

Nothing in context: Variation, grammaticization and past time marking in Nigerian Pidgin English

SHANA POPLACK and SAU TAGLIAMONTE

citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought t

provided by Revistas Científicas de la U

Ottawa K1N 6N5 (Canada)
spoplack@aix1.uottawa.ca

Department of Languages & Linguistic Science
University of York
Heslington
York, YO1 5DD (UK)
st17@ebor.ycirc.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

*Assessment of form/function relationships is notoriously contentious in creole grammars since overt grammatical markers typically alternate with zero in a number of subsystems of the grammar. Categorical perception coupled with the structuralist tendency to ascribe a single function to each form together conspire in promoting the widespread notion that both overt and zero forms are grammatical markers of specific meanings. Exemplifying with the past temporal reference sector of Nigerian Pidgin English (NPE), an extended pidgin said to exhibit prototypical creole features, this paper shows that only a small minority of NPE contexts with a particular semantic reference co-occur with an overt form claimed to encode this reference. Indeed, the overt forms typically appear in a number of diverse contexts. Thus despite considerable grammaticization over the past couple of centuries, none of the overt NPE past temporal reference forms have as yet attained the status of grammatical marker. It follows that the selection of zero cannot be inferred to unambiguously signal the absence of a specific associated meaning, pace the Bickertonian scenario, whereby each form, overt and null, has a unique semantic interpretation. (Keywords: grammaticization, linguistic variation and change, form/function asymmetry, past temporal reference, Nigerian Pidgin English, creole prototype, creole languages, zero-marked verb, variable rule analysis, *hm*, *kom*, *don*).*

* The support of the SSHRC, in the form of grants #410-90-0336 and #410-95-0778 to both authors, is gratefully acknowledged. We thank Ejike Eze for his participation in coding the data, and for useful discussions about the past. Marjory Meehan for insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper, and Salikoko Mufwene for suggesting a new way of looking at the materials we report on here. This paper was originally published in Philip Baker & Anand Sycia (eds.) (1996) *Changing Meanings, Changing Functions: Papers Relating to Grammaticalization in Contact Languages* (London: University of Westminster Press). The Editorial Board of *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa* is very grateful to the editors as well as to University of Westminster Press for permission to re-publish it.

RESUMEN

*La evaluación de las relaciones forma/función es de notoria controversia en el caso de las gramáticas criollas desde que marcadores gramaticales explícitos alternan normalmente con flexiones cero en numerosos subsistemas de la gramática. La tendencia categórica estructuralista o atribuir una función individual para cada forma contribuye a fomentar la noción tan generalizada de que tanto las formas explícitas como las implícitas (cero) son marcadores gramaticales de significados específicos. Al ejemplificar con la categoría de referencia temporal de pasado en el inglés pidgin nigeriano (Nigerian Pidgin English, NPE), un pidgin extendido que parece ser que exhibe rasgos criollos prototípicos, el presente artículo muestra cómo sólo un número reducido de colirextos NPE con una referencia semántica específica convive con una forma explícita a la que se le atribuye la codificación de esa referencia. De hecho, las formas explícitas normalmente se dan en una serie de contextos diversos. Por tanto, a pesar de la considerable gramaticalización durante los últimos dos siglos, ninguna de las formas NPE de referencia temporal de pasado ha logrado aún el estatus de marcador gramatical. De lo que se desprende que no se puede suponer que la selección de la forma cero indique inequívocamente la ausencia de un significado específico, con el debido respeto para la perspectiva hickertoniana, en el que cada forma, tanto la explícita como la cero, tiene una única interpretación semántica. (Palabras Clave: gramaticalización, variación y cambio lingüísticos, asimetría formal/funcional, referencia temporal de pasado, inglés pidgin nigeriano, prototipo criollo, lenguas criollas, verbo sin marcas flexivas, análisis de la regla variable. *hm, kom, don*).*

I. INTRODUCTION

As grammatical morphemes develop from lexical material, a form may become so intimately associated with a particular meaning that its absence is likewise interpreted to signal absence of that meaning. Once an overt morpheme becomes obligatory, or at least highly frequent, the listener is entitled, by conventionalization of implicature, to infer that if it was not used, the inferences associated with it were not intended (Bybee 1994: 235). Beginning with the occasional use of a lexical item, the candidate for grammatical status gains frequency, undergoes erosion of its original lexical meaning and comes to occupy a fixed syntactic slot. Concomitant with generalization in meaning is increased appropriateness and use. Eventually, the grammaticized form may appear not only in contexts where it signals a particular meaning, but also entirely redundantly, whenever its meaning is simply compatible with the general meaning of the utterance (Pagliuca 1994: ix). The more grammatical processes a given linguistic unit undergoes, the more its use becomes obligatory in certain contexts and ungrammatical in others (Heine & Reh 1984).

The changes associated with grammaticization do not come about abruptly, but may endure for centuries, as forms pass through a series of transitions from content word to morphological affix. Various stages of this process may therefore be observable in any synchronic state of the language (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 3). This is why the concept of cline defined historically as a path along which forms evolve, and synchronically, as a continuum— is basic to its study (ibid.: 6). In the early stages a lexical item may be associated

with, but not yet embody, a grammatical meaning: its absence cannot yet be taken to signal absence of the meaning.

Creole languages provide an excellent locus for the study of grammaticization. Because of the extreme sociohistorical circumstances under which they typically develop, normally gradual processes of linguistic restructuring are compressed. Diachronic evidence may thus be telescoped in a single stage of the language, with attendant advantages for linguistic analysis. In addition, the contact languages contributing to the formation of the creole (lexifier, substrate) often continue to coexist with it, offering valuable comparative evidence for the behavior of the forms in question (Mufwene 1996). Perhaps most important, due no doubt to the widespread variability in pidgin and creole languages of overt and null expressions of grammatical meaning, the above-mentioned scenario, whereby absence of a mark is imbued with a unique semantic interpretation (i.e. absence of the meaning associated with the mark), is often invoked. Arguably most influential is Bickerton's creole "prototype" (D. Bickerton 1974: 1979: 1981), which predicts that stative verbs in [-anterior] and punctual verbs in [+anterior], temporal relationship to a preceding reference verb will receive an overt grammatical mark (in English-based creoles, usually *bm* or *ben*); zero is interpreted in this schema as marking [-anterior] relationship in punctual verbs.

In this study we examine the interplay of linguistic variation, ongoing grammaticization and tense/aspect marking through empirical study of past time expression in Nigerian Pidgin English (NPE), an extended pidgin widely held to exhibit prototypical creole features (Aghyisi 1984: Faraclas 1987: Singler 1992). Taking the entire past temporal reference sector as a point of departure, our approach is innovative in examining both 1) the extent to which a given *form*, once selected, actually signals a given context, as well as 2) the extent to which each *context* is preferentially associated with any of the forms occurring in it. Moreover, we contend, and will demonstrate, that only such a multidimensional analysis can reveal the true relationship between form and function, and hence, the degree to which each candidate for morpheme status may appropriately be characterized as *marking* a given function. Special focus on the *absence* of a mark, i.e. zero, in contexts where overt forms are also attested, permits us to determine whether the former in fact has a unique semantic interpretation. An added bonus of the analysis is the synchronic portrait it affords of the grammaticization continuum, and the position on it of the different forms within a well-demarcated sector of the NPE grammar at a given point in its evolution.

Typically grammaticization is studied diachronically. From a synchronic point of view, however, it may be viewed as a special case of form-function asymmetry (Heine et al. 1991b: 2). As such we submit that it can be profitably treated within the variationist framework we adopt here, although with the notable exception of Sankoff's work (e.g. 1976, 1977a; 1977b; 1979; 1990), the variationist approach to grammaticization is greatly underrepresented. The analyses that follow will contribute to filling that gap.

11. PAST TIME MARKING IN ENGLISH-BASED CREOLES AND NPE

Perhaps most salient of the properties creoles share is their tense-modality-aspect (TMA) system (see Muysken (1981) for summary). Creole languages are widely characterized as being aspect-prominent, expressing aspectual distinctions by means of preverbal particles, whose use is said to interact with temporal reference and stativity (Bickerton 1973: 1979: 1981). Those

expressing past temporal reference in English-based creoles typically include forms like *dɔn*, *bɔn* and zero. These, as well as other particles occurring in past temporal reference contexts, are illustrated with data from NPE in the following six examples.

- (1) *ka n* wi *kɔm* *drɪŋk* am wit evritiŋ wey i *gɪv* ɔs (041256)
'We drank it with everything he gave us'
- (2) *dɔn* i *dɔn dai* (1/013)
'He has died'
- (3) *de* a *de waka* fɔ nɔt lef rait an senta (31103)
'I was walking about in the North, left, right and center'
- (4) *bm* a *bm* orijinali *kɔm* frɔm Inglan (01/7-8)
'I originally came from England'
- (5) *fɪɪʃ* a *fɔl fɪɪʃ* (2/152)
'I fell'
- (6) *zero* imidetli wey de si di demɔsretɔs, de *ʃut* (01270)
'Immediately they saw the demonstrators, they shot'

Although the inventory of attested forms is quite consistent across creoles, their functions, and thus the grammatical mechanism underlying them, remain controversial. In particular, researchers have tended to equate like surface forms with similar functions, although a number of factors (e.g. differential input of substrate and lexifier languages) may result in use of similar forms for *different* functions (e.g. Mufwene 1996; Myhill 1991; Sankoff 1990; Singler 1990; Winford 1985).

The few existing characterizations of the contemporary past temporal reference system of NPE, such as those of Agheyisi (1971) and Faraclas (1987), basically endorse Bickerton's (1974: 1981: 1984) conception of the interaction of an action/state distinction and anterior, rather than past, tense in overt and zero marking of past. Thus Faraclas states that "zero marked action verbs are [+past], while zero marked nonaction verbs are [-past]", predicting that only [+punctual] verbs with past temporal reference will surface with no overt morphology. Overt marking of past time is said to be accomplished by the "tense auxiliary" *bm*, denoting "anterior past with action verbs and simple past with non-action verbs" (Faraclas 1987: 46). Agheyisi interprets *bm* as a marker of remote past for active verbs, but simple or remote past for statives⁴. *dɔn* is unanimously characterized as a completive aspectual marker, and Faraclas (ibid.) attributes this meaning to *fɪɪʃ* as well. Non-punctual aspect (either durative, iterative or habitual) is said to be encoded by the continuative marker *de*. Another form, *kɔm* (*ka*), is characterized by Faraclas as having no direct bearing on time reference or sequence: he interprets it as "a marker of objectivity or realis modality" (ibid.: 50).

Figure 1 summarizes these predictions for past time marking in NPE. In what follows we compare them to the forms actually used in our past temporal reference data.

Figure 1:
Summary of Predictions for Past Time Marking in NPE

	Punctual	Stative
anterior / remote	<i>bɪn</i>	none
simple past	zero	<i>bɪn</i>
sequential	none	none
completive	<i>dɔn / fɪnɪs</i>	<i>dɔn / fɪnɪs</i>
durative / iterative / habitual	<i>de</i>	<i>de</i>
objective / realis	<i>kɔn</i>	<i>kɔn</i>

111. DATA AND METHOD

III.1. The Corpus

The data on which this study is based are drawn from a corpus of informal conversations among a social network of 12 Nigerians. All had immigrated to Ottawa, Canada within five years of this writing, but were born, raised and/or long-time residents of predominantly NPE-speaking areas of Nigeria (e.g. Bendel, Rivers, Lagos). Though the speakers are highly educated and multilingual in a number of Kwa languages, as well as in NPE and Standard English, the interaction between them and Ejike Eze, an in-group member who collected the data, took place entirely in NPE.

111.2. Coding and Analysis

This study (v. also Tagliamonte & Poplack 1988) differs from its predecessors in that the locus of variation includes *all* verbs with past teniporal reference, here defined as any event or state occurring prior to speech time. All eligible contexts, whether overtly niarked or not, were extracted from the tape-recorded conversations constituting the NPE corpus, giving a total of 4,759 verbal structures referring to events or states in the past.

Each main verb was systematically coded according to nearly a dozen linguistic features extrapolated from the literature on past teniporal reference in creoles and related vernaculars, as well as the relevant African substrate languages, where available. Most central—and elusive—of these are the interrelated features of stativity and temporal relationship. Claims about the links between them are tricky to validate, because 1) their interaction must be taken into account (Tagliamonte & Poplack 1993), and 2) it is difficult to identify non-applications (Sankoff 1990: 307). The validity of any analysis of these issues resides, in large measure, in the resolution of the above problems. In ensuing sections we describe the methods we have developed to deal with them.

III.3. Temporal Relationship

Available characterizations of *bɪn*'s role as anterior niarker provide no discovery procedure for point of reference in its absence. As previously (Tagliamonte 1991; Tagliamonte & Poplack 1993), we adopt for this purpose the framework of Lo Cascio and associates for identifying temporal structure in discourse (e.g. Lo Cascio & Co Vet 1986). Following this model, which

permits identification of temporal relationships according to consistent and systematic criteria. each verb was categorized according to the temporal relationship it entertained with its preceding reference verb. viz. anteriority, sequentiality, coincidence, repetition and reorientation. Verbs were coded as ANTERIOR when Event 2 was ordered before Event 1, as in (7a-b), and SEQUENTIAL when Event 1 was ordered before Event 2, as in (8). For present purposes, the residue were classed as OTHER NON-ANTERIOR, as in (9)". This categorization schema enabled us to test the requisite application and non-application sites for anterior tense marking in the data. Inclusion of non-application sites permits comparison of marker usage in anterior *and* non-anterior temporal relationships in the semantic domain of past time.

- (7a) a no wan kɔm. a bnz *de kɔm go* (81147)
'I did not want to come. I had been coming and going'
- (7b) i kɔm go fɔ dat ples wey i kɔt di tri (41019)
'He went to the place where he had cut the tree from'
- (8) a kɔt ma sista. ma sista *rijet* mi (11066)
'I called my sister. my sister rejected me'
- (9) i *du* beta wɔk. i *las* fɔ tu tems ɔv di gɔvnmnt (71110)
'He did a good job. He lasted for two terms of government'

111.4. Stativity

In order to capture the elusive category of STATIVITY, we coded each verb both in terms of its inherent punctual or stative qualities and in terms of sentential aspect. Following Quirk et al. (1985), we categorized as stative, verbs representing mental perception, states of emotion or attitude, sensory perception and bodily sensation, as well as verbs of relationship and measurement, as in (10).

- (10a) a no *laik* as di ples dey (11016)
'I did not like how the place was'
- (10b) a *hia* sey na dem fait agens 3s (51363)
'I heard that they were the ones who fought against us'
- (10c) di tinj *las* tri yias oh (7/053)
'The thing lasted for three years'

Punctual verbs included those representing events understood to have occurred once, as in (11).

- (11a) i kɔm *tel* mi ini nem (121137)
'He told me his name'

- (11b) ma perens a no no hu *tel* dem (11194)
'I don't know who told niy parents'
- (11c) Gɔd *giv* mi pis wen a ripen (121237)
'God gave me peace when I repented'
- (11d) ma hɔsban *kɔm sen* mi di pepas (131112)
'My husband sent me the papers'

Verbs were also coded as continuous or iterative according to contextual indicators such as adverbs, conjunctions and other disambiguating information, but tabulated separately according to whether they were lexically stative, as in (12), or non-stative, as in (13).

- (12a) a *kɔm de rispet* dat wɔn (51373)
'I was respecting that one'
- (12b) im *de spɔil* mi (121152)
'He was spoiling me'
- (12c) a *dɔn dr hia* dat kain tinj (31287)
'I have been hearing that kind of thing'
- (13a) so wi *kɔm de draiv* de go (131035)
'So we were driving on'
- (13b) winta *kan de kan* (21130)
'Winter was coming'
- (13c) i du beta *wɔk* fɔ dem oh (71109)
'He did a good job for them'
- (13d) evri dey na im a *de krai* (121037)
'I cried every day'

This permitted us to disentangle the (often confusing) interface between the stative/non-stative and punctual/non-punctual dichotomies. Because our schema considered each distinction independently, an exhaustive four-way comparison among factors could be achieved⁷.

11.5. Temporal Distance

To test whether verbal marking is sensitive to temporal distance, as (at least implicitly) suggested for NPE by Agheyisi (1971: 134), we categorized verbs in terms of both their relative remoteness from each other and their absolute remoteness from speech time. This permitted us to distinguish events and states that had occurred in the remote past, as in (14a-b),

from more recent ones. as in (14c-d)

- (14a) a se wai yu *bɔn* tri pikin? (91182)
'I said. "why did you give birth to three children?"'
- (14b) na di mɔn nia fada dai de bɔn ain (81350)
'It was the nionth my father died that he was born'
- (14c) wɔn ɔv nia fren *fen* di 3da dey. yu no (11181)
'One of my friends fainted the other day. you know'
- (14d) di bɔi kil im fren an kil imself ɔlso (61139)
'The boy killed his friend and killed himself also'

11.6. Contextual Disambiguation

A recurrent characterization of pidgins is that context disambiguates temporal reference (e.g. Bakker 1995: 37): functional effects on marking have also been invoked with regard to creoles in general (e.g. Mufwene 1983) as well as to early varieties of West African Pidgin English (WAPE), a presumed precursor of NPE (Fayer 1982). Such observations suggest that overt morphological marking is promoted by lack of other disambiguating information in the surrounding discourse. To test the effect of local disambiguation on past marking, we examined co-occurrence patterns of verbs with temporal adverbs in the immediate clause, as in (15).

- (15a) a *kɔm* hia **etiet** (71470)
'I carne here in eighty-eight'
- (15b) a *dɔn* ripen tru tru **dat taim** (121199)
'I had truly repented that time'
- (15c) **dat nait** im no *slip* wit am shaa (11269)
'That night he did not sleep with her'

Our own earlier studies of verbal marking in Early Black English in the Americas (Poplack & Tagliamonte 1989; Tagliamonte & Poplack 1993) revealed a counterfunctional trend, whereby an overt mark on a preceding reference form favored a overt mark on the current verb or noun, as exemplified with NPE in (16). We also examine the applicability of this copying, or "parallel processing" (Scherre & Naro 1991) effect in NPE.

- (16a) i *kɔm pil* ɔl di hol kanda ɔv di banana na im i *kɔm* tek am kip am fɔ insaid pɔt (41032)
'He peeled off all the banana peels and put them in a pot'

(16b) a *kɔl* ma sista. ma sista *rijet* mi (11066)
'I called my sister. niy sister rejected me'

(16c) a *dɔn rejista*. a *dɔn bikɔm* kanejan man (71036)
'I have registered. I have become a Canadian'

111.7. Other Factors

Because marking patterns in NPE could conceivably have been transmitted by the lexifier, the substrate(s) or both, we also examined features found to affect variability in these and related vernaculars, available information permitting. For example, in Igbo, the first language of most of our speakers, the verb surfaces bare in negative sentences with past temporal reference (Emenanjo 1985; Nwachukwu 1983; Okeke 1984). We tested the effect of NEGATION in NPE by distinguishing affirmative, as in (17a-b), from negative (17c-d) sentence types.

(17a) i *kɔm open* dɔ fɔ mi (13/047)
'He opened the door for me'

(17b) i *sey* tudey na ma hɔsbɛn tɔn (61548)
'She said today is my husband's turn'

(17c) i no *rejista* wetin im hol (71118)
'He did not register what he had'

(17d) mɔŋki *no si* enitiŋ wey it go it (41009)
'The monkey did not see anything to eat'

PHONOLOGICAL CONTEXT, both preceding and following, has been shown to affect past tense marking in English (e.g. Guy 1980; Neu 1981), Jamaican Creole (Patrick 1991), and Early Black English (Tagliamonte & Poplack 1988: 1993): VERB CLASS (as inferred from morphological patterns across the verb paradigm) and VERB TYPE (i.e. "strong" vs. "weak") condition past tense marking in vernacular varieties of English (e.g. Cheshire 1982; Christian et al. 1988; Hughes & Trudgill 1979) as well as Early Black English (Tagliamonte & Poplack 1993). Results of preliminary analyses showed that none of these features had a significant effect on overt marking in NPE: we do not discuss them further in what follows.

III.8. Analyzing Variability

To detect which of the remaining factors contribute statistically significant effects to the presence of each of the past temporal reference options when all are considered simultaneously, as well as the relative importance of each, we made use of the multiple regression procedure incorporated in GoldVarb 2.0 (Rand & Sankoff 1990), a variable rule application for the

Macintosh. The alert reader will note that the "variable context", or locus of variation, we have defined for this study —viz., the entire past temporal reference system— is somewhat unorthodox in comparison to those traditionally featured in variation studies. This is intended as a heuristic device, warranted by the nature of the problem. To Bickerton's characterization of the opposition between *hm* and zero as privative, Sankoff (1990) had already objected that testing whether *use* of a marker conforms to the prototype, while ignoring whether the *non-uses* so conform could be misleading. We agree. Any accountable report on the relationship between, for example *hm* and anterior time, requires isolating all anterior *contexts* (regardless of the presence in them of an anterior [or any other] marker), although this has rarely been attempted (see Myhill 1991; Tagliamonte & Poplack 1993). But we submit, and will demonstrate, that the problem is far more complex. The principle of accountability requires that all the *other* temporal relations *hm* enters into be examined as well. No particular propensity for a form to mark one temporal relationship can be established in the absence of information on its propensity to mark all of the other temporal relationships. There are at least three reasons for this. First, the semantic categories are themselves fuzzy. Thus anterior, for example, may also be remote or non-remote, punctual or stative. Second, the forms, zero included, are inherently variable, and therefore may appear not only in their preferred contexts, but elsewhere as well. A *unique* association between form and context can only be posited after establishing that the form is not likewise associated with other contexts. Finally, as a result of their inherent variability, as well as for other reasons detailed above, there is no a priori means to determine which form, if any, zero is a "non-application" (or variant realization) of. The only solution is to take as denominator the entire past temporal reference space, and as numerator, all the forms attested within it. Section IV presents the results of this exercise.

IV. RESULTS

Table 1 displays the overall distribution of forms across past temporal reference contexts in NPE.

Table 1: Overall distribution of forms used in past temporal reference contexts in NPE

variants	N	%
zero	2612	55
<i>kɔn</i>	1087	23
<i>dɔn</i>	485	10
<i>de</i>	372	8
<i>hm</i>	73	1.5
<i>fɪŋ</i>	68	1.4
English morphology	62	1.3
TOTAL	4759	

A large proportion of the semantic domain of past is occupied by *kɔn* (23%), and somewhat lesser parts by *dɔn* (10%) and *de* (8%). *hm* and *fɪŋ* account for little more than 1% each of all forms used in past temporal contexts. English morphology, as in (18), is equally sporadic, and is virtually always confined to irregular forms, such as vowel change or syllabic pasts, the

majority of which occurred with one speaker.'

(18a) a *wen* dia as e sevintin yia ol (31565)

'I went there as a seventeen year old'

(18b) *wen* god *krieted* e man. de giv am wunian (21315)

'When God created nian. they gave hini woman'

Perhaps the most striking finding of Table 1 is the revelation that more than half of the past temporal reference contexts feature no overt niark at all. This raises the question of whether the verbs in these contexts are marked with zero. If so, what is the sense of the zero mark? Does it systematically convey a reading of non-anterior past for punctual verbs, as would be predicted by the creole prototype? Or are these verbs simply *unmarked*?

In determining the function of linguistic forms, there are two logical possibilities. The first is that any difference in meaning is embodied in a difference in form. This is the position, implicit or explicit, of e.g. Agheyisi (1971), Bickerton (1975) and Faraclas (1987; 1989), as well as of the traditional and generative linguistic enterprise more generally. The second, as is more typical of spoken language, is that features of the environment will *co-occur* with these forms in such a way as to indicate whether they are used for similar or different functions. Variable rule analysis enables us to characterize precisely the nature of these co-occurrence patterns by calculating which features of the environment are important and to what degree. Such features will be shown to exert effects that are both *statistically significant* (as determined by the stepwise selection procedure incorporated in the variable rule program) and *important* (as judged by the relative *range* of factor effects).

IV.1. Multivariate Analysis

Table 2 depicts the results of six independent variable rule analyses of the contribution of the same six factors (i.e. TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP, TEMPORAL DISTANCE, LEXICAL STATIVITY, TEMPORAL DISAMBIGUATION, MARK ON PRECEDING VERB and NEGATION) to the probability that each of *kɔm*, *dɔn*, *hm*, *fɪɪs*, *de* and zero will be selected in a given past temporal reference context. The interpretation is as follows. If, for example, sequential temporal relationship contributes a substantially higher effect (when compared with other possible temporal relationships) to the choice of a form, then that form (whether overt or null) may be inferred to signal, or *mark*, that relationship.

We first note from inspection of the ranges that the greatest contribution to the selection of each overt form but one is contributed by the factor of temporal relationship. This suggests that the particles do indeed play a role in delimiting temporal space. Examining factor effects within this factor group for each form, we observe that *kɔm* is promoted in sequential temporal relationship (with a contribution of .70), contrary to Faraclas' claim (1987:49) that it has no bearing on time reference. Both *dɔn* and *hm* are favored in anterior contexts (with contributions of .76 and .90 respectively), while *de* is preferred in non-anterior contexts (.64).

The factor of TEMPORAL DISTANCE also exerts a strong effect on *dɔn* and *hm*. The former is associated with proximate (or non-remote), and the latter, with remote, anterior time. Note that LEXICAL STATIVITY, to which the expression of anteriority is said to be sensitive, is not selected as significant to the occurrence of either *hni* (the putative anterior marker), or zero

(its putative counterpart). Moreover, the effect of stativity on the occurrence of *kɔm* and *dɔn* is smaller than that of any other factor. It is moderate at best with respect to *de*. Only the completive marker *fɪnɪʃ* displays a strong influence of this feature, not surprisingly: states tend not to reach completion.

Table 2: Six independent variable rule analyses of the contribution of factors selected as significant to the probability that each form will be used in past temporal reference contexts in NPE

	<i>kɔm</i>	<i>dɔn</i>	<i>bɪn</i>	<i>fɪnɪʃ</i>	<i>de</i>	zero
CORRECTED MEAN:	0.19	0.07	0.004	0.012	0.07	0.57
TOTAL N = 4692						
Temporal Relationship						
Anterior	.20	0.76	0.9	[]	.50	0.55
Sequential	0.7	0.28	.21	[]	.40	0.47
Non-anterior	.41	.65	.63	[]	.64	0.51
RANGE	50	48	69		24	8
Temporal Distance						
[+remote]	[]	.44	0.58	.46	.54	0.51
[-remote]	[]	.63	.32	.59	.41	0.47
RANGE		19	26	15	13	4
Lexical Stativity						
[+Stative]	.55	.48	[]	0.32	.38	[]
[+Punctual]	.48	.51	[]	.57	.54	[]
RANGE	7	3		25	16	
Temporal Adverb						
Adverb present	.33	.36	.65	0.17	0.63	.59
No adverb	.52	.51	.49	.54	.49	.49
RANGE	22	15	16	37	14	10
Mark on Preceding Verb						
Parallel mark	.72 (<i>kɔm</i>)	.82 (<i>dɔn</i>)	.95 (<i>bɪn</i>)	N/A	.75 (<i>de</i>)	.60 (\emptyset)
Other mark	.45	.49	.48		.46	.40
Zero mark	.41	.46	.51		.48	
RANGE	31	36	44		19	20
Negation						
Negative verb	.14	(KO=0)	[]	(KO=0)	.38	.86
Affirmative verb	.53	(0.05)	[]	(0.05)	.51	.47
RANGE	39				13	39
Note: Square brackets indicate that the factor group was not selected as significant. KO=0 indicates a "knockout", or (in this case) categorical absence of <i>dɔn</i> and <i>fɪnɪʃ</i> in past temporal reference contexts containing the factor of negation. Such tokens are removed from the variable rule run. The alternative factor can be considered to have no effect (factor weight = 0.50).						

Two additional factors test more general predictions about the role of contextual disambiguation in marking variability in creoles: PRESENCE OF A DISAMBIGUATING TEMPORAL ADVERB and MARK ON PRECEDING VERB. Contrary to the functional effect, whereby grammatical forms would surface only when absolutely required for informational purposes.

disambiguation from adverbs exerts an effect that is riot only moderate. hut also inconsistent. that any of the options will appear. This is because the strongest predictor that each will be selected. zero included, is after a verh on which it has already occurred.

Taken together. the results in Table 2 reveal the existence of pervasive variability in the past temporal reference sector of NPE. Aside from this. however. they confirm the received wisdom. The NPE past temporal reference system is clearly relational rather than absolute. and some of the overt forms are sensitive to features like temporal distance and temporal disamhiguation.

How do these observations apply to zero? If zero is a variant of one or more of the overt forms. the contribution of factors to its presence should he in inverse relationship (ceteris paribus) to the same factors' contribution to the presence of the other forms. From perusal of the last column of Tahle 2. it is plain that the factors affecting selection of the overt forms have virtually no effect on zero. First. the effects of TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP and TEMPORAL DISTANCE are exceedingly small in comparison with each of the other forms. LEXICAL STATIVITY was not selected as significant at all. Only two factors exert any influence on the choice of zero: the PARALLEL PROCESSING effect. whereby one zero leads to more. and especially. NEGATION: zero is strongly favored when the verh is in the iiegative. We have already suggested that the interdiction against overt marking of past temporal negatives is likely a substratum effect of Igbo. the L, of most of the speakers. We returni to the role of zero below.

We observed earlier that *bm* and *dɔn* appeared to be functioning as anterior markers. given the great contribution of that factor to their selection (Table 2). But recall from Table 1 that *bm* is exceedingly rare. only accounting for 1.5% of the data. How can these apparently conflicting effects be reconciled? As noted above, to assess the true role of these forms in marking anteriority (or any other segment of the past time domain). we must take the semantic *contexts* as a reference point. and examine the distribution of forms across them. Consider Tables 3-6.

Table 3: Percent Distribution of Forms by TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP

Variants	ANTERIOR		NON-ANTERIOR		SEQUENTIAL	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
zero	60	523	57	868	51	1049
<i>kɔm</i>	7	60	16	240	38	791
<i>dɔn</i>	19	169	14	209	3	65
<i>bm</i>	5	44	1	19	0	3
<i>de</i>	7	65	11	176	5	112
<i>fɔmɔ</i>	1	6	1	19	2	39
TOTAL ¹⁰		867		1531		2059

Table 3 confirms that of 867 anterior contexts isolated. *bm* marks no more than 5 % of them. Interestingly. *dɔn* marks many more. 19%. Table 4 repeats this exercise by examining TEMPORAL DISTANCE contexts.

Observe that *dɔn* occurs relatively frequently in (anterior) non-remote contexts as conipared to *bm* (which never occurs here). explaining the preponderance of the former in anterior relations in Table 3. But *dɔn* is still only used in 15% of non-remote contexts. the remainder of which either co-occur with another overt form. usually *kɔm*. or. even more

typically, remain unmarked. Of course it may be objected that the overall rates of occurrence depicted in Tables 3 and 4 obscure any differential usage of forms according to the stativity of the predicate. Accordingly, we now examine their distribution as a function of stativity, as in Table 5.

Variants	REMOTE		NON-REMOTE	
	%	N	%	N
zero	56	819	51	723
<i>kəm</i>	23	753	25	358
<i>dəm</i>	8	264	15	211
<i>hm</i>	2	66	0	7
<i>de</i>	9	287	6	83
<i>fmɪs</i>	1	37	2	28
TOTAL		3226		1410

Variants	PUNCTUAL		STATIVE	
	%	N	%	N
zero	54	1872	58	680
<i>kəm</i>	25	879	21	242
<i>dəm</i>	10	336	12	147
<i>hm</i>	1	46	2	27
<i>de</i>	8	293	6	75
<i>fmɪs</i>	2	60	1	7
TOTAL		3486		1178

Table 5 confirms that lexical stativity is not a distinguishing factor in the choice of any of the forms: the percentages across punctual and stative contexts are essentially the same.

An inescapable finding of Tables 3 through 5 is that zero is by far the most frequently used option in each of the contexts examined. This is of course also evident from the very disparate *corrected means*, or overall tendencies of occurrence, in the six independent variable rule runs in Table 2. The corrected mean for zero is the highest, at .57, while that of the overt forms ranges from a high of only .19 for *kəm* to a low of .004 for *hm*. The likelihood that any of the overt forms will surface is thus very small.

Without taking into account disparities in overall rate of occurrence, the analyses in Table 2 obscure the fact that while *hm*, for example, was shown to be highly favored in anterior contexts (with a probability of .90), it actually marks only a very small percentage of such contexts (Table 3). To permit comparison of the probabilities that each of the forms will occur in a given context while at the same time controlling for their overall frequency of occurrence in that context, we reanalyzed the data according to the *combined* effect of CORRECTED MEAN and FACTOR WEIGHT, as in Table 6. This allows us to compare the probabilities for a given factor *across* independent runs, in addition to the more traditional comparison of factor weights *within* a single run. The result is a composite picture of the entire past temporal reference system, permitting assessment of the true role of each form in it.

Table 6 gives strong confirmation of our impressions based on the percentages in Tables 3, 4 and 5. The results for the TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP, TEMPORAL DISTANCE and

MARK ON PRECEDING VERB make clear that certain contexts highly favor certain forms. But even the *iiist* apparently specific of these forms —*bm*— whose probability of occurrence in (remote) anterior contexts we have seen to be very high, is actually extremely infrequent even in this most favored context. The probability that *bm* will occur, when its overall tendency of occurrence is factored in, is now only .04. Compare this with the vastly increased probability (.62) that zero will occur in the same anterior context! This observation can simply be repeated across the board, as can be seen by inspecting the rows featuring the probabilities of occurrence of forms across contexts. In every context and for every form, the probability that the overt form will be selected is negligible when compared to that of zero. How can these results be interpreted?

Table 6: Six independent variable rule analyses of the contribution of factors selected as significant to the probability that each form will be used in past temporal reference contexts in NPE, considering the combined effect of CORRECTED MEAN + FACTOR WEIGHT

	<i>kɔm</i>	<i>dɔm</i>	<i>bm</i>	<i>fɔɪ</i>	<i>de</i>	zero
TOTAL N = 4692						
Temporal Relationship						
Anterior	.06	.20	.04	.01	.07	.62
Sequential	.35	.03	.00	.01	.05	.53
Non-anterior	.14	.12	.01	.01	.12	.58
Temporal Distance						
[+remote]	0.19	.06	.01	.01	.08	0.58
[-remote]	.20	.12	.00	.02	.05	0.53
Lexical Stativity						
[+Stative]	0.22	.07	.01	.01	.04	.56
[+Punctual]	.18	.07	.00	.01	.08	.56
Temporal Adverb						
Adverb present	0.1	0.04	.01	.00	.11	0.65
No adverb	.20	0.07	.00	.01	.07	0.55
Mark on Preceding Verb						
Parallel mark	.38 (<i>kɔm</i>)	.26 (<i>dɔm</i>)	.08 (<i>bm</i>)	N/A	.18 (<i>de</i>)	.66 (0)
Other mark	0.16	.07	.00		.06	0.46
Zero mark	.14	.06	.00		.06	
Negation						
Negative verb	.04	(KO=0)	.00	(KO=0)	.04	.89
Affirmative verb	.21	(0.07)	.01	(0.011)	.07	.53
Note: The figure .00 is due to rounding; it indicates a non-zero weight of less than .005. For explanation of the knockout factor, see note at the bottom of Table 2.						

IV.2. Tense/Aspect Forms in NPE

It is clear that NPE makes productive use of tense/aspect distinctions like temporal relationship, temporal distance and extended processes. We have demonstrated that some of the forms examined here are highly associated with such distinctions, e.g. *bni* with anterior remote past, *dɔm* with anterior proximate past, and *kɔm* with sequential past. It is equally clear

that overt marking of these distinctions is far from obligatory, as most descriptions of creoles in general, and NPE in particular, would have it, but rather, variable. Aiiy suggestion that the bare verbs have been contextually disambiguated, as is said to be typical of overt morphological marking in creoles, does not apply here. On the contrary, the contributions of factors testing this effect (i.e. DISAMBIGUATING TEMPORAL ADVERB, and especially, MARK ON PRECEDING VERB in Table 2) reveal no tendency for overt forms to surface when they are sole bearers of grammatical information. Moreover, most of the past temporal reference contexts we have isolated carry no grammatical indication of tense or aspect at all, other than what is encoded in the (bare) verb itself. This is in striking contrast to the behavior of fully (or even highly) grammaticized morphemes, which are used not only when the meanings they supply are necessary, but also entirely redundantly (e.g. Bybee 1994:235). The fact that none of the overt forms predominates in any of the contexts it is said to "mark" is damaging to the claim that these are structurally specified grammatical markers.

What then is the status of these overt forms? Our findings suggest that they are forms with grammatical meaning, albeit ones that have not yet completely grammaticized formally to the status of full-fledged morphemes. To evaluate this proposal, we now operationalize a number of indices of grammaticization and apply them to these candidates for marker status.

IV.3. Measuring Grammaticization

Although any attempt at precise segmentation of the continuum resulting from grammaticization processes remains arbitrary, there is general agreement (e.g. Bybee 1985; Bybee et al. 1994; Heine et al. 1991a; Heine & Reh 1984; Lehmann 1982; 1986) on the most salient characteristics associated with them. These include semantic bleaching, increase in syntactic significance, fixation of syntactic position, obligatoriness in some contexts and ungrammaticality in others, semantic, morphosyntactic and phonetic coalescence, loss of phonetic substance and increase in frequency of use.

Table 7: Indices of grammaticization (Bybee et al. 1994) for selected candidates for marker status in NPE

Forms	INDEX				
	OVERALL FREQUENCY	FREQUENCY IN ASSOCIATED SEMANTIC CONTEXT	PHONOLOGICAL REDUCTION	RIGIDIFICATION OF SYNTACTIC POSITION	
			consonant assimilation	open class intervention	position preceding verb
<i>fɪnɪs</i>	1.4%	N/A	0%	47%	0%
<i>bɪn</i>	2%	5% (anterior)	7%	3%	96%
<i>dɪn</i>	10%	15% (non-remote)	13%	3%	100%
<i>kɪn</i>	23%	38% (sequential)	44%	5%	99%

Table 7 applies to the overt forms used in NPE past temporal reference contexts five indices adapted from Bybee et al. (1994) measuring, respectively, frequency, phonological reduction, and rigidification of syntactic position. These include: 1) overall frequency of occurrence, 2) frequency of occurrence in the specific semantic context with which the form is purportedly associated, 3) consonant assimilation, a measure of phonological reduction, and two measures of syntactic placement: whether open class items are permitted to intervene

between the particle and the main verb, and position of the particle with regard to the main verb.

The regularity of the relationship between indices and forms is striking. The form that is highest in overall frequency —*kɔm*— also scores highest on each of the other measures. It occurs in specifically sequential contexts exponentially more than any other overt form, it undergoes far more phonological reduction, it is virtually never separated from its main verb by intervening material and almost always appears in the fixed position preceding the main verb. Compare *hm*, which we have seen to be extremely rare, not only overall, but also in specifically anterior contexts. *hm* may be observed to undergo far less phonological reduction, admit more intervention of open-class material between it and the main verb, and to be placed in more syntactic positions. And the other forms are neatly ranged around these, forming a continuum, with the intermediate *dɔn* scoring higher, and the rarer *fmɪʂ*, lower, on these measures. Thus, if there is any candidate for morpheme status in the NPE past temporal reference system, it certainly is not *hni*, contra claims to that effect in virtually all the literature on NPE in particular, and English-based creoles more generally. The most highly grammaticized form in the system is clearly *kɔm*¹¹.

This observation is bolstered by a comparison of the distribution of forms across the individuals in our sample, as in Table 8. It is clear that *kɔm* is abundantly used by most speakers. In contrast, two thirds of the tokens of *hm* come from the same two. A full third of the speakers never used *hm* at all.

Table 8: Overall Distribution of Variants by Speaker

Speaker#	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Variant	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
zero	201	200	108	133	417	160	342	245	154	124	42	272	212	2610
<i>kɔm</i>	76	92	41	178	53	13	4	75	13	18	4	287	233	1087
<i>dɔn</i>	54	36	33	8	61	37	48	41	22	22	31	46	42	481
<i>de</i>	21	20	7	17	53	15	28	53	23	13	5	71	45	371
<i>hm</i>	28	2	7	-	4	4	1	20	-	-	-	6	1	73
<i>fmɪʂ</i>	5	7	4	13	5	4	2	-	-	-	-	14	14	68
TOTAL	385	357	200	349	593	233	425	434	212	177	82	696	547	4690

Figure 2, based on Tables 3 and 4, provides perhaps the first empirically-motivated portrait of a grammaticization continuum, illustrating with the NPE past temporal reference system. The bars indicate the portion each form currently occupies of the subdomains representing the different temporal relationships and distances.

Because grammaticization involves diachronic change, it is most meaningfully assessed by comparing different stages of a language. Especially instructive in this regard are Fayer's (1982; 1986) analyses of 18th and 19th century WAPE texts. Interestingly, throughout the period she studied, there was almost no evidence of the cohort of markers typical of creoles. *dɔn*, the only form denoting aspect attested in the early data, is vanishingly rare, with an overall frequency of only .3% (Fayer 1982: 313). *hm* increases from a low of .2% in the 18th century to a high of 4% in some of the 19th century texts. At the outset, verbs were normally disambiguated by temporal conjunctions and prepositional phrases occurring in sentence-initial

position. By the 19th century, Fayer notes a qualitative change in distributional patterns: temporal modification appears in other sentence positions (p. 286), and preverbal markers increase in frequency (p. 313).




Figure 2: Percent distribution of forms across the past temporal reference domain according to temporal distance and temporal relationship.

These data, taken together with the contemporary distributions in Table 1, provide unequivocal evidence that use of overt forms in NPE has increased dramatically over the duration¹². Observe that *don*, once accounting for no more than .3% of the past temporal reference space, has now risen to a full 10%; *de*, with no earlier textual attestations, now occupies 8%; even *bn* has increased from near non-existent to 1.5%¹³. But zero still accounts for most of the conceptual space.

IV.5. The Role of Zero and Overt Forms in Marking Past Time

We may now return to the question raised earlier regarding the function of zero in NPE. Can we infer from the progression of overt forms along the grammaticization cline that zero signals the absence of one of them? To qualify as a zero marker, according to Bybee et al. (1994: 239), the interpretation of the zero-marked form must be "specific and unambiguous", and the inferences speakers make regarding its choice should form part of its explicit meaning. If this were the case, we should observe a particular association of zero with one or more of the semantic subdomains we identified. None obtains. Our finding that zero is preferred over every overt form in each context, with no particular favoring effect for any (except the substratal negation effect) militates against identifying it as the specific marker of any one of them. Because the overt forms occupy such a small part of each semantic subdomain (Figure 2), and even more damaging to their identification as grammatical morphemes—because they may occur in several of them (albeit with differing degrees of frequency), none of them can be said

to unambiguously signal a specific meaning. It follows that zero cannot signal the absence of that meaning (Labov 1984).

What then is the function of these forms in marking past time? Bybee (1994: 239) distinguishes "zero meaning", i.e. the meaning expressed by a zero *marker*, and "open meaning", conveyed by the absence of an (optional) grammatical morpheme. We suggest that zero has "open meaning": it functions as the default marker of past temporal reference. In this sense its use is similar to the "neutral" form described by Welmers (1973) for Efik, which is used simply to state what happened without any particular emphasis, or the NPE "invariant form" described by Agheysi (1971: 133), which contrasts with those conveying "tense and aspect variations". In order to *divert* the basic tendency toward the neutral, or default, interpretation of past time to, say, a narrative or sequential one, *kom* can be employed. For a continuous reading, *de* may be selected. For an anterior remote meaning, *bin* is an option, and so on. As pointed out by Sankoff (1990: 309) in connection with *ben* in Sranan and Tok Pisin, selection of an overt form is not an automatic part of the syntax, but proceeds according to an optional system, as is typical of the initial stages of grammaticization. While semantic distinctions are being created, use of the forms expressing them must be sensitive to discourse-pragmatic concerns.

Open meaning may develop into zero meaning via some of the same mechanisms motivating grammaticization of overt material (Bybee 1994). Chief among them are increased frequency of an overt form and concomitant licensing of the inference that, in its absence, the meaning associated with it was not intended. Eventually, other senses come to be conventionally associated with the absence of the form. This has not yet occurred in NPE.

The distribution of zero and overt forms in NPE bears little resemblance to the creole prototype. Nor does it derive from the superstrate, which has an entirely different system of past time marking via inflection, i.e. *-ed*, as the default option. We suggest that the observed variability in zero marking is a residuum of the substrate. A number of independent lines of evidence point in this direction. For one thing, the conceptual space covered by zero in NPE corresponds closely to that covered by the unmarked past in at least some West African languages. For another, the strong effect of negation (Table 2) is a known characteristic of Igbo. Finally, we have already observed significant substratum effects on other unrelated areas of the NPE grammar (Tagliamonte *et al.* 1997).

CONCLUSIONS

By taking *past time* as our reference point, rather than the *markers* said to encode it, we have succeeded in delimiting the different semantic subdomains making up the NPE past temporal reference sector. This in turn enabled us to scientifically test the role of each, as well as that of lexical stativity, in predicting the occurrence of overt and zero forms in discourse. We have established that relative tense organization of the past temporal reference system is certainly operative in NPE. On the other hand, our findings do not support the characterization of aspect prominence typically associated with creoles in general, and NPE in particular. This can be inferred from the findings that 1) overt aspectual forms are rarely used, and 2) LEXICAL STATIVITY does not distinguish among them or zero¹⁴. We stress that these results could only have been revealed by examination of the different temporal *contexts*, in addition to the usual analysis of the distribution of forms across them.

Categorical perception coupled with the structuralist tendency to ascribe a single function to each form —like *bm* embodying anterior temporal relationship— together conspire in promoting the widespread notion that the forms studied here are grammatical *markers* of specific meanings. We have shown that only a small minority of NPE contexts with a particular semantic reference are accompanied by an overt form claimed to encode this reference. Moreover, the overt forms typically appear in more than one context. Thus although they have grammaticized considerably over the past couple of centuries, none of the forms considered here, zero included, may be said to have as yet attained the status of grammatical *marker*. Rather we have suggested that selection of an overt form may serve special discourse-pragmatic needs, typical of earlier stages of grammaticization. It follows that the selection of zero cannot be inferred to unambiguously signal the absence of a specific meaning, *pace* the Bickertonian scenario, whereby each form, overt and null, has a unique interpretation.

NOTES:

1. Though identification of the interaction between temporal reference and stativity as a particularly “creole” characteristic is usually attributed to Bickerton; it was already noted in Welmer’s (1973) descriptions of West African languages, as well as in Aghyisi’s (1971) description of NPE.
2. Codes in parentheses refer to speaker number and location of her/his utterance in the NPE corpus. Transcription protocol generally follows Aghyisi (1971) where possible.
3. Recent work in creolistics makes clear that pidgins and creoles in fact exhibit far more diversity in their TMA systems than previously assumed (e.g. (Mufwene 1986: 1991) Singler (1990: xiv) and several of the papers therein).
4. Schneider (1966) equates *bm* with undifferentiated past.
5. See Tagliamonte et al. (1997) for detailed description of the corpus.
6. The few verbs for which one of these relationships could not be inferred were excluded from the calculations. Further information regarding the coding of temporal relationships in discourse can be found in Tagliamonte (1991) and Tagliamonte & Poplack (1993).
7. Pilot tests of all possible resulting combinations yielded substantially similar results; in what follows we present those for *lexical* stativity, and distinguish only punctual and stative verbs.
8. Moreover, the overt marks surfacing in this domain will be observed in ensuing analyses to be used to say *different* things. Thus they do not correspond to the strict definition of variants of a variable as alternative ways of saying the same thing.
9. Combinations of more than one form (often cited in the literature) are extremely rare and are limited to *dɔm + kɔm* sequences (.08%, $N=4$). The only exception is *de*, which co-occurs with all the other forms. Recall that *de* is a continuous marker which, unlike the other markers examined here, has no independent connotation of past: we include it only by virtue of its occurrence in past temporal reference contexts. In Tables 2 and 6, members of 89 sequences were examined independently with the remainder of their cohort.
10. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.
11. To any suggestion that the discrepancy between our results and the claims made for NPE may be due to the contact these speakers have had with Ottawa English over the past five years, we respond that even if contact-induced grammatical change were possible over a time span of five years or less (itself highly doubtful), the behavior of *kɔm*

has no counterpart in English. It thus cannot be attributed to this source. See Tagliamonte *et al.* (1997) for fuller discussion of this issue. Such discrepancies are often observed when empirical analyses of spoken language data are compared with other types of analysis. (Cf. Bickerton (1975) with Sankoff (1990) and Myhill (1991) for another case in point)

12. In contrast, English-like inflectional and auxiliary constructions, which make up the balance (nearly 30%) of the tense and aspect markers in the *Diary of Antera Duke* (Fayer 1982: 278) have all but disappeared.

13. The most dramatic change would appear to involve the current front-runner, *kaɲ*, although it is unclear whether its absence from Fayer's counts is due to its absence from the texts or to its not having been considered.

14. Nor is this a recent innovation. Fayer's early WAPE data include (extremely rare) attestation of only one aspect marker, *daɲ*. Interestingly, there is no evidence of a LEXICAL STATIVITY effect there either (*ibid.*: 313-14). These findings challenge the characterization of aspect as the major underlying mechanism of the past temporal reference system in (earlier or contemporary) NPE.

REFERENCES

- Agheyisi, R. N. (1971) *West African Pidgin English: Simplification and simplicity*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Agheyisi, R. N. (1984) «Linguistic implications of the changing role of Nigerian Pidgin English», in *English World-Wide* 5(2): 211-233.
- Bakker, P. (1995) «Pidgins», in J. Arends, P. Muysken & N. Smith (Eds.) *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 24-39.
- Bickerton, D. (1974) «Creolization, linguistic universals, natural semantics and the brain», in *Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(3): 124-141.
- Bickerton, D. (1975) *Dynamics of a creole system*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bickerton, D. (1979) «The status of *bin* in the Atlantic creoles», in I. Hancock (Ed.), *Readings in Creole Studies*. Ghent: E. Story-Scientia. 309-314.
- Bickerton, D. (1981) *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma
- Bickerton, D. (1984) «The language bioprogram hypothesis», in *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2): 173-221
- Bybee, J. (1994) «The Grammaticization of zero: Asymmetries in tense and aspect systems», in W. Pagliuca (Ed.), *Perspectives on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 235-254.
- Bybee, J., Perkins, R. & Pagliuca, W. (1994) *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bybee, J. L. (1985) *Morphology. A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cheshire, J. (1982) *Variation in an English dialect: A sociolinguistic study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christian, D., Wolfram, W. & Dube, N. (1988) *Variation and change in geographically isolated communities: Appalachian English and Ozark English*. Vol. 74. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: American Dialect Society.

Emenanjo, E. N. (1985) *Auxiliaries N1 Igbo syntax: A comparative study*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Ibadan.

Faraclas, N. G. (1987) «Creolization and the tense-aspect-modality system of Nigerian Pidgin», in *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 9(1): 45-59.

Faraclas, N. G. (1989) *A grammar of Nigerian Pidgin*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California at Berkeley.

Faye-i, J. M. (1982) *Written Pidgin English in Old Calabar in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Fayer, J. M. (1986) «Pidgins as written languages: Evidence from eighteenth century Old Calabar», in *Anthropological Linguistics* 28(3): 313-319.

Guy, G. (1980) «Variation in the group and the individual: The case of final stop deletion», in W. Labov (Ed.), *Locating Language in Time and Space*. New York: Academic Press. 1-36.

Heine, B., Claudi, U. & Hünnemeyer, F. (1991a) «From cognition to grammar: Evidence from African languages», in E. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 149-187.

Heine, B., Claudi, U. & Hünnemeyer, F. (1991b) *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heine, B. & Reh, M. (1984) *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Hopper, P. J. & Traugott, E. C. (1993) *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, A. & Trudgill, P. (1979) *English accents and dialects: An introduction to social and regional varieties of British English*. London: Edward Arnold.

Labov, W. (1984) «The interpretation of zeroes», in W. Dressler (ed.), *Phonologica 1984*. Proceedings of the Fifth International Phonology Meeting, Eisenstadt. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press. 135-156

Lehmann, C. (1983) *Thoughts on Grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch, Vol. 1. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts 48*. Cologne: Universität zu Köln, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Lehmann, C. (1986) «Grammaticalization and linguistic typology», in *General Linguistica* 26(1): 3-23.

Lo Cascio, V. & Co Vet (1986) *Temporal structure in sentence and discourse*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Mufwene, S. S. M. (1983) «Observations on time reference in Jamaican and Guyanese creoles», in *English World-Wide* 4(2): 199-229.

Mufwene, S. S. M. (1986) «The universalist and substrate hypotheses complement one another», in P. Muysken & N. Smith (Eds.), *Substrata Versus Universals in Creole Genesis*. Creole Language Library (CLL). I. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 129-162.

Mufwene, S. S. M. (1991) «Pidgins, creoles, typology, and markedness», in F. Byrne & T. Huebner (Eds.), *Development and structures of creole languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 123-143.

Mufwene, S. S. M. (1996) «Creolization and grammaticization: What creolistics could contribute to research on grammaticization», in P. Baker & A. Sycia (Eds.), *Changing meanings, changing functions: Papers relating to grammaticization in contact languages*. Westminster: University of Westminster Press. 5-28.

Muysken, P. (1981) «Creole tense/mood/aspect system: The unmarked case?», in P. Muysken (ed.), *Generative Studies on Creole Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris. 181-199.

Myhill, J. (1991) «Typological text analysis: Tense and aspect in creoles and second languages», in T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theories*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 93-121.

Neu, H. (1981) [(Ranking of constraints on /t,d/ deletion in American English: A statistical analysis], in W. Lahov (Ed.), *Locating language in time and space*. New York: Academic Press. 37-54.

Nwachukwu, P. A. (1983) *Towards an Igbo literary standard*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Okeke, V. O. (1984) *Key to the Igbo language*. Obosi: Pacific College Press Ltd.

Pagliuca, W. (Ed) (1994) *Perspectives on grammaticization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Patrick, P. (1991) «Creoles at the inersection of variable processes: -t,d-deletion and past-marking in the Jamaican mesolect», in *Language Variation and Change* 3(2): 171-189.
- Poplach, S. & Tagliamonte, S. (1989) «There's no tenie like the present: Verbal -s inflection in Early Black English», in *Language Variation and Change* 1(1): 47-84.
- Quirk, R., Greenhauni, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, I. (1985) *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. New York: Longman.
- Rand, D. & Sankoff, D. (1990) *GoldVarb. A variable rule application for the Macintosh*. Centre de recherches mathématiques. Université de Montréal.
- Sankoff, G. (1977a) «Creolization and syntactic change in New Guinea Tok Pisin», in M. Sanches & M. Blount (Eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language change*. New York: Academic Press. 119-130.
- Sankoff, G. (1977b) «Variability and explanation in language and culture: Cliticization in New Guinea Tok Pisin», in M. Saville-Troike (Ed.), *Linguistics and Anthropology*. Georgetown University Press. 59-73.
- Sankoff, G. (1979) «The genesis of a language», in K. Hill (Ed.), *The Genesis of Language*. Aiiii Arboi. Michigan: Karoma Press. 23-47.
- Sankoff, G. (1990) «The grammaticalization of tense and aspect in Toh Pisin and Sranan», in *Language Variation and Change* 2(3) 295-313
- Sankoff, G. & Brown, P. (1976) «The origins of syntax in discourse», in *Language* 52(3): 631-666.
- Scherre, M. & Naro, A. (1991) «Marking in discourse: "Birds of a feather"», in *Language Variation and Change* 3(1): 23-32.
- Schneider, G. D. (1966) «West African Pidgin English -An Overview of Phonology-Morphology», in *Journal of English linguistics* 1: 49-56.
- Singler, J. V. (ed) (1990) *Pidgin and Creole tense-mood-aspect systems*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Singler, J. V. (1992) «Nativization and pidgin/creole genesis: A reply to Bickerton», in *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 7(2): 319-333.
- Tagliamonte, S. (1991) *A matter of time: Past temporal reference verbal structures in Samaná English and the Ex-slave Recordings*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Ottawa.
- Tagliamonte, S. & Poplack, S. (1988) «How Black English *past* got to the present: Evidence fromi Samaná», in *Language in Society* 17(4): 513-533.

Tagliamonte, S. & Poplack, S. (1993) «The zero-marked verb: Testing the creole hypothesis». in *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 8(2): 171-206.

Tagliamonte, S., Poplack, S. & Eze, E. (1997) «Pluralization patterns in Nigerian Pidgin English». in *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 12(1): 103-129.

Welmers, W. E. (1973) *African language structures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Winford, D. (1985) «The concept of "diglossia" in Caribbean creole situations». in *Language in Society* 14(3): 345-356.