The Lesser Antillean Origins of Guianese

Mikael Parkvall
Associate Professor, Institute for Linguistics, Stockholm University,
Stockholm, Sweden
Corresponding author
parkvall@ling.su.se

Bart Jacobs
Adjunct Professor, Institute for Romance Philology, Jagiellonian University
Krakow, Krakow, Poland
bart.jacobs@uj.edu.pl

Abstract

This paper investigates the origins of Guianese French Creole. Whereas the existing literature assumes Guianese was formed *in situ*, we argue the creole is in fact genetically related to Lesser Antillean French Creole. We support our hypothesis by means of a range of comparative linguistic data. Furthermore, a historical framework is provided that accounts for linguistic transfer from the Lesser Antilles to French Guiana in the second half of the 17th century.

Keywords

Guianese French Creole – Lesser Antilles – Gbe – Martinican – Guadeloupean – TAM markers – Surnames – Toponymy

1   Introduction[1]

The colonial expansion in the 16th to 19th centuries and subsequent linguistic encounters between European and African languages led to the emergence of

---

a number of new and heavily restructured language varieties known as pidgins and creoles. Although the lexica of these young languages are typically derived from the respective colonial language, the origins of their grammars are heavily debated, yielding a variety of creole genesis hypotheses ranging from Bickerton's (1981 and elsewhere) Language Bioprogram to Relexification (Voorhoeve, 1973; Lefebvre, 1998) and from abrupt (Thomason and Kaufmann, 1988) to gradual (Arends, 1989) scenarios of creole genesis. It is clear, in any case, that if we want to understand creolisation, it is pivotal to know when and where creole languages were actually formed. Not seldom, scholars simply assume that a given creole was formed in the location where it is currently spoken, whereas on closer inspection quite a few creoles appear to have been brought in from elsewhere. Needless to say, only after determining the exact time and place of birth of a creole can we begin to investigate who was involved in the process, and under which conditions it was carried out. It is to this knowledge that the present article aims to contribute.

The French lexicon-creole of French Guiana (henceforth "Guianese") is a creole language with some 60,000 to 80,000 L1 and L2 speakers most of whom reside in French Guiana (Pfänder, 2013; Alby and Léglise, 2013) (Map 1). It is one of between twenty and forty different languages spoken in the country

MAP 1   Cayenne and the Lesser Antilles. The map indicates the islands where Lesser
             Antillean French Creole was (probably) spoken in the second half of the 17th
             century and excludes those where it was introduced at a later date.

(Alby and Léglise, 2007: 3–5). Besides Guianese, the country harbours speakers of, amongst others, Amerindian languages, other French-lexified creoles (particularly Haitian and Lesser Antillean), the English-lexified creoles of Surinam, and of course French (Alby and Léglise, 2007: 472–475). Guianese is also one of the over a dozen creole languages around the world whose lexicon is based on French. It is thought to have emerged in Cayenne[2] in the period between 1660 and 1690 when the local plantation economy and corresponding slave trade gathered momentum. Guianese has received only a moderate amount of attention from creolists in the past (notwithstanding Corne, 1971; Fauquenoy, 1972, 1974, 1979; and Bull, 1992), but recent years have seen an increase in documentation on and discussion of the language. This is primarily manifested in works by Pfänder (1996, 2000), Schlupp (1997), Damoiseau (2007), Jennings (1995, 1999, 2009), Wiesinger (2013, 2016, 2019) and Jennings and Pfänder (2015, 2018).

Jennings and Pfänder (2018) (henceforth J&P, 2018), a monograph with a historical and a linguistic part, can be seen as the state of the art with regard to the formation of the language. J&P make the following two principle claims:

i)   Guianese was formed in a bilingual (French-Gbe) scenario, so that most of the grammatical structure of Guianese can be traced to Gbe.

ii)   Guianese was formed locally in Cayenne, and is not genetically related to the French-lexicon creoles of the Lesser Antilles.[3]

We think both claims merit being questioned, and that there is even good reason to reject them. The present article is one in a series of two in which we present an alternative view. Jacobs and Parkvall (2021) specifically tackle the first claim, arguing that the Gbe influence is (vastly) overstated.

The second claim is the topic of this paper. Section 2 argues that the linguistic correspondences between Guianese and Lesser Antillean are indicative of a genetic lineage, and thus that the former should historically be seen as a (at

---

2   Cayenne is the capital of French Guiana, and in the period that concerns us here the colony consisted only of that town and its immediate surroundings.

3   The French-lexicon creole varieties of the Lesser Antilles constitute, in our view, one language, and we shall refer to them jointly as Lesser Antillean. It is, however, not uncommon, to give language status to the variety of each political entity. The subvarieties usually included are the creoles of eastern St. Barth (with an offshoot on St. Thomas), Guadeloupe, Dominica, Martinique, St. Lucia, Dominica, Grenada and Trinidad. As always, linguistic differences do not necessarily follow political boundaries, and the variation *within* these islands is not seldom as considerable as *between* them. Also, several of the islands were conquered by the British around 1800, while others were retained by France. Therefore, the varieties have during the past two centuries been exposed to differing prestige languages, and thereby differing linguistic influences. Their original genealogical unity is generally agreed upon, but is of course more obvious diachronically than synchronically.

least partial) descendant of the latter. In Section 3 we bolster our case historically. We outline why we think J&P's historical reconstruction is tenuous at best, and how, in turn, we think the linguistic transfer from the Lesser Antilles to Cayenne could have come about in the second half of the 17th century.

2   Linguistics

Few, if any, question that Guianese and Lesser Antillean are, at present, two separate languages rather than dialects of one and the same language. Yet, we suspect that Lesser Antillean provided the principle input into the late-17th-century formation of what eventually developed into today's Guianese. In this section we focus on a number of features which J&P (2015, 2018) put forth to strengthen their claims that Guianese is not genetically related to Lesser Antillean (Section 2.1) and that Gbe had an unusually large impact on the formation of Guianese (Section 2.2). We use these features as a springboard for detailed comparisons of the creoles' verbal systems – particularly tense/aspect/mood (TAM) markers – and question words. The importance of TAM markers for the diachronic analysis of creole languages is evident: besides being paradigmatically organised, these markers typically differ radically from the lexifier systems, making them useful indicators of potential genetic affiliations (or the lack thereof) between creoles.[4] The same holds for interrogatives: these too can be and have been used to reconstruct early stages of languages and establish historical links between them (Matras, 2003: 159; Muysken, 2008: 90), also in the specific context of creole studies (Muysken and Smith, 1990; Clements, 2000).

We first address a number of features in the verbal domain which J&P present as setting Guianese and Lesser Antillean apart (Section 2.1). As we shall see, far from demonstrating linguistic distance between the creoles, these features actually offer sound illustrations of the close resemblance between the respective verbal systems. Section 2.2 analyses features which J&P claim showcase Gbe transfers in Guianese. Again we will see that these features, if anything, in fact provide evidence in favour of a genetic link between Guianese and Lesser Antillean. Furthermore in this section, we seize the opportunity to look in detail at similarities between the creoles' interrogative paradigms.

---

4   With specific regards to French-lexified creoles, see amongst others Goodman (1964), Pfänder (2000), Vaillant (2009); for creoles in general see for instance Bickerton (1981), Singler ([ed.], 1990), or in fact any handbook on creole languages.

In Section 2.3 we summarise the correspondences, highlight some differences, and discuss the implications of the data.

2.1   *Guianese vs. Lesser Antillean: Verbal System*

Guianese and Lesser Antillean TAM markers are not only similar, they are in fact identical. In both, there is a past *te*, an imperfective *ka* and an irrealis *ke*.[5] The imperfective marker *ka* is particularly meaningful as it lacks an accepted etymology. There are proposals in the literature, but none is without problems. Clearly, the more unexpected a given item, the smaller the chance that the item would have made its way into two languages independently. And indeed, all other French-lexicon creoles have settled for other options. Below we will highlight a number of shared intricacies illustrating that the TAM markers not only correspond in form but very much also in function.[6] The example sentences presented in Table 1 are based on J&P (2015: 47).[7]

Based on those examples, J&P (2015: 47) admit that "at first glance the TAM systems of both languages are the same". However, they then proceed to point out differences which in their view testify to the unrelatedness of the two creoles. To be precise, J&P (2015, 2018) list the following features as distinctive:

1.   The distinction between stative and dynamic verbs is crucial in Lesser Antillean, but not in Guianese. Most importantly, Guianese *ka* with stative verbs can yield a progressive reading, rather than an inchoative one, as in Lesser Antillean (J&P, 2015: 57; 2018: 115, 121).

2.   *Te* is past-before-past in Lesser Antillean, but simply past in Guianese (2015: 51; 2018: 125).

3.   Guianese has a deontic element *pu*, which is lacking in Lesser Antillean (2018: 135).

4.   Negative imperatives in Guianese can take the imperfective *ka* (2018: 138).

5.   In Lesser Antillean, *ka* expresses the habitual more often than the progressive (2015: 55; 2018: 115).

---

5   We agree with J&P that *ke* developed in comparatively recent times, probably in the 19th century, out of *ka* + *ale* 'to go'.

6   By means of additional illustration, the Appendix contains a juxtaposition of some of Hancock's (1987) example sentences as elicited for Lesser Antillean and Guianese by ourselves and by Daval-Markusen (2011). Hancock provided translations of 50 sentences into a large number of English-lexicon creoles, in order to highlight similarities and differences between them.

7   Throughout this article, creole examples are given in IPA, except when found in direct quotes.

TABLE 1   TAM particles in the two creoles

Creole (*both Guianese and Lesser Antillean*)	*English*
I Ø mãʒe	'S/he has eaten', 'S/he ate'
I ka mãʒe	'S/he is eating', 'S/he eats'
I te mãʒe	'S/he had eaten'
I ke mãʒe	'S/he will eat', 'S/he is going to eat'
I te ka mãʒe	'S/he used to eat', 'S/he was easting'
I ke ka mãʒe	'S/he will be eating'
I te ke mãʒe	'S/he would be eating', 'S/he would have eaten'

6.   Guianese is more prone to use *ka* with past reference without an explicit past marker (2015: 57; 2018: 115).

7.   The TAM particles in the early years of the creoles were distinct (2015: 47).

As we shall see, these features do not set the two languages apart anywhere near as neatly as J&P suggest, and in fact lend themselves to further illustrate some intrinsic similarities between the two creoles. Let us have a look at them one by one.

2.1.1   The Distinction Between Stative and Dynamic Verbs

J&P (2018: 115, 116) claim that Guianese *ka* "behaves differently [from Lesser Antillean *ka*]". They note, for instance, that in Martinican "stative verbs […] combine with *ka* […] only to express inchoative (e. g. *getting angry*)" (our emphasis), whereas in Guianese "[i]f so-called stative verbs are combined with *ka*, the default meaning is progressivity". Bizarrely, however, the example they give for Guianese to exemplify this is precisely the inchoative "getting angry" (1):

Guianese

(1)   *Ki   sa   u   ka   kolɛ?*
        Q   DEM   2S   IPFV   be.angry
        'Why are you getting angry?'[8]

---

8   Throughout this article, we follow the Leipzig glossing rules.

In the remainder of the same section the authors give examples which – unintentionally, we assume – illustrate that *ka* + stative verb predicates can indeed yield inchoative meanings in both Lesser Antillean and Guianese. Compare for instance Martinican *Timãmaj la ka bɛl* {child DEM IPFV be.beautiful} 'That child is becoming/growing beautiful' (J&P, 2018: 115) with Guianese *I ka blã* {3s IPFV be.white} 'it becomes/turns white' (2018: 117). Likewise, a pair such as Guianese *Ø plɛ̃* 'to be full' vs. *ka plɛ̃* 'to fill up/become full', presented by J&P (2018: 117, 118) as a stative-nonstative pair peculiar to Guianese, is in fact neatly mirrored in Lesser Antillean, exemplified here by Guadeloupean:

Lesser Antillean

(2a)   *Paɲe*   *-la*   **Ø**   *plɛ̃*
        basket   DEM   be.full
        'The basket is full.' (Tourneux and Barbotin, 2008: 299)

Lesser Antillean

(2b)   *Se*   *grɛn*   *diri*   **ka**   *plɛ̃*   *sak*
        COP   grain   rice   IPFV   be.full   sack
        'These are grains of rice [that] fill up the sack.' (Tourneux and
            Barbotin, 2008: 107)

The overlap between Lesser Antillean and Guianese in this area is illustrated further by the similarities in form and function between their respective stative verbs (Table 2), i. e. verbs that do not require *ka* in the present tense (but see 3a-c and 4a-c).

While some of these could be argued to be chance correspondences, the shared idiosyncrasies vis-à-vis the lexifier are too many to be discarded as meaningless. What is more, in both languages, counter to expectation, *ka* is sometimes used in fully stative predicates (3a-c; 4a-c).

Guianese

(3a)   [...]   *mun*   *ki*   **ka**   *rete*   *ãnã*   *lasal*   [...]
                 people   who   IPFV   stay   in   hall
                 'people who live in halls' (Schlupp, 1997: 51)

Lesser Antillean

(3b)   *I*   **ka**   **rete**   *ã*   *kote*   *ki*   *agoʃ*   *mɛ̃m.*
        3s   IPFV   stay   in   place   REL   left   really
        'He lives in a very remote place.' (Confiant, 2007)

TABLE 2　　　Stative verbs in Guianese and Lesser Antillean

Guianese (Schlupp, 1997: 35, 36)	Lesser Antillean (Pinalie and Bernabé, 1999: 70, 71; Confiant, 2007)	French (etymology, if different, in brackets)[a]	Gloss
ãvi	ãvi	avoir envie	'to want, to be in the mood for'
bɛ̃zwɛ̃ ~ buzwɛ̃	buzwɛ̃ ~ bizwɛ̃	avoir besoin	'to need'
divɛt ~ dwɛt	dwɛt	devoir	'to have to'
ɛ̃mɛ̃	ɛ̃mɛ̃	aimer	'to love'
fɛ̃	fɛ̃	avoir faim	'to be hungry'
gɛ̃	ni	avoir; être (gagner, tenir)	'to have; to exist'
ha(j)i ~ rai	haji ~ raji	haïr	'to hate'
k�õnɛt	kõnɛt	connaître	'to know (how to)'
kõprãn	kõprãn ~ kõpwãn[b]	comprendre	'to imagine'
kõtã	kõtã	aimer (être content)	'to like'
krɛ	kwɛ	croire	'to believe'
le	le	vouloir	'to want'
mijɔ, simjɔ, vomje	mije, simje	préférer (mieux, c'est mieux/meilleur, il vaut mieux)	'to prefer'
pɛ	pɛ	avoir peur	'to be afraid'
puve (pwe, pe)	pe	pouvoir	'to be able to'
sav(e)	sav(e)	savoir	'to know (facts)'
swɛf	swɛf	avoir soif	'to be thirsty'
val ~ vo	vo	valoir	'to be worth'

[a] Only infinitives are given here; clearly, the etymology is in some cases an inflected form.
[b] [w] is an allophone of /r/ in both varieties.

Lesser Antillean

(3c)　　I　　**ka**　　**rete**　　lwɛ̃.
　　　　3s　　IPFV　　stay　　far
　　　'He lives far away.' (Tourneux and Barbotin, 2008: 251)

Guianese

(4a) *Mo*   ***ka***   ***krɛ***   *ã*   *Bõdje*
      1S   IPFV   believe   PREP   God
      'I believe in God.' (Pfänder, 2013: example 52–53)

Lesser Antillean

(4b) *Ã̃*   ***ka***   *kwɛ*   *ã*   *Bõdje*
      1S   IPFV   believe   PREP   God
      'I believe in God.' (Tourneux and Barbotin, 2008: 220)

Lesser Antillean

(4c) *Se*   *meksitʃɛ̃*   *-ã*   *ka*   *kwɛ*   *ãdã*   *laviez*
      PL   Mexican   DEF   IPFV   believe   PREP   Virgin.Mary
      'The Mexicans believe in Virgin Mary.' (Confiant, 2007)

2.1.2   "*Te* is Past-Before-Past in Lesser Antillean, but Simply Past in Guianese"

As another difference between Guianese and Lesser Antillean J&P (2018: 124–128) present the fact that, among their informants, Guianese *te* conveys past and "only rarely" anterior: "While Martinican informants translated the French pluperfect with *té*, the French Guianese informants translated the pluperfect with Ø" (2018: 126). Again, however, J&P's own data seem to contradict this, with examples such as Guianese *I te ẽvite* 'He had invited' (2018: 125). Likewise, in a Guianese fairy-tale elicited by the authors, "To indicate that the journey to the friend's place lies prior to the story's main narrative, the speaker marks verbs with the past-tense marker *té*" (2018: 124), which is a rather classical description of an anterior marker. Moreover, other descriptions of Guianese that we have consulted, including Pfänder (2013), but also Schlupp (1997) who made an explicit effort to exclude Guianese lects that might be influenced by modern-day Lesser Antillean immigration, all provide descriptions of *te* closely resembling that of Lesser Antillean, i. e. as a marker for either past tense *or* anterior, depending on factors such as the narrative situation, the semantic context (stative vs. non-stative) and/or the register of the speaker. In fact, the meaning of *te* can alternate between past and anterior within one and the same utterance (Schlupp, 1997: 33).

Even if we were to assume the behaviour observed by J&P to be a real difference between Lesser Antillean *te* and Guianese *te*, suffice to note here that for many creole languages such variation is recorded as purely interlectal variation. For Jamaican Creole, for instance, Patrick (1999: 171) notes that anteriority

can be marked by either *ben* or Ø, depending on the speaker's register. In fact, mesolectal speakers of Jamaican can take recourse to a third anterior marker, namely *did*, suggesting that there is more variation in this particular domain within Jamaican than there is between Guianese and Lesser Antillean.

2.1.3   Deontic *Pu*

According to J&P (2018: 135, our emphasis), "In [Guianese] (*though not in other French creoles, such as Martinican Creole*), there is yet another deontic marker: *pou* ('for')". This alleged absence of *pu* outside of Guianese is contradicted by Pinalie and Bernabé (1999: 97ff) who consider *pu* one of the three principal Martinican deontic markers (8b, 8c). Incidentally, the other two are *dwɛt* (← *doit* 'must') and *fo* (← [*il*] *faut* '[it is] necessary'), both of which are indeed also found in Guianese with the same form and meaning:

Guianese

(5a)   *sa*   *ki*   ***fo***
         DEM   REL   need
         'that which is necessary' (Schlupp, 1997: 388; cf. J&P, 2018: 134)

Lesser Antillean

(5b)   *sa*   *ki*   ***fo***
         DEM   REL   need
         'that which is necessary' (Pinalie and Bernabé, 1999: 97)

Guianese

(6a)   *So*   *madam*   ***dwɛt***   *pati*
         3S.POSS   lady   must   leave
         'His wife must leave.' (Schlupp, 1997: 322)

Lesser Antillean

(6b)   *U*   ***dwɛt***   *pati*
         2S   must   leave
         'You must leave.' (Pinalie and Bernabé, 1999: 99)

    J&P (2018: 135) add that Guianese typically "places *pou* before the subject pronoun". This too is wholly unremarkable in the insular varieties:

Guianese

(7a)   ***Pu***   *li*   *kõpran*
         for   3s   understand
         'He should understand.' (J&P, 2018: 135)

Lesser Antillean

(7b) *Se*   ***pu***   *nu*   *pati*
      COP   for   1p   leave
      'We should/must leave.' (Pinalie and Bernabé, 1999: 98)

Lesser Antillean

(7c) *Mi*   *sa*   ***pu***   *u*   *fɛ!*
      here   DEM   for   2s   make
      'Here's what you have to do!' (Tourneux and Barbotin, 2008: 326)

Another Guianese deontic marker singled out by J&P (2018: 134, 135) is *bɛzwɛ̃*. This marker too shows close form-function equivalence with Lesser Antillean (ALPA, 484; Tourneux and Barbotin, 2008: 54, 55):

Guianese

(8a) *Nu*   ***bezwɛ̃***   *ʒite*   *bwa*
      1p   need   cut   wood
      'We have to cut the trees.' (J&P, 2018: 135)

Lesser Antillean

(8b) *Misje*   ***bizwɛ̃***   *fɛme*   *buʃ*   *li*
      mister   need   close   mouth   DEM
      'The gentleman needs to shut up.' (ALPA, 484)

While some of the above-discussed forms may well be chance correspondences due to shared French lexifier input, the main point here is that a feature put forth by J&P as setting Guianese and Lesser Antillean apart, again turns out not to be so distinctive after all.

2.1.4   Imperatives Marked by Imperfective *ka*

According to J&P (2018: 138), negative imperatives tend to be marked by *ka*, which, they add, "has not been reported for Martinican Creole". However, this is merely a stylistic alternative with the purpose of attenuating the imperative (Schlupp, 1997: 52, 53); the unmarked negative imperative in Guianese, just as in Lesser Antillean, is without *ka*, as in *pa kõte!* {NEG tell} 'Don't tell (it)!' (Schlupp, 1997: 70) and *pa gade dejɛ* {NEG look back} 'Don't look back!' (J&P, 2018: 141).

2.1.5   "Guianese Ka is More of a Progressive, Lesser Antillean Ka More of a Habitual"

In their discussion of *ka*, J&P (2018: 114) claim that "*ka* in [Guianese] has mainly been used for progressive aspect" and, inversely, that "In Martinican

Creole […], the imperfective marker *ka* may express progressivity, but mostly expresses habitual or iterative meaning" (2.: 115). In other words, Guianese *ka* would convey mainly +PROG, and Lesser Antillean *ka* mainly +HAB. But the only way for these two claims to be true would of course be if the languages in question had other means to express +HAB and +PROG respectively, which, however, they do not: in both creoles, *ka* covers the entire scope of imperfectivity (for dynamic verbs) and does not compete with any other markers. The logical implication is, unless speakers of the two languages have a mysterious preference to talk about different types of actions, that *ka* conveys progressive and habitual aspect in equal measure in Guianese and Lesser Antillean (cf. Jennings, 2001: 72; Confiant, 2007; Pinalie and Bernabé, 1999: 69, 70; Damoiseau, 2014: 43; Jadfard, 1997: 22; Schlupp, 1997: 61, 62; Colot and Ludwig, 2013; Pfänder, 2013; Jennings and Pfänder, 2015: 47; Chapuis, 2007: 87; Tourneux and Barbotin, 2008: 172; Frank [ed.], 2001). Thus, an utterance like *I te ka mãʒe* can mean either 's/he was eating' or 's/he used to eat' depending on the context, in Guianese as well as in Lesser Antillean – just as we saw in Table 1 above, for which the data was provided by J&P.

2.1.6   *Ka* With Past Reference Without an Explicit Past Marker
J&P (2018: 115) claim that Lesser Antillean "also differs from [Guianese] in that it uses *ka* mainly with present reference and requires combination with the past marker *té* […] to indicate past reference. The *té* can be dropped only once the speaker has established that the context is not in the present. [Guianese], on the other hand, can use *ka* with past reference without a past marker." The claim is difficult to examine, since the authors provide no examples, but suffice to note that this, too, seems to concern rather unremarkable variation that most linguists would assume to be common within lects of the same language or even between registers of one and the same speaker. And since the authors' corpus consists mainly of story-telling, their observation might simply be an artefact of its nature; it is well-known that in many languages around the world, creoles included, past tense marking is often omitted in storytelling.

Genre-related considerations aside, examples such as those in (9), where the *ka* + V complement clause is clearly situated in the past, are evidence that Lesser Antillean *ka*, just like Guianese *ka*, is a fully-fledged imperfective aspect marker that is in itself unmarked for tense, and which can occur without *te* in past-tense contexts:[9]

---

9   Note that such 'past-tensed' complement clauses are quite common in all varieties of Lesser Antillean and indeed also in Guianese, and are by no means restricted to the main verb *kumãse* where, incidentally, the pronunciation in both languages diverges in the same way (/u/ in the place of the expected /ɔ/) from the etymon *commencer*.

Guianese

(9a) *I*   *kumãse*   **ka**   **mãze**
      3s   begin   IPFV   eat
      'She began to eat/eating.' (Schlupp, 1997: 282)

Lesser Antillean

(9b) *I*   *kumãse*   **ka**   **repete**   *-j*
      3s   begin   IPFV   repeat   3s
      'He began to repeat/repeating it.' (Confiant, 2007: 59)

Lesser Antillean

(9c) *Jo*   *kumãse*   **ka**   **diskite**
      3p   begin   IPFV   discuss
      'They began discussing.' (Frank [ed.], 2001)

Lesser Antillean

(9d) *I*   *mete*   *-j*   **ka**   **prijedje**
      3s   begin   3S   IPFV   pray
      'He began to pray.' (Telchid, 1985)

2.1.7 "Differing TAM Particles in the Early Years of the Creoles"
J&P (2015: 49) note that "Similarities in the systems of [Guianese] and [Martinican] today […] do not imply that the languages had similar [TAM] systems when they emerged". While that is in itself a fair point, their suggestion that the respective systems were significantly different in the early days is not supported by the data.

They correctly note that some early Guianese texts are characterised by the use of markers *wa* (FUTURE) and *kaba* (PERFECTIVE), neither of which are in use today. But how meaningful are these? Starting with the latter, as J&P (2015: 49) themselves point out, Portuguese-derived *kaba* is or was attested in other non-Portuguese-lexified creoles such as Negerhollands and Sranan. Another creole, Papiamentu, also features *kaba*, whereas the Portuguese-lexified creoles from the Cape Verde Islands, to which Papiamentu is thought to be closely related, do not. If anything, these observations make clear that *kaba* is not a very good indicator of genetic relatedness (or of the lack thereof).

Moreover, J&P's (2015: 40) claim that *kaba* is "not attested in the other French based Creoles of the Caribbean" is wrong, as a derivate of Portuguese *acabar* has also been attested in the French-lexicon creole of Haiti (there are

several instances in Hazaël-Massieux 2008). This, in turn, casts doubt on J&P's assumption that early Guianese *kaba* "must come from the fact that the founding slave population spent its first four to seven years in Portuguese ownership" (J&P, 2015: 40), i. e. that it must be a remnant of pre-1667 speech habits. (About the importance of the year 1667 in the history of Cayenne, see Section 3.) Clearly, the fact that several other non-Portuguese-lexified creoles, including Haitian, have (had) the item, shows it could have entered Guianese in a variety of ways and at different points in history. Saint-Quentin (1872: lvii), for instance, assumed that the feature was a carry-over from Brazilian Portuguese, which hardly seems far-fetched considering the geographic proximity. Also, whereas the meaning of *kaba*, 'to finish', can certainly be said to be "among the most frequent nouns, verbs and function words cross-linguistically" (J&P, 2015: 40), a more pertinent question is of course how frequent the item itself is, or was, in Guianese. Seeing as the marker is mentioned in just two out of dozens of 18th- to 20th-century Guianese texts (Schlupp, 1997: 235) and is not attested at all in the conservative variety of Karipuna (J. Tobler, 1983; A. Tobler, 1987; see also Section 2.3), a probable answer to that question is: not very.

The other marker mentioned by J&P as setting early Guianese apart from early Lesser Antillean is *wa*. However, while J&P acknowledge that the form *va* existed also in Lesser Antillean (cf. Hazaël-Massieux, 2008), they seem to ignore that Guianese *wa* had developed out of an earlier form *va*; early Guianese texts clearly show *wa* replacing *va* in the course of the 19th century, before it stopped being used altogether. (Schlupp, 1997: 78–80). In sum, then, there is very little to suggest that the early Guianese TAM system was any more different from Lesser Antillean than it is now.

2.2   *J&P's Gbe Feature List*

According to J&P, speakers of Gbe[10] were predominant among the Cayenne slaves in the early colonial days and as a result were able to exert an exceptionally strong influence on the formation of the creole, even to the extent that "*most* [Guianese] grammatical features can be modelled as […] transfer[s] from Gbe" (2018: 84, emphasis ours).

To underpin their case, J&P present Guianese features which they suggest were calqued on Gbe and which would demonstrate that Guianese is more Gbe-like than other French Creoles in general and than Lesser Antillean in

---

10   Sometimes treated as a language and sometimes as a subfamily of Kwa (which in turn is a branch of Niger-Congo), Gbe is a cluster of varieties spoken primarily in Togo and Benin, but to some extent also in neighbouring Ghana and Nigeria. Its members are Ewe, Gen, Fon, Adja, Phla-Pherá, and sometimes "Gbe" is suffixed to these names.

particular. In doing this, however, they in our view exaggerate the Gbe character of Guianese and at the same time fail to comment on, let alone account for, the far-reaching resemblances between Guianese and Lesser Antillean.

The features J&P selected in order to showcase the impact of Gbe on Guianese are summarised in Jacobs and Parkvall (2021). For all these features, J&P – implicitly or explicitly – suggest a parallel between Gbe and Guianese, and claim that the creole structure represents a carry-over/transfer from Gbe. On closer inspection, it turns out that virtually all of these features suffer from one or more of the following problems:

i)   The characterisation of Gbe is dubious.
ii)   The Guianese data can be questioned.
iii)   The feature is found in African languages other than Gbe.
iv)   The feature is exceedingly common in pidgins and creoles in general.
v)   The feature is cross-linguistically frequent to the point of being useless as an argument for transfer.

Most important in the present context is that well over 80% of the features are parallelled in Lesser Antillean. One such feature concerns the bimorphemic question words – a typical inventory for both creoles (there is some dialectal variation) is given in Table 3.

The Lesser Antillean system is parallel to Guianese not just in being mostly bimorphemic, but also in sharing the exact same etymologies. One could imagine, say, 'where' being derived from French *qui + lieu* or *qui + endroit*,

TABLE 3   Question words in Guianese and Lesser Antillean

Q-word	Guianese	Lesser Antillean	etymon	Mainstream French
who	*kimun*	*kimun*	*qui + monde* 'what + people'	*qui*
what	*kisa*	*kisa*	*qui + ça* 'what + dem'	*quoi*
	kibagaj	*kibagaj*	*qui + bagage* 'what + luggage'	
when	*kile*	*kile*	*qui + l'heure* 'what + hour'	*quand*
	kitã	*kitã*	*qui + temps* 'what + time'	
where	*kikote*	*kikote*	*qui + côté* 'what side'	*où*
why	*pukisa*	*pukisa*	*pour + qui + ça* 'for + what + dem'	*pourquoi*
	kife	*kife*	*qui + faire* 'what + make'	
how	*kumã*	*kumã*	*comment* 'how'	*comment*
how much	*kɔ̃mɛ̃*	*kɔ̃mɛ̃*	*combien* 'how much'	*combien*

or 'when' from *qui + moment*, 'what' from *qui + chose*, 'who' from *qui + personne*, etc. Instead, however, more unexpected French items (such as *bagage*, *monde* and *côté*) were chosen in both Guianese and Lesser Antillean, including even the same deviations from mainstream French phonology (e. g. [bagaj] instead of the expected *[bagaʒ], and [mun] instead of *[mɔ̃d]. Furthermore, both Guianese and Lesser Antillean share the same *exceptions* to the rule, in that 'how' and 'how much'/'how many' are monomorphemic.

In short, J&P's feature list, which was designed to highlight the structural parallells between Guianese and Gbe, on closer scrutiny unintentionally highlights the fact that on the one hand Guianese does not share truly idiosyncratic traits with Gbe, while on the other hand it has the majority of its grammatical apparatus in common with Lesser Antillean.

Jacobs and Parkvall (2021) take issue specifically with the Gbe influence that J&P claim characterises Guianese, and also discusses the linguistic features in greater detail.

2.3   *Summary and Discussion*

The main point to take away from the preceding linguistic analyses is that there is a considerable amount of overlap between Guianese and Lesser Antillean in key domains of the morpho-syntax and that J&P's attempt to trivialise the overlap does not stand up to scrutiny. The TAM and interrogative paradigms are examples of features presented by J&P which in fact point in another direction than what they argue for. The small differences in the use of TAM markers appear to represent genre- and/or register-specific tendencies rather than clear-cut differences. This kind of marginal variation can often be observed within one and the same language or even in the speech of one and the same speaker. We would in fact expect nothing less in daughter varieties that separated three and a half centuries ago.

However, there is no denying that there are also some conspicuous differences between the two creoles. We are, after all, and by all accounts, dealing with two different languages synchronically, rather than two dialects of one and the same language. Some of these differences are exemplified in the Hancock sentences (see Appendix); they concern the pronominal domain (Guianese 1s *mo*, 3p *je*, 3s.POSS *so* ≠ Lesser Antillean *mwɛ̃, jo, li*), the syntax (e. g. the placement of demonstratives and pronominal possessors is postnominal in Lesser Antillean versus prenominal in Guianese), and the vocabulary (e. g. Guianese *gãɲɛ̃* 'to have, to exist' ≠ Lesser Antillean (*ti*)*ni*). But notwithstanding these differences, the similarities are, in our view, too far-reaching and too idiosyncratic to be ascribed to chance. Might the similarities be due to the fact that both creoles are lexified by French? This is unlikely, seeing as most of the structures

discussed in the foregoing are quite unlike French. Recall, for instance, that a shared core item such as the imperfective marker *ka* does not even have an accepted etymology, and can thus hardly be seen as an expected outcome of just any contact between French and African languages. And even if we were to accept the French etymology (*ne*) *qu'à* 'just, only' proposed by some authors, that would still render a creole phrase like *I pe ke fãte* 'She will not sing' wholly un-French: **Elle pas qu'à aller chanter*.

One might be tempted to argue that the synchronic similarities between Guianese and Lesser Antillean are the result of the later immigration of Lesser Antilleans to Guiana and resulting contact between the two languages. On closer inspection, however, this hypothesis too fails to convince: due to the difficulty of sailing from the islands to Guiana (which J&P [2018: 11, 23] also emphasise) it was only until the advent of steam ships that migration from the former to the latter gathered momentum, and it is thus only in the very late 19th and early 20th centuries that Lesser Antillean immigrants became truly numerous (Dorion-Sébeloue, 1985; J&P, 2018: 95–96; Lasserre [ed.], 1979; Honychurch, 1975: 155). And yet, most features of present-day Guianese seem to have been in place long before that. For instance, the first semi-authentic text in Guianese (reproduced in Hazaël-Massieux, 2008: 219–220), which is from the 1790s, contains core items such as *baj* 'to give', *briga* 'to fight', *gaɲe* 'to have', *je* '3p', *ka* 'IPFV', *kɔ* 'reflexive marker', *li* '3s', *mo* '1s', *mun* 'person', *sa* 'DEM', *te* 'PAST', *un* 'INDEF', *va* 'IRR', *vule* 'to want', *zot* '2p'. Some of these are similar to Lesser Antillean, and some are not, but all are also found in later attestations of the language. In fact, the text also contains an item (*tini* 'to have') which is typical of Lesser Antillean, but which is not found in present-day Guianese (cf. Schlupp, 1997: 336). This text was produced 130 years after the original French colonisation, and about halfway between that event and the present day, but crucially, it predates large-scale immigration from the Antilles. In addition, Bull's (1992) study of diachronic changes in Guianese also shows rather moderate differences between pre- and post-1900 versions of Guianese.

Another indication that Guianese has not changed all that drastically from what it was prior to substantial Antillean immigration can be gleaned at through the Amerindian populations on the Brazilian side of the border, pockets of whom speak an offshoot of Guianese known as Karipuna Creole. Karipuna has been blessed with a reference grammar (Tobler, 1983) and a dictionary (Tobler, 1987), which allow its unambiguous classification as a dialect of Guianese. The Karipuna (and the neighbouring Galibi and Palikur) people may have begun speaking Guianese as early as in the 18th century (Röntgen, 1998; Alleyne and Ferreira, 2007; Grenand and Grenand, 1987: 11). While later dates are also possible, their adoption of the language in any case predates

both the Antillean immigration and the near-universal knowledge of French introduced into French Guiana by the school system. Since the Karipunas live in Brazil, the prestige language has always been Portuguese rather than French, and the area was not subject to immigration from the Caribbean. And yet, Karipuna Creole is still today mutually intelligible not only with Guianese, but even to a great extent with Lesser Antillean, according to Anonby (2007: 13).

We grant that *some* of the synchronic similarities between Guianese and Lesser Antillean are to be attributed to post-formative contact between the two. But the point is that, owing to the existence of early Guianese texts (Schlupp, 1997; Hazaël-Massieux, 2008), and descriptions of Karipuna, one can fairly confidently identify which features are genuine to Guianese and which were added later in the wake of Lesser Antillean migration to French Guiana.[11] Taken together, the old textual attestations and the Brazilian offshoot show that Guianese has not been transformed into a completely different language, but has remained fairly similar to what it looked like in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Might the similarities then be attributed to shared substrate influence? It would seem not, since J&P repeatedly (e. g., 2018: 25, 63, 71, 166) stress the *differences* in ethnic composition between early Cayenne and the early Lesser Antilles. In sum, we think the best and most economic explanation for the Lesser Antillean footprint in Guianese is to assume shared ancestry, a claim we will underpin historically in the next section.

3   Historical Framework

According to J&P (2018: 41), "[i]t is very difficult to present a convincing argument on historical grounds that [Guianese] is an offshoot of the Lesser Antillean creoles". However, although the evidence for genetic relatedness is primarily linguistic in nature, as we shall see, it is far from impossible to support our case with historical data.

As outlined in Section 2, Guianese is a lot more similar to Lesser Antillean than it is to the two languages – French and Gbe – that J&P put forth as ancestral to the creole.[12] Needless to say, we think this requires a historical explanation.

---

11   The variety spoken in St-Laurent-du-Maroni, for instance, is also known locally as *Pale Mwɛ̃*, in reference to the use there of the Antillean 1st person singular *mwɛ̃* (≠ Guianese *mo*) (Schlupp 1997:4). In some instances the influence seems more subtle. Based on a reading of old texts, for instance, we can with some degree of confidence speculate that the negation *pe* (rather than *pa*) in *pe ke* (see Appendix) was introduced into Guianese via Lesser Antillean in the beginning of the 20th century.

It seems to us as if J&P's singular focus on Gbe and their failure to recognise/ acknowledge the linguistic similarities with Lesser Antillean have kept them from exploring certain historical events and from looking deeper into the possible historical ties with the Lesser Antilles. Below we take up those two tasks.

The historical background of Guianese is the subject of the first half of J&P (2018). It can briefly be summarised thus: Following several French explorations and settlement attempts, the Dutch, along with a group of Portuguese-speaking Jews, were the first Europeans to permanently establish themselves in Cayenne, settling there in 1654 after having been ousted from Brazil by the Portuguese. During the short Dutch reign, the first African slaves were imported into Cayenne, presumably mostly from Gbe-speaking areas, and Pidgin Portuguese is likely to have been the language used between masters and slaves. Ten years later, in 1664, ownership of the colony passed to the French, who also took over the slaves owned by the Dutch and the Jews. More slaves were imported, again with a strong representation of Gbe speakers. Save for brief English and Dutch occupations in 1667 and 1676 respectively, and a longer Portuguese one during the Napoleonic wars, French Guiana has remained French ever since.

The above historical events/dates are not controversial as such, but the precise details are, and we differ from J&P in our interpretation of these details, particularly with regard to the demography of early colonial Cayenne and to the role of the English sacking of Cayenne, in 1667, in reshaping that demography. J&P downplay the importance of the said sacking and paint a picture of considerable continuity between the populations before and after 1667. Since the pre-1667 population was more demonstrably Gbe-dominant than the post-1667 population, J&P's bilingual Gbe-French creolisation scenario largely hinges on the idea of such a continuity. Our reading of the available sources rather suggests the linguistic history of Cayenne started almost from scratch following the English attack and that Lesser Antilleans played a key role in rebuilding the town.

3.1   *The 1667 English Raid*

As noted, we think J&P underestimate the impact of the 1667 attack on Cayenne. In J&P's account, there is a demographic and linguistic continuity from the first (part Dutch, part Jewish) settlement in the 1650s until today. We, on the other hand, believe that the English raid in 1667 caused at least a

---

12   Or three languages, if one includes Portuguese. Jacobs and Parkvall (2021) discuss the alleged Portuguese contribution, and find it too to be grossly inflated in J&P's account.

partial break in this history – one which resulted in less Gbe and more Lesser Antillean influence.

The French (re)settled in Cayenne in 1664. A mere three years after this, an English force under captain John Harman attacked the colony and burnt it to the ground. Some slaves and prisoners of war were taken, although the exact numbers are in doubt. Only months afterwards, the French set out from the Lesser Antilles to rebuild their colony. To us, this English pillaging of Cayenne in 1667 is a crucial date not only for the history of French Guiana, but also for its creole. Both the colony and its linguistic habits had to make a fresh start.

J&P (2018: 40) do consider the English raid linguistically relevant, but only insofar as "the raiders carried off the Portuguese [i. e. Jewish] planters to Suriname, thereby ending the direct Portuguese influence on the slave population of French Guiana". They explicitly deny that the linguistic situation of the slave population was affected in any other way: "The English raid did not change the linguistic composition of the slave population, which remained almost entirely Gbe-speaking as before" (J&P, 2018: 41). Despite the French masters either having fled ("probably without slaves") or having been taken to the Antilles as prisoners of war, the English, according to J&P (2018: 40), only got away with a mere two slaves out of a slave population of around 260–290.[13] Still in the same year, an English privateer launched a second attack, capturing 39 more slaves (2018: 40)[14] in addition to which one slave died in the turmoil. This brings the total number of lost slaves, in J&P's account of the raid, to a mere 42. When peace came, "the French settlers and 'several' slaves returned to Cayenne", where they also found 150 of their peers "along with the slaves living in the wreckage of the colony" (2018: 40). While J&P are open to the possibility that the returnees *might* have brought with them slaves from the Lesser Antilles speaking the insular Creole, these were in any case "not numerous enough to influence the rest of Cayenne's slaves" (2018: 41). Thus, to J&P, both the settlers and the slave population in post-1667 Cayenne were essentially the same as they were before the 1667 attack; linguistic habits and developments continued as if nothing had happened. This represents a crucial divergence between their version and ours.

We accept that the slave population was around 260–290 before the English invasion. For ease of argumentation, we take 290 as a starting point in the remainder of this section. Now, with a year of 5% natural population decrease, which was typical of the Guianas in that period,[15] the expected slave population would have been around 275 in 1668. However, J&P (2018: 41) report it as 180.[16] So there is a gap of about 95 between the expected and the attested

number, based on J&P's own figures. This in itself would seem to suggest that the invasion led to the disappearance of more than just the 42 slaves mentioned by J&P. Indeed, other reports provide higher numbers of abducted slaves. Both Goslinga (1971: 406) and Marley (2005: 781; 2008: 261, 264) suggest no less than 250 slaves were taken by the English. In the remainder, we follow the slightly more conservative estimate suggested in a contemporary English account (reproduced in Harlow [ed.], 1925: 222–242) where it is reported that the English left behind "nigh as Many Slaues as they Carryed away". This ought to mean that they left Cayenne with about 150 slaves.[17]

According to contemporary English sources, these slaves were sold in Barbados (Sainsbury, 1880b: 576), and in 1675, English and French officials were still discussing their return (Sainsbury, 1880b: 326). Since this was conditioned by the handing back of English slaves taken by the French on St. Kitts, something that never took place (Dunn, 1972: 124), it seems quite likely that the ca. 150 slaves remained in English hands forever. The same would seem to apply to the 39 taken in the second attack, who appear to have been sold in Surinam.[18] Thus, in our reading of the sources, French Guiana would have lost 150 + 39, or more than two thirds of its slave population, during the two subsequent attacks.

Sugar at this time was rapidly becoming the dominant cash crop of the circum-Caribbean. Since this relied almost entirely on slave labour, it only stands to reason that the English would have abducted as many slaves as logistically possible. Since the invaders clearly had the transport capacity to carry off the entire slave population,[19] one may wonder why they only took around 150. A possible reason is that the remaining ca. 100 slaves had fled the scene. This is confirmed by the fact that the English hired the "Indian Prince" Jan van der Goes (a local chief who intermediated between colonists and local tribes) to capture the escaped slaves (Sainsbury, 1880a; Harlow [ed.], 1925: 222–242). Unfortunately, the records do not reveal whether Van der Goes was at all successful, and if so, what the fate was of the slaves he might have captured.

---

13   Jennings (1993b: 30; 1995: 24), J&P (2018: 39), Rodway (1912: 68).

14   This would seem to be the raid by Peter Wroth mentioned by Tertre (1667–1671: 352)

15   5% is often assumed in the historical literature for this area (e. g. Oostindie, 1993: 16; cf. also Sheridan, 1974: 244, 247; Curtin, 1969: 62, 79–80), and indeed also what Jennings (1999: 248) works with.

16   They do not provide a source for this number. In a letter by Abraham Crijnsen to the Chamber of Zeeland dated June 1668, governor Lefebvre de Lézy is said to be in Cayenne "with 100 men and 250 Negroes" (Hulsman, 2009: 169, our translation from Dutch).

17   This would be in reference to Harman's attack alone, since Wroth's is treated as a separate action in the English sources as well (Sainsbury, 1880c).

In J&P's version, the slaves who were not taken by the English accompanied their French masters when these themselves took refuge in the forest and, after the raid, followed them back to obediently take up their old work on the plantations. However, recalling that the French had been militarily crushed, and had had their entire material existence reduced to rubbles, we struggle to see how the French could have controlled their slaves in the bush, without access to buildings, arms and the various kinds of equipment they were accustomed to. In other words, we find it at least as likely that the slaves tried to survive on their own, unless they were captured by Van der Goes. It is also quite likely that at least some slaves would have succumbed in the inhospitable rainforest; others may have been able to escape to Surinam (where fugitives were about to found the Saramaccan tribe), or have been welcomed and assimilated (or perhaps re-enslaved) by native tribes further inland. Whatever the case, J&P's narrative that nearly all except 42 slaves returned to work on Cayenne's plantations after the raid strikes us as highly tenuous.

What is also ignored by J&P is the post-raid introduction of new slaves from the Antilles. The historical sources at our disposal suggest that, directly following the raid, several (the sources speak of "bon nombre", "plusieurs", and "nombreux") slaves were brought in from the Lesser Antilles (Tertre, 1667–1671: 314; Labat, 1730: 118–121; Ternaux-Compans, 1843:73; Artur, 1763[2002]: 225). There is no way of knowing exactly what a "bon nombre" numerically corresponds to, but it seems perfectly possible that the new Antillean arrivals made up a majority of the 180 slaves reported for Cayenne in 1668. One contemporary source states that slaves were brought from the Lesser Antilles to Cayenne by the ship *Concorde* (Grillet, 1668, in Montézon, 1857: 224), which, given its size, would have been capable of transporting several hundred slaves. If, as claimed by J&P (2018: 41), the slave population was indeed 180 right after the reestablishment of French rule, it seems to us that the Antillean slaves could well have numbered 100 or more, and thus have been numerically equal to or even have outnumbered the 'old' slaves.

---

18   June 1668 letter by Johan Tressry to the Dutch West Indies Company, Chamber of Zealand (*Zeeuws Archief,* 2035–022).

19   Disregarding four minor vessels, the combined tonnage of the English fleet was over 5 000 tons. In the relevant era, slave ships tended to carry about two slaves per ton, which means that their theoretical carrying capacity would have amounted to ten thousand slaves. Of course, none of these vessels were dedicated slave carriers, and they needed to accommodate 850 troops, 400 cannons, 80 French prisoners of war and a good deal of booty. Still, 10 000 is a number so immensely larger than the fewer than 300 slaves present in the colony at the time that we can safely exclude that the lack of transport capacity prevented the English from getting away with more slaves than they did.

May a Founder Effect then have played a role, prompting the 'new' slaves to copy the linguistic habits of the 'old' slaves already present in Cayenne? According to J&P (2018: 26, 71), it did. However, we can be fairly certain that these new slaves did *not* see the old slaves as linguistic role models, seeing as the presumed Pidgin Portuguese (which we agree with J&P [2018: 30, 36] would have been the main vehicle of interethnic communication among the Cayenne slaves and their masters prior to the English raid) evidently died out, was replaced by a French-lexicon creole very similar to that of the Lesser Antilles, and did not leave many (if any) traces in that new creole.

To sum up the above, it seems to us a quite possible scenario that about 200 (150 + 39) of the around 290 pre-1667 slaves disappeared from the scene during (and in the aftermath of) the English attack(s), and that 100 or more new ones arrived from the Antilles. Adding to this a 5% annual natural decrease in the slave population, these figures would neatly explain the post-invasion census figures, as well as the linguistic similarities between Guianese and Lesser Antillean, neither of which is addressed by J&P. The estimated figures are summarised in Table 4. Obviously, our number 100 is but a guess. Had we instead assumed 94, the numbers would match perfectly.

Let us now turn to the white population. The data for the white population is even more patchy and contradictory than it is for the slaves. We accept J&P's suggestion that there were 670 whites, of whom 610 French and 60 Jews, before the raid, and ca. 350 whites (all French) after it. We also agree with J&P in that all the 60 Jewish planters were removed from the scene. J&P (2018: 40) furthermore suggest that of the 610 Frenchmen, 100 fled to the Antilles, and another 80 were taken as prisoners of war by the English, while the rest hid in the bush until the English left.[20] All three groups would have returned to rebuild their homes after the reestablishment of French rule, and this would not have involved any new settlers from the Lesser Antilles. Again taking a natural annual decrease of 5%, this story still leaves unexplained a net decrease of 610 − 350 − 30 = 230 among the French[21] population. Although it is derivable from J&P's own figures (2018: 39–41), they never attempt to explain this decrease. (According to Bel and Hulsman [2019: 161], the decrease was even 84%.)

Our reading of the historical sources is again detailedly different. We accept that ca. 180 Frenchmen disappeared from the scene (100 fled to the Antilles and 80 were taken as prisoners of war). However, whereas J&P unquestioningly assume all of these returned to Cayenne, we think things are slightly more complicated. First of all, contemporary sources state that around 200 settlers arrived from the Lesser Antilles almost immediately after the English attack (i. e. still in 1667) (Tertre, 1667–1671: 314; Artur, 2002: 221–227; Labat, 1730:

TABLE 4   Summary of estimated out- and inflow of slaves during (and in the aftermath of) the English attack, according to J&P (2018) and ourselves.

	Slaves pre-invasion	Slaves outflow (1st & 2nd raid)	Natural decrease (5%) in one year	Slaves inflow	Attested slaves post-invasion	Unexplained discrepancy
J&P	290	3 + 39	ca. 15	0	180	53
our assessment	290	150 + 39	ca. 15	100	180	6

118–121; Grillet, 1668, in Montézon, 1857: 223–224; cf. Marley, 2005: 781, 2008: 261, 264). This means we have, compared to J&P, an additional inflow of 20 settlers post-invasion. Secondly, according to Artur (2002: 221–227), out of those 200 Antilleans, ca. 80 were indeed French refugees returning to Cayenne, but the remaining 120 were in fact newcomers. Grillet (1668, in Montézon, 1857: 208) also mentions these 200 Antillean settlers without referring to them as return-ees: "Le vaisseau la *Concorde* nous a amené deux cents passagers qui viennent se fixer dans l'île de Cayenne". While these potential Antillean newcomers had no major impact on the overall numbers of whites in Cayenne post-invasion, they are of obvious relevance in light of the hypothesised language transfer from the Lesser Antilles to Cayenne.

Moreover, the sources at our disposal suggest that ca. 200–250 whites fled to Surinam, and there is no record of their returning to Cayenne (Clodoré, 1671: 314, 320–321; Labat, 1730: 118–121; Artur, 2002: 221–227; Hartsinck, 1770: 588). Taking the lower estimate, the gap between the expected (610-200 + 20–30 = 400) and the attested (350) post-invasion white population would be reduced to 50, some of whom can be presumed to in one way or the other have died in the ensuing chaos. Table 5 summarises the estimated figures.

To summarise, then: during and in the aftermath of the raid, significant parts of the slave population as well as the settler population in French Guiana appear to have been replaced by new slaves and settlers from the Lesser Antilles. It is quite possible, and in light of the linguistic evidence even likely, that the Antillean slaves and settlers arriving in Cayenne in late 1667 outnumbered

---

20   Some French (women and children, according to Artur, 1763 [2002]: 224) clearly did stay in the ruins of the plantations, since English reports mention the invaders having equipped them with tools before leaving (Harlow [ed.], 1925:222–242).

21   I. e. excluding the Jews, whose departure J&P do account for.

TABLE 5   Summary of estimated out- and inflow of whites during (and in the aftermath of) the English attack, according to J&P (2018) and ourselves.

	Whites pre-invasion	Whites outflow	Natural decrease 5% in one year	Whites inflow	Attested whites post-invasion	Unexplained discrepancy
J&P	610	180	ca. 30	180	350	230
our assessment	610	380	ca. 30	200	350	50

those present from before the attack. We do accept that the Goupy slave list (to be discussed below) is evidence of *some* demographic continuity between the pre- and post-invasion society. But the evidence suggests that this continuity was very limited.

3.2 *So How Much Continuity Was There?*

While we do believe that the population of Cayenne (both its free and unfree segments) after the English attack had rather little in common with the one present before 1667, there are indeed indications of *some* continuity. The chief piece of evidence for that are the so-called Goupy papers, and these appear to confirm that some slaves did indeed wind up back on the plantations. Between 1687 and 1690, the Noël plantation in Rémire (now a suburb of Cayenne), was administrated by a certain Goupy des Marets who left us a valuable 800-paged dossier including a list of slaves working on the plantation, and this list is transcribed in Debien (1964). It minutely documents the plantation's work force at the time, giving us names, duties, and provenance of the slaves, including their ethnicity and in some cases even the particular ship on which they had arrived. The Goupy slave list constitutes arguably the only concrete piece of evidence for demographic continuity between the pre- and post-1667 period, and this is not lost on J&P.

However, we think the evidence deserves some scrutiny beyond what J&P provide. According to J&P's analysis of the Goupy papers, there are nine slaves alive in 1690 who, judging by the particular ship they had arrived with, would have been in Guiana before the invasion. At face value, that is an impressive number, given that the attack took place 23 years earlier, and in view of the total list containing 104 individuals. Nevertheless, while the Goupy papers do prove the presence of pre-1667 survivors, we think their numbers are exaggerated in J&P's analysis. Firstly, four of the nine alleged survivors are given as "Vernal 1" in J&P's version, which means that they were brought to the colony by the first voyage of slave trader Jan van Arel ('Vernal'), in the middle of 1667, i. e. a few

months *before* the English attack, as opposed to "Vernal 2", which refers to Van Arel's second delivery, in 1669, i. e. *after* the attack, and from which J&P list only three slaves. However, in Goupy's original slave list,[22] three of J&P's four "Vernal 1" slaves are simply stated as having been delivered by Van Arel, without a specific reference to any of his two voyages. Thus, for reasons unknown to us, J&P appear to have transferred unspecified Van Arel ('Vernal') cases to the "Vernal 1" category, something that obviously increases the alleged number of pre-1667 survivors, supporting their continuity scenario.

Should we go along with J&P and accept that the three unspecified Vernal slaves did come with "Vernal 1", it would mean that "Vernal 1" slaves were oddly overrepresented in the Noël plantation compared to the mere three "Vernal 2" slaves. After all, "Vernal 1" only brought 27 slaves to Cayenne, whereas "Vernal 2" delivered no less than 225. And since the latter had obviously arrived later, and had not been subject to the invasion and the turmoil that followed in its wake, one might reasonably expect "Vernal 2" rather than "Vernal 1" slaves to have been overrepresented in the Noël plantation. In other words, the known numbers and facts match each other a lot better if the unspecified "Vernal" people were actually "Vernal 2", meaning that they arrived *after* the English attack and the rebuilding of the colony. This would reduce the total number of survivors from nine to six.

A second problem with J&P's analysis is that they appear to take (Goupy's description of) the Noël plantation as representative for Cayenne as a whole: "His [Goupy's] descriptions of slave life, and most importantly his biographies of 104 slaves are the centrepiece of [our] reconstruction of early French Guiana" (J&P, 2018: 10, 11). Upon closer inspection, there are reasons to assume that the Noël plantation was not very representative at all: it existed before 1667, and so it is perfectly possible that "old" (pre-invasion) slaves were overrepresented there. Meanwhile, much of the post-invasion expansion of the slave population most likely took place on newly established plantations, some of which were in fact founded by Martinican Jesuits (most notably Loyola, discussed in the next section). It therefore seems unwise to generalise the Rémire data to the colony as a whole.

Also contributing to that impression is that among the slaves of identifiable African ethnicity in the Goupy list, the Gbes constitute 48%. The cumulative imports, as given by J&P, combined with the above-mentioned 5% natural decrease, would make us expect 31% Gbes, and our revised shipping list (Jacobs and Parkvall, 2021) would give a mere 25%. Thus, Gbes are considerably overrepresented in the Goupy papers, even if we only use J&P's shipping

---

22   A copy of which was kindly provided to us by Martijn van den Bel.

data. This adds to the suspicion that the data from this particular plantation cannot unquestioningly be extended to the colony as a whole.

At the end of the day, the Goupy material does prove that some pre-1667 slaves remained after the re-establishment of the French colony, but the proof amounts to a close-knit group of six individuals[23] from one single plantation.

3.3   *Communication Between Guiana and the Islands*

J&P claim that Guiana was unlikely to be influenced by the Lesser Antilles as a result of the geographical distance and the unfavourable winds and currents (2018: 11, 23). But while those circumstances undoubtedly complicated traffic from the islands to Cayenne, it does not follow that such traffic did not take place. If communications were as difficult as J&P suggest, we would not have expected Guiana to have been administratively dependent on the islands, which it was. The administrative link even included family ties at the highest level. A relevant example in the present context is that, in 1668, i. e. one year after the English raid, the governor of Guiana, Lefebvre de Lézy, was in the rebuilding of Cayenne "resupplied by his brother [governor Lefebvre de la Barre] from Martinique" (Marley, 2005: 781).

Other officials also circulated between the islands and Guiana in the late 17th and early 18th centuries: Messrs. Folliot des Roses and de Gennes who had been governors of Marie-Galante and St. Kitts respectively both settled in Guiana, and Guianese governors de Saint-Marthe and de Châteaugué (of Canadian origin) both came from Martinique (Wiesinger, 2013: 6). Other individuals known to have moved from the Lesser Antilles to Guiana in the late 17th century include Claude Guillouet d'Orvilliers, Jean Herault, Paul Domé (born on St. Kitts), and Marie Anne Enos and Jacques Mahault (from Martinique) (Huyghues-Belrose, 2007; Taillemite, 1969; the *Geneanet* marriage records).[24]

In addition to the secular administration, mention should also be made of ecclesiastical authorities, as the religious presence in Cayenne too was subordinate to that of the islands. In fact, the entire Jesuit mission in Guiana was modelled on that of the Lesser Antilles and drew most of its clergy from there (Montézon, 1857: xvii, xviii; cf. Wiesinger, 2013: 6). One of the plantations established after the departure of the English invaders was the renowned Loyola habitation, founded in 1668 by father Jean Grillet, a representative of the Jesuit mission on Martinique (Auger, 2018: 145; cf. Roux, 1994 and elsewhere; Rousselle, 2018). Incidentally, during his 1668 journey from the Lesser Antilles

---

23   The five slaves that were brought to Cayenne by "Hyan" (presumably Jan Claes Langendijck who in 1662 is alleged to have sold 120 slaves on Cayenne) had, according to Goupy, clung together like a family ever since setting foot in Cayenne.

to Cayenne, Grillet was accompanied by two private slaves from Martinique (Grillet, 1668, in Montézon, 1857: 224).

The Jesuit friars were not only concerned with preaching the gospel of love, but also with making economic profits from slave labour. In and around Cayenne, the Jesuits ended up owning multiple plantations inhabited by "several times the prescribed number of enslaved people" (Auger, 2018: 145). Loyola, the Jesuits' most prosperous plantation, was "known at one time as the largest producer of sugar in French Guiana" and at its height counted around 500 slaves (Auger, 2018: 145, 146). Father de la Mousse in the late 17th century compared the economic importance of the Jesuits in Guiana to that of the Jews in the days of Dutch rule (Mousse, 2006: 150), and Artur (2002: 320, cited in J&P, 2018: 53) notes that they preached to the slave population "in bad French brought down to their level", which may well have been the Creole of the Lesser Antilles.[25]

3.4   Other Historical-Linguistic Evidence

Our assumption that the history of French Guiana started virtually anew after 1667, and that it did so with a strong Lesser Antillean input, not only explains the far-reaching linguistic similarities between Guianese and Lesser Antillean. It also provides explanations for other facts that would seem enigmatic under J&P's scenario, such as the demise of the hypothesised original Portuguese Pidgin, and the character of Guianese onomastics (both surnames and place names).

---

24   The Guianese marriage records from 1681–98 indicate places of birth of many of the brides and grooms, and it was brought to our attention that the list contains rather few individuals whose place of birth was the Antilles. This, however, is neither particularly problematic nor surprising. First, only whites are included, and not slaves. Secondly, people – regardless of place of birth – could of course have spent time on the islands, acquired the local creole, and then moved to Guiana. Most importantly, however, the records list marriages that took place a couple of decades after the rebuilding of the colony in 1667. Even if the pioneers of re-settlement were young (say, in their twenties or thirties), most of them would have been beyond marriageable age by the time these records were taken. The marriage records are available at https://www.geneanet.org/releves-collaboratifs/geo/GUF/french-guiana (accessed by us 2018-08-03).

3.4.1 The Shift From a Portuguese- to a French-Lexicon Medium of Interethnic Communication

A glaring omission in J&P's account is their failure to address, let alone answer, the question when and why the population of Cayenne shifted from a Portuguese-lexified lingua franca in the period before the English raid (J&P, 2018: 30, 36) to a French-lexified one afterwards. Very little is provided in terms of an explanation, but they seem to assume that a shift followed automatically from the departure of the Portuguese-speaking (i. e. Jewish) segment of the population in 1667 (2018: 43). However, such a shift cannot be taken for granted; quite the contrary. There are several other comparable societies where such a shift did not happen – most notably, the English were evicted from neighbouring Surinam shortly after having colonised it, and despite that, throughout the existence of slavery, Dutch masters continued using the English-lexicon creole (Sranan) with their slaves, and it is only now, more than three centuries after the Dutch takeover, and after several decades of independence, that Dutch is replacing Sranan as the country's most widely used language.

J&P (2018: 71) state that "social structures" made owners unwilling to learn the language of the slaves (be it Gbe or Pidgin Portuguese), but what the Dutch did in their next-door colony, a society with a slave-based economy and thus virtually identical social structures, was precisely that – they learnt the slave language. Should anyone be inclined to believe that Frenchmen would for some reason have behaved differently from representatives of other colonial powers in this regard, we might recall that an English-lexicon creole has remained the language of the Caribbean island of St. Martin, whose northern half has been French since 1648, and never has been ruled by the British. French colonists were apparently also quite happy to use pidgins lexified by indigenous languages in both Louisiana (Mobilian Jargon) and Central Africa (Sango). Thus, even the departure of the Jews would leave the replacement of the (hypothesised) Portuguese Pidgin by a French-lexicon lingua franca unexplained. In our scenario, meanwhile, this replacement is not surprising, for the simple reason that there was little demographic continuity from the original colonisation to the post-1667 period. In other words, whatever the contact language of the pre-1667 slaves was, it did not form the basis of the lingua franca that emerged afterwards.

---

25   It is furthermore possible that the expansion of Jesuit missions beyond Cayenne, to places such as Kourou, Sinnamary, and Saint-Paul-d'Oyapock (e. g. Rousselle, 2018: 79, 80), played some role in the spread of the creole to those parts.

3.4.2 Surnames[26]

Beyond occasional individuals, it is impossible to say with certainty how many of the post-1667 settlers hailed directly from France, and how many had arrived in Cayenne from the Lesser Antilles. What we do have, however, is their names. The 1677 census is the earliest one that we know of. It does not give the origins of the settlers, but does list their surnames, and more than half of these are attested earlier on the Lesser Antilles, while slightly over a third are not.[27] This does of course not prove that half of the white population had immigrated from the islands, but it does lend credence to the idea that at least some post-1667 settlers hailed from there.[28]

The 1685 list of slave owners published by Jennings (1995: 40) seems to be the second earliest, and the first to include detailed data on slave ownership. Apart from the Jesuit order, it contains the names of 71 slave owners, and these are of course of special interest for creole genesis precisely in their capacity of slave owners. Among the ten people with the largest number of slaves, nine have surnames which are attested earlier on the Lesser Antilles. While some of these names are common in France (such as Dubois and Fontaine), others are less so (e. g. Boudet, Boudré and de Férolles), making a direct connexion with the islands rather likely. In all, 73% of the slaves in Guiana were owned by people whose surnames were found earlier on the islands. Conversely, we know the names of 60 Frenchmen who were present before the English devastation of Cayenne, and of these names, less than a fourth are found in post-1667 Guiana. Thus, the re-established colony, in terms of surnames, is far more similar to the Lesser Antilles than to the pre-1667 settlement.

J&P (2018: 38) themselves note that the original 1664 expedition (from which they postulate continuity) set out from La Rochelle, and that one would therefore expect colonists to have been recruited from its hinterland. Yet, by

---

26 The data on surnames was collected from a large number of (both digital and printed) sources, including old censuses and maps. Particularly rewarding were the newsletters of the association *Généalogie et histoire de la Caraïbe*. In all cases, alternate spellings that would yield the same pronunciation have been treated as one and the same, as has some variation with regard to articles and prepositions.

27 11% are difficult to read, are attested later on the islands, or display spellings that make us doubt whether or not we are dealing with the same name.

28 First names are often excluded, and even when they are, we cannot be certain whether we are dealing with one and the same individual. In quite a few cases, however, the same combination of first name and surname is found for people attested on the Antilles and in 17th century censuses of Guiana, and where, moreover, the age (if given) makes identity a clear possibility. Examples include Noël Rivière, Jean Lucas, Jean Giron, Jean Dufresne, Jean Classent, Jacques Guillot, Charles Petit (Guadeloupe), Louis Mitteau, Jean Fresneau (Marie-Galante), Jean Bouteillier (Martinique) and Louis Leclerc (St. Kitts).

their own admission "early census records of the colony show a predominance of Norman, Picard and Île-de-France names", that is areas of France located much further to the north. They appear (and rightfully so) to be surprised by this fact, but draw no conclusions from, nor make any further comments on it. The observation is in our view anything but unexpected. The northerly, and in particular Norman, origins of the first French settlers in the Lesser Antilles is well documented (Chauleau, 1966: 100; Debien, 1951: 147–148; Goddet-Langlois and Goddet-Langlois 1991: 29–30; Petitjean Roget, 1955, 1980; Revert, 1949), and thereby the seeming anomaly can easily be explained by Lesser Antillean immigration to Guiana.

All in all, it seems that the onomastics of early French Guiana better matches a scenario in which the colony was re-established in 1667 with only a limited continuity from before the English sacking of the colony. This is true not only for the names of persons, but also for the toponymy:

3.4.3   Toponymy

The Dutch and Jews who inhabited Cayenne before the French takeover must have had names for features in their physical environment. Given that the French coexisted with them for some time, we would have expected them to have taken over some of these, just like Anglo-Americans did with French, Spanish and Dutch names (Detroit, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, El Paso, Brooklyn, Harlem, Staten Island…). Under the assumption of continuity, we would also expect some of those to have survived into modern times. And yet, no place-names in the Cayenne area are of Dutch or Portuguese origin. Nor do any features seem to be named after the 1664 immigrants whose names are known. The names that are not Amerindian or refer to natural features (including flora and fauna) tend for the most part to contain the names of settlers. While none can be traced to the pre-1667 French population, many clearly refer to the post-1667 one,[29] and a large proportion of these, in turn, contain surnames found on the 17th century Lesser Antilles.[30] This finding is unexpected if there was a significant continuity in the European population dating from 1664. On the other hand, it follows neatly from the French colony having started almost anew in 1667.

Note that we analysed only the surroundings of Cayenne, as that is where one would expect the European toponymy to be the oldest, and where most features would have been named long before contacts between Guiana and the islands became truly frequent. Other coastal areas, which were settled much later, not to mention the inland that was explored by Europeans only in fairly recent times, cannot be expected to teach us anything about 17th century settlement.

4   Conclusion

This article has offered linguistic and historical evidence in support of the hypothesis that Lesser Antillean French Creole provided the foundations upon which Guianese French Creole was formed. The primary linguistic evidence for their shared ancestry is found in the morpho-syntax, particularly in the areas of TAM marking and question words, two closed word classes whose members align in the creoles whilst differing sharply from the lexifier. These linguistic findings, however, will need to be verified in future research by means of in-depth comparative analyses of the lexicon, phonology and other areas of the grammar that we could not attend to here for reasons of space.

From a historical point of view, we showed that the English raid from 1667 caused great disruption, prompting the removal of numerous slaves and whites from Cayenne and the arrival, shortly after the raid, of a significant amount of new slaves and whites from the Lesser Antilles, as the rebuilding of Cayenne was to a significant extent carried out under the supervision of, and in collaboration with, the islands. Although the precise historical-demographic details of that episode remain unresolved, it opened a window of opportunity for the creole of the Lesser Antilles to be transferred to Cayenne. We cannot disprove that there was *some* linguistic continuity between pre- and post-1667 French Guiana. What we argue, however, and what we think the data presented in the foregoing are evidence of, is that the post-1667 Lesser Antillean contribution came to dominate over whatever linguistic habits had been in place before the English raid, and that Guianese is to a large extent a continuation of the French Creole spoken on the Lesser Antilles. A crucial difference between our account and that of J&P, then, is that only ours explains the far-reaching linguistic similarities with Lesser Antillean as well as co-occurring phenomena such as the disappearance of the hypothesised pre-1667 Portuguese pidgin/creole, the number of inhabitants present after the raid, and even the nature of Guianese onomastics.

As we have seen, there are also some small but important linguistic differences between the two creoles. How, then, can we best account for the conspicuous Lesser Antillean footprint in Guianese as well as for those differences? We may here tentatively suggest that Guianese represents a merger of Lesser Antillean, first and foremost, with a secondary (also French-lexicon)

---

29   Examples: Trou Biron, Boudet, Jasmin, Crique Latouche, Crique Lindor, Mont Lucas, Crique Tisseau.
30   Examples: Anse Nadau, Chatenay, Crique Romieu, Fond Jacquet, Malmaison, Malterre, Marais Leblond, Plage de Gosselin, Quesnel, Rivière d'Hervieux, Savane la Motte.

component. That other (much smaller) component may have developed locally, before the raid, or, alternatively, have been brought in from elsewhere.[31] The details of such hypothetical scenarios, however, go beyond the scope of this paper and must remain for future research.

References

Agbedor, Paul. 1996. The syntax of Ewe personal pronouns. *Linguistique Africaine* 16: 19–51.

Alby, Sophie and Isabelle Léglise. 2007. Le paysage sociolinguistique de la Guyane: Un état des lieux desrecherches. In Mam-Lam-Fouck, Serge (ed.), *Comprendre la Guyane d'aujourd'hui. Un département français dans la région des Guyanes*, 469–479. Matoury: Ibis Rouge Editions.

Alby, Sophie and Isabelle Léglise. 2013. Multilingualism in French Guiana as a resource for teaching and learning. Paper presented at the Urban Multilingualism and Education Conference, Ghent, Belgium.

Alleyne, Mervyn. 1996. *Syntaxe historique créole*. Paris and Schœlcher: Éditions Karthala/Presses Universitaires Créoles.

ALPA = Dû, Jean le and Guylaine Brun-Trigaud. 2011. *Atlas linguistique des Petites Antilles*, vols. 1–2. Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques.

Amastae, Jon Edward. 1975. *Dominican Creole Phonology*. Eugene: Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Ameka, Felix. 1991. *Ewe: its grammatical constructions and illocutionary devices*. Canberra: Ph. D thesis, Australian National University.

Ameka, Felix. 2008. Aspect and modality in Ewe: A survey. Ameka, Felix and M. E. Kropp Dakubu (eds.) *Aspect and modality in Kwa languages*, 135–194. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Anonby, Stan. 2007. A report on the creoles of Amapá. *SIL Electronic Survey Reports*. https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/9041.

Arends, Jacques. 1989. Syntactic developments in Sranan: Creolization as a gradual process. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nijmegen.

Artur, Jacques. 2002. *Histoire des colonies françoises de la Guianne*. Guadeloupe: Ibis Rouge.

Auger, Réginald. 2018. Criação de um espaço comemorativo em um cemitério localizado emu ma plantação Jesuíta de cana-de-açúcar na Guiana Francesa. *História: Questões and Debates* 66 (2): 139–159.

---

31   Parkvall (1995) speculated that French Guiana may have received input from a hypothesised French-lexified pidgin from Senegal, but the arguments in this paper are not contingent on this specific possibility.

Baker, Philip. 1984. Agglutinated French articles in Creole French: their evolutionary significance. *Te Reo* 27: 89–129.

Baptista, Marlyse. 2002. *The Syntax of Cape Verdean Creole. The Sotavento Varieties*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bel, Martijn van den and Lodewijk Hulsman. 2019. *Les Hollandais à Cayenne: La présence néerlandaise en Guyane française (1655–1677)*. Matoury: Ibis Rouge.

Bernabé, Jean. 1987. *Fondas kréyol-la*. Paris: l'Harmattan.

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

Bôle-Richard, Rémy. 1983. *Systématique phonologique et grammaticale d'un parler Ewe: Le Gen-Mina du Sud-Togo et Sud-Bénin*. Paris: l'Harmattan.

Bull, Philip Aaron. 1992. *La manifestation de l'évolution lexicale du créole guyanais*. Burnaby: M. A. Thesis, Simon Fraser University.

Carrington, Lawrence. 1984. *Saint Lucian Creole: A Descriptive Analysis of its Phonology and Morpho-syntax*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Cérol, Marie-Josée. 1991. *Une introduction au créole guadeloupéen*. Schoelcher: Éditions Jasor.

Chapuis, Daniel. 2007. Dominican (Creole French), or Kwéyòl. In Holm, John and Peter Patrick (eds.) *Comparative Creole Syntax*, 83–100. London: Battlebridge.

Chauleau, Liliane. 1966. *La Société à la Martinique au XVIIe siècle (1635–1713)*. Caen.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2000. Evidência para a existência de um pidgin português asiático. In d'Andrade, Ernesto, Dulce Pereira, and Maria Antónia Mota (eds.), *Crioulos de base portuguesa*, 185–198. Lisbon: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística.

Clodoré, Jean. 1671. *Relation de ce qui s'est passé, dans les isles and terre-ferme de l'Amerique, pendant la derniere guerre avec l'Angleterre*, vol 2. Paris: Gervais Clouzier.

Colot, Serge, and Ralph Ludwig. 2013. Guadeloupean Creole and Martinican Creole. In Michaelis, Susanne, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath and Magnuss Huber (eds.) *The Survey of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 2, 205–219. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Confiant, Raphaël. 2007. *Dictionnaire créole martiniquais-français*. Guyane: Ibis Rouge.

Corne, Chris. 1971. Le patois créole français de la Guyane (St-Laurent-du-Maroni): esquisse de grammaire. *Te Reo* 14: 81–103.

Curtin, Philip. 1969. *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Dalphinis, Morgan. 1985. *Caribbean and African languages: social history, language, literature, and education*. London: Karia Press.

Damoiseau, Robert. 1984. *Éléments de grammaire du créole martiniquais*. Fort-de-France: Hatier-Antilles.

Damoiseau, Robert. 2007. Le créole guyanais dans la famille des créoles à base lexicale française de la zone américano-caraïbe. In Mam Lam Fouck, Serge (ed.), *Comprendre la Guyane d'aujourd'hui*, 501–514. Guyane: Ibis Rouge.

Damoiseau, Robert. 2014. Pour une approche comparative de la grammaire créole: Créoles guadeloupéen, martiniquais, guyanais, haïtien. *Contextes et Didactiques* 4: 36–47.

Daval-Markussen, Aymeric. 2011. *Of networks and trees in contact linguistics: new light on the typology of creoles*. Århus: M. A. Thesis, Århus Universitet.

Debien, Gabriel. 1951. *Les engagés pour les Antilles (1634–1715)*. Abbeville: Imprimerie F. Paillart.

Debien, Gabriel. 1964. Sur une sucrerie de la Guyane en 1690. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français de l'Afrique Noire* 26: 166–194.

Dorion-Sébeloue, Henriette. 1985. La migration guyanaise. *Les Dossiers d'Outre-Mer* 81, 104–111.

Dunn, Richard. 1972. *Sugar and Slaves. The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies 1624–1713*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Duthie, A. S. 1996. *Introducing Ewe linguistic patterns*. Accra: Ghana University Press.

Fauquenoy, Marguerite. 1972. Analyse structurale du créole guyanais. Paris: Klincksieck.

Fauquenoy, Marguerite. 1974. Guyanese: A French creole. In DeCamp, David and Ian Hancock (eds.): *Pidgins and Creoles: Current Trends and Prospects*, 27–37. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Fauquenoy-Saint-Jacques, Marguerite. 1979. La situation linguistique. Lasserre, Guy (ed.): *Atlas des départements français d'outre-mer 4: La Guyane*. Bordeaux and Talence: ORSTOM.

Frank, David. 2001. *Kweẏòl Dictionary*. Ministry of Education, Government of Saint Lucia.

Goddet-Langlois, Jean and Goddet-Langlois, Denise. 1991. *La vie en Guadeloupe au XVIIe siècle suivi du Dictionnaire des familles guadeloupéennes de 1635 à 1700*. Fort-de-France: Éditions Exbrayat.

Goodman, Morris. 1964. *A Comparative Study of Creole French Dialects*. London., The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Goslinga, Cornelis. 1971. *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580–1680*. Assen: Van Gorcum and Co.

Grant, Anthony. 1995. *Agglutinated nominals in Creole French. Synchronic and diachronic aspects*. Bradford: Ph. D. Thesis, University of Bradford.

Green, John. 1988. Romance Creoles. In Harris, Martin and Nigel Vincent (eds.), *The Romance languages*, 420–473. London: Routledge.

Grenand, Pierre and F. Grenand. 1987. La côte d'Amapá, de la bouche de l'Amazone à la baie d'Oyapock, à travers la tradition orale palikur. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi*, (*série Antropologia* 3-1): 1–78.

Hancock, Ian. 1987. A Preliminary Classification of the Anglophone Atlantic Creoles, with Syntactic Data from Thirty-Three Representative Dialects. In Gilbert, Glenn

(ed.) *Pidgin and Creole Languages: Essays in Memory of John E. Reinecke*, 264–333. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Harlow, Vincent (ed.). 1925. *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana 1623– 67*. London: Hakluyt Society.

Hartsinck, Jan Jacob. 1770. *Beschryving van Guiana of de Wilde Kust in Zuid-America*. Amsterdam: S. Emmering.

Hazaël-Massieux, Guy. 1989. La grammaticalisation des connexions. Ludwig, Ralph (ed.), *Les créoles français entre l'oral et l'écrit*, 201–211. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Hazaël-Massieux, Marie-Christine. 2008. *Textes anciens en créole français de la Caraïbe*. Paris: Publibook.

Holm, John and Peter Patrick (eds.). 2007. *Comparative Creole Syntax: Parallel Outlines of 18 Creole Grammars*. London: Battlebridge.

Honychurch, Lennox. 1975. *The Dominica Story. A history of the island*. Roseau: Dominica Institute.

Hulsman, L. A. H. C.. 2009. *Nederlands Amazonia: handel met indianen tussen 1580 en 1680*. Amsterdam: Ph. D. thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Huyghues-Belrose, Vincent. 2007. The early colonization of Tobago: bibliographical and archival material in Martinique and France. *Études caribéennes* 8. https://doi. org/10.4000/etudescaribeennes.1032 .

Jacobs, Bart, and Mikael Parkvall.. 2021. "How Gbe is Guianese French Creole?" *Lingua* 250: 102939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102939 .

Jadfard, Roseline. 1997. *Kréòl. Guide Pratique de Conversation en Créole Guyanais*. Kourou: Ibis Rouge.

Jennings, William and Stefan Pfänder. 2015. French Guianese Creole: Its emergence from contact. *Journal of Language Contact* 8 (1): 36–69.

Jennings, William and Stefan Pfänder. 2018. *Inheritance and Innovation in a colonial language*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jennings, William. 1993. *La genèse du cayennais: Étude de sa démographie et de l'évolution de son système verbal*. Auckland: M. A. Thesis, University of Auckland.

Jennings, William. 1995. The first generation of a Creole society: Cayenne 1660–1700. In Baker, Philip (ed.), *From Contact to Creole and beyond*, 21–40. London: University of Westminster Press.

Jennings, William. 1999. The role of Cayenne in the Pernambuco-Surinam Hypothesis. In Huber, Magnus and Mikael Parkvall (eds.), *Spreading the word*, 241–50. London: Westminster University Press.

Jennings, William. 2001. Tense and aspect in Cayenne Creole. *Te Reo* 44: 65–84.

Jennings, William. 2009. Demographic factors in the formation of French Guianese Creole. Guianese Creole. In Selbach, Rachel and Hugo Cardoso (eds.), *Gradual Creolization: Studies Celebrating Jacques Arends*, 373–387. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kephart, Ron. 1991. Creole French in Carriacou, Grenada: Texts and Commentary. *Florida Journal of Anthropology* 16, special publication no. 7: 81–89.

Labat, Jean-Baptiste. 1730. *Voyage du Chevalier des Marchais en Guinée, isles voisines et à Cayenne, fait en 1725, 1726 et 1727*. Paris: Pierre Prault (4 vols.).

Ladhams, John. 2012. Article Agglutination and the African Contribution to the Portuguese-Based Creoles. In Bartens, Angela and Philip Baker (eds.), *Black Through White*, 31–50. London: Battlebridge.

Lang, Jürgen. 2009. *Les langues des autres dans la créolisation. Théorie et exemplification par le créole d'empreinte wolof à l'île Santiago du Cap-Vert*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Lasserre, Guy (ed.). 1979. *Atlas des départements français d'Outre-Mer 3: La Guyane*. Paris: Centre National de Recherche Scientifique/Institut Géographique National.

Lefebvre, Claire. 1998. *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ludwig, Ralph. 1996. Langues en contact: Évolutions du créole guadeloupéen. In Yacou, Alain (ed.), *Créoles de la Caraïbe*, 57–77. Paris: Karthala.

Manessy, Gabriel. 1995. *Créoles, pidgins, variétés véhiculaires. Procès et genèse*. Paris: CNRS.

Marley, David. 2005. *Historic cities of the Americas*, vol. 1. Santa Barbara: ABC/Clio.

Marley, David. 2008. *Wars of the Americas*, vol. 1 (2nd ed.). Santa Barbara: ABC/Clio.

Maurer, Philippe. 2009. *Principense*. London and Colombo: Battlebridge.

Montézon, M.-F. de (ed.). 1857. *Mission de Cayenne et de la Guyane française*, vol. 1. Paris: Julien, Lanier, Cosnard et Cie.

Mousse, Jean de la. 2006. *Les indiens de la Sinnamary. Journal du père Jean de la Mousse en Guyane (1684–1691)*. Paris: Éditions Chandeigne.

Oostindie, Gert. 1993. The economics of Surinam slavery. *Economic and Social History in the Netherlands* 5: 1–24.

Parkvall, Mikael. 1995. *A Dual Approach to French Creole Genesis*. M. A. Thesis, Stockholms Universitet, Institutionen för lingvistik.

Patrick, Peter. 1999. *Urban Jamaican creole: Variation in the mesolect*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Petitjean Roget, Jean. 1955. Les femmes des colons à la Martinique au XVIe et XVIIe siècle. *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 9 (2): 176–235.

Petitjean-Roget, Jacques. 1980. *La Société d'habitation à la Martinique – Un demi-siècle de formation 1635–1685* (2 vols.). Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.

Pfänder, Stefan. 1996. Il n'y a pas d'Histoire…: L'expression du temps passé en créole guyanais. *Études Créoles* 19 (2): 31–46.

Pfänder, Stefan. 2000. Le créole guyanais: Témoin d'une phase plus ancienne de la créolisation? *Etudes Créoles* 23 (2): 101–116

Pfänder, Stefan. 2000. *Aspekt und Tempus im Frankokreol*. Tübingen: Günter Narr.

Pfänder, Stefan. 2013. Guyanais. In Haspelmath, Martin, Magnus Huber, Philippe Maurer and Susanne Michaelis (eds.), *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, vol 2, 220–228. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillip, Hilary. 1988. *Description du créole de la Grenade*. Grenoble: Ph. D. thesis, Université de Grenoble.

Pinalie, Pierre and Jean Bernabé. 1999. *Grammaire du créole martiniquais en 50 leçons*. Paris: l'Harmattan.

Poullet, Hector, Sylviane Telchid and Danièle Montbrand. 1984. *Dictionnaire des expressions du créole guadeloupéen*. Fort-de-France: Hatier Antilles.

Prudent, Lambert-Félix. 1980. *Des baragouins à la langue antillaise: analyse historique et sociolinguistique du discours sur le créole*. Paris: Editions Caribéennes.

Quint, Nicolas. 2000. *Grammaire de la langue Cap-Verdienne*. Paris: l'Harmattan.

Revert, Eugène. 1949. *La Martinique*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines.

Rodway, James. 1912. *Guiana: British, Dutch, and French*. London: T. Fischer Unwin.

Röntgen, Karl-Heinz. 1998. L'origine d'une communauté créolophone: les Karipunas au Brésil. *Études Créoles* 21 (2): 36–64.

Rousselle, Antoine Loyer. 2018. *Le magasin de l'habitation Loyola: approche archéologique sur les identités et les interactions culturelles au XVIIIe siècle en Guyane française*. Québec: M. A. thesis, Université Laval.

Roux, Yannick Le. 1994. *L'Habitation guyanaise sous l'Ancien Régime. Étude de la culture matérielle*. Paris: Ph. D. thesis, École des Hautes Études.

Sainsbury, Noel. 1880. America and West Indies: July 1667. *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, vol 5, 1661–1668. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Sainsbury, Noel (ed.). 1880b. America and West Indies: May 1668. *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, vol. 5, 1661–1668. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Sainsbury, Noel (ed.). 1880c. America and West Indies: June 1668. *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, vol. 5, 1661–1668. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Sainsbury, Noel (ed.). 1880d. America and West Indies: December 1675. *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, vol. 9, 1675–1676. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Samuel, Peter and David Frank. 2000. Translating Poetry and Figurative Language into St. Lucian Creole. Paper presented at the 13th Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics, Mona, Jamaica, August 2000.

Schlupp, Daniel. 1997. *Modalités prédicatives, modalités aspectuelles et auxiliaires en créole à base lexicale française de la Guyane française: XVIIIe-XXe siècle*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Sheridan, Richard. 1974. *Sugar and Slavery. An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623–1775*. Lodge Hill: University of the West Indies.

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

Stolz, Thomas. 1986. *Gibt es das kreolische Sprachwandelsmodell?* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Taillemite, Étienne. 1969. Guillouet d'Orvilliers, Claude. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2.

Taylor, Douglas. 1977. *Languages of the West Indies*. London: Johns Hopkins.

Telchid, Sylviane. 1985. Ti Chika. http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/tichika.htm. Accessed 2019-12-23.

Ternaux-Compans, Henri. 1843. *Notice historique sur la Guyane française*. Paris: Firmin Didot frères.

Tertre, Jean Baptiste. 1667–1671. *Histoire générale des Antilles habitées par les François*. 4 vols. Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Thomas, John Jacob. 1869. *The theory and practice of Creole grammar*. Port of Spain: Chronicle publishing office.

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

Tobler, Alfred. 1987. *Dicionário crioulo karipúna/português, português/crioulo karipúna*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Tobler, Joy. 1983. *The grammar of Karipúna Creole*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Tourneux, Henry and Maurice Barbotin. 2008. *Dictionnaire pratique du créole de Guadeloupe (Marie-Galante)*. Paris: Karthala.

Valdman, Albert. 1978. *Le créole: Structure, statut et origine*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Valdman, Albert. 1983. Creolization and second language acquisition. In Anderson, Roger (ed.), *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*, 212–243. Rowley: Newbury House.

Valkhoff, Marius. 1966. *Studies in Portuguese and Creole*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Voorhoeve, Jan. 1973. Historical and linguistic evidence in favour of the relexification theory in the Formation of Creoles. Language in Society 1. 133–145.

Warburton, Irene, Prosper Kpotufe and Roland Glover. 1968. *Ewe basic course*. African Studies Program, Indiana University.

Westermann, Diedrich and M. A. Bryan. 1952. *The Languages of West Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.

Westermann, Diedrich. 1939. *Die Ewe-Sprache in Togo*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Wiesinger, Evelyn. 2013. Acteurs et échanges linguistiques dans les premiers temps en Guyane française coloniale: Contribution à l'étude de la genèse du créole guyanais.

Creolica.   http://www.creolica.net/Acteurs-et-echanges-linguistiques.   Accessed
    2018-12-23.

Wiesinger, Evelyn. 2016. Marquage du pluriel en créole guyanais et au-delà. *Études
    Créoles* 34 (1–2): 63–98.

Wiesinger, Evelyn. 2019. Non-French lexicon in Guianese French Creole. A
    sociohistorical and linguistic study on the African contribution. *Journal of Pidgin
    and Creole Languages* 34 (1): 3–48.

Appendix

Parallel example sentences in Guianese and Lesser Antillean

	French	Lesser Antillean	Guianese	Creole gloss
She doesn't sing for us	Elle ne chante pas pour nous	*I pa ka ʃãte pu nu*	*I pa ka ʃãte pu nu*	3s NEG IPFV sing PREP 1p
She isn't singing	Elle ne chante pas	*I pa ka ʃãte*	*I pa ka ʃãte*	3s NEG IPFV sing
She hasn't sung	Elle n'a pas chanté	*I pɔkɔ ʃãte*	*I pɔkɔ ʃãte*	3s NEG.yet sing
She sees her brother by the door	Elle voit son frère à la porte	*I ka wɛ frɛ-j bɔ lapɔt-la*	*I ka wɛ so frɛ bɔd lapɔt-a*	3s IPFV see brother-3s PREP door-DEF / 3s IPFV see 3s.POSS brother PREP door DEF
She will not sing	Elle ne chantera pas	*I pe ke ʃãte*	*I pe ke ʃãte*	3s NEG IRR sing
She's all right	Elle va bien	*I bjẽ*	*I bjẽ*	3s alright
They asked me if I wanted it	Ils m'ont demandé si je le voulais	*Jo mãde mwẽ si mwẽ te le j*	*Je dumãde mo si mo te le l*	3p ask 1s if 1s PST want 3s.OBJ
They're not like that	Ils ne sont pas comme ça	*Jo pa kõsa*	*Je pa komsa*	3p NEG like.that