express obligation and/or futurity.39

(32) Mwen pou marye semèn pwòchen.
I fut.1sg get.married 3sg next
'I have to get married next week.' (Haitian Creole – Wattier 2003: 7)

(33) Tut solda pu vini laplas kunyè a.
all soldier 1sg come square now 3sg DET
'All the soldiers must come to the square now.'
(Haitian Creole – Koopman & Lefebre 1982: 71)

(34) Li pu vini si li kapav.
he fut 3sg if he can
'He will come if he can.' (Mauritian Creole – Véronique 1999: 201)

(c) pour is part of the purpose subordinate pour (pas) que, which can lose the element que especially in Louisiana French.

(35) Ça nous a été donné pour on écoute.
this us AUX 3SG be_PP give_PP COMP 3SG.INDF listen.3SG
'That was given to us so that we listened to it.'
(LOU – Stäbler 1995a: 216)

(36) [...] pour pas que la mer pese rentrer.
[... ] COMP NEG CONJ the sea can.SUBJ.3SG enter.INF
'[...] so that the sea cannot enter.' (NB – M, 57)

As in popular French, an infinitival sentence can replace a purpose or consecutive subordinate clause with subjunctive.40 According to Rottet (2001), the emergence of non-finite subordinate clauses stands out as a significant pattern in the speech of semi-speakers. In Louisiana the complementizer que is usually omitted, and the pronoun of the subordinate is usually tonic.

(37) Euse i a donné de l’ argent pour lui aller
they him AUX.3SG/PL give PP part money COMP him go.3SG
au magasin.
to the store
'They gave him some money so that he went to the store.'
(LOU – Guilbeau 1950: 223)

37. According to King, however, these structures are not the result of direct syntactic borrowing. "Rather, I shall argue that lexical borrowing has triggered reanalysis of the Prince Edward Island French preposition system" (King 2000: 136).


39. In Louisiana Creole, the auxiliary gen pou (Neumann 1985: 227) expresses obligation and futurity (with a strong nuance of obligation).

(38) Mom elle faisait du thé de sassafras pour nous-autres boire ça. 

Mum made some sassafras tea or another kind of tea to make us drink that.

LOU – LFLD, Evangeline

These purpose constructions, apparently rare in New Brunswick and Newfoundland, were well known in Old French and are still used in popular and dialectal French. It is therefore wrong to assume an exclusively English influence here, even though the analogous English patterns (as in examples (41) and (42)) naturally contributed to their reappearance. The same constructions with pour as a purpose subordinator can be found in different French creoles and in St. Thomas.

(39) Tchô dan tit bêké pour el pa têbè 
hold a little bit COMP she NEG fall 
'Hold her a little so that she won't fall.' (St. Thomas – Highfield 1979: 118)

(40) Frem la port pu la wi muzat. 
close the door COMP NEG he see us 
'Close the door so that he won't see us.' (Louisiana Creole – Neumann 1985: 348)

(41) Li pran so bisiklet pu li vini. 
he take his bicycle COMP he come 
'Takes his bicycle to come.' (Mauritian Creole – Véronique 1999: 201)

(42) Mo gô ò bazy pu m mon tre u. 
I have a chose COMP I show you, 
'I have a thing to show you.' (Haitian Creole – Koopman & Lefebvre 1982: 70)

In the speech of the semi-speakers of Cajun, however, pour also appears in non-purpose constructions (Rottet 1995: 274–5, 2001: 255–257).

(43) J' aimerais pour toi manger en tit brin. 
I likeCOND.2SG.IPFV COMP you eat a little bit 
'I want you to eat a little bit.' (LOU – Rottet 1995: 275)

(44) If vous avait euh demandé pour vous se [...] marier. 
he you AUX.3SG.IPFV DM ASK.PP COMP you REFL.3SG [...] marry.INF 
'He had asked you to get married.' (LOU – LFLD, Evangeline, Mamou)

Discussion

1. A comparison between the use of pour in the varieties of Acadian French and its use in French creoles illustrates that in this case material continuity goes hand in hand with an astonishingly large measure of functional continuity in so far as its use as a preposition and a future and obligation marker is concerned. Although this limits to a certain extent the hypothesis stated by Detges, who speaks of an almost total functional discontinuity between the French creoles and their base language with respect to grammatical paradigms (2002: 71), the "superstrate data"


43. Lefebvre (1998: 119) does not mention the French periphrasis avoir pour, which perfectly explains the obligation value that pu has in Haitian Creole.
do not answer the questions why *pou* has become so prominent in some creoles, why it has the semantics it has today, or how the innovative combinations of *pou* with other markers can be explained.44

ii. As far as the use of the subordinator is concerned, the parallels between the non-standard varieties of French and the creole languages are obvious. However, similar to the subject pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person singular, this is a question of relatively recent developments in the speech of semi-speakers especially in Louisiana, so that substrate influence cannot totally be excluded here. Nevertheless, the fact that *pour* can perfectly well introduce complements of verbs of the want-class in NAF should be taken into account (cf. Lefebvre 1998: 189).

5. Conclusions

In view of what has been stated so far, the following conclusions can be tentatively drawn:

First, the value of a comprehensive database of New World French lies primarily in providing material to reconstruct at least part of the possible European "input" and its intralinguistic variation – no more and no less. I am aware, of course, that there is a risk involved in drawing conclusions from the contemporary varieties of North American French about the language of the colonists; nevertheless, creolists should look here not only for the "construction material" as far as lexical and grammatical forms are concerned but also for specific functional patterns – there are not too many other sources.

Second, the developments that the "marginal Frenches" have gone through until now have been diverse. The extent of these developments differs not only from variety to variety, but also from category to category. The above-mentioned examples have shown that, in addition to the specific changes that French goes through when not under any normative pressure, there are also changes that are triggered by contact with English as well as by language attrition. That language attrition, creolization and non-guided second language acquisition may partially yield similar linguistic outcomes – all three favour elements that are regular,

frequent, transparent, information-bearing and salient – creates a methodological problem, for the question is clearly one of completely dissimilar language contact situations.45

Third, although I am convinced that a better knowledge of the specific structures of non-standard Frenches provides important information on the type of French the settlers spoke, I doubt whether these varieties provide any clues as to the evolutionary mechanisms effective during creolization. There is no doubt that a comparison of the French creoles with the "marginal" varieties – even with the most "progressive" ones – may help to locate specific restructurings that are outside the realm of changes that French undergoes under specific sociolinguistic conditions such as isolation, a lack of normative pressure, intensive language contact, or language death. However, it is less evident whether creolization is to a certain extent based on "the radicalization and transmission of restructuring processes, for which 'marginal' French varieties offered variants and provided the direction" (Chaudenson 2001: 171).

Can universal processes of language change and language-specific internal changes – and it is this combination that the "self-regulating processes/evolutionary tendencies" are about – be "transmitted" or "continued" in the very special context of unguided second language acquisition as it presumably existed in plantation society (cf. Chaudenson 2001: 182)? Or as Alleyne (1996: 37) puts it:

Est-ce qu'une langue peut posséder de telles tendances d'une façon tellement inéluctable qu'un autre peuple, en adoptant cette langue, se voie obligé de les continuer? Cela impliquerait qu'une langue est un organisme autonome existant hors des mentalités et des comportements des gens qui la manipulent et hors des contextes sociaux dans lesquels elle se parle. Evidemment, ce n'est pas le cas. Autrement dit, comment pourrait-il se faire qu'un peuple, en adoptant une langue, perceive ces tendances et les continue? 46


45. Chaudenson repeatedly points out "la créolisation reproduirait, en quelque sorte à l'adversâ, les processus de l'attrition ou de l'étoilement linguistiques" (2003a: 23, cf. also 2003: 206). Alleyne (1996: 39 as well notes that internal language change and second language acquisition share certain features: "l'acquisition d'une langue seconde, surtout là où il n'existe pas de pression correctrice, peut produire des effets tout à fait parallèles à ces tendances évolutives (perte de flexions, structures syntaxiquement transparentes etc.)."

46. "Can a language have such unavoidable tendencies that another people, upon adopting that language, finds itself forced to continue them? This would imply that a language is an autonomous organism that exists outside of the minds and the behaviour of the people using it, and outside of the social contexts in which it is spoken. This is evidently not the case. In other words, how could a people that adopts a language perceive these tendencies and continue them?"
One must certainly be careful not to take the terms "transmission" and "continuation" too literally nor should one deduce an uninterrupted chain of language evolution. The fact that some creole-specific restructuring processes look like "transmissions" or "radicalizations" of analogous processes in French does not mean that this scenario makes sense linguistically. While the "transmission" of specific internal developments may be plausible for the francophone regions in North America, the situation was completely different on the islands of the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean, where language transmission was not "normal" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988). Here, there was at most a certain continuity with regard to the universal strategies at work in the evolution of oral languages in general, which, however, is now somewhat tautological insofar as these processes are always active anyway. And fourth, creolization itself is a specific case of language change coupled with uncontrollable second language learning under unique social, historical and cultural conditions. The restructuring processes that in the course of time led to the emergence of new languages comprises various universal processes of language change such as reanalysis and grammaticalization as well as contact-induced changes such as grammatical replication (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 242–243) or selections based on convergence. Two recent definitions of creolization as an "interesting division of labor between universals and substratum influence" (Mather 2006: 268) or as "the conspiracy of both factors" (Plag 2002) tries to take into account that the emergence of creole languages can only be explained by a multicausal approach. It should not be ignored, however, that the interplay between substrates and the highly variable "superstrate" differed from area to area, and that creolization as a gradual phenomenon did not affect all categories at the same time and in the same way. After all, each creole possesses its own distinct history.

Special abbreviations

| APR | atonic pronoun |
| CONJ | conjunction |
| DM | discourse marker |
| ANT | anteriority |
| PART | partitive article |
| PREP | preposition |
| TPR | tonic pronoun |
| PP | past participle |
| ADV | adverbial |
| NAF | North American French |
| NB | Nouveau Brunswick (New Brunswick) |
| NE | Nouvelle Écosse (Nova Scotia) |
| IPE | Île du Prince Édouard (Prince Edward Island) |
| TN | Terre Neuve (Newfoundland) |
| LOU | Louisiana |
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