**A Diachronic and Synchronic Account
of the Multifunctionality of Saramaccan *táa***

Claire Lefebvre
Université du Québec à Montréal and MPI/EVA, Leipzig
and
Virginie Loranger
Université du Québec à Montréal

Table of contents

Summary

This paper bears on the properties and on the historical derivation of the multifunctional lexical item *táa* in Saramaccan, an English and Portuguese based Creole of Surinam. *Táa* fulfills several functions : it may be used as a verb, a complementiser, a quotative marker, and as a marker conveying similarity or manner. *Táa* is thus a multifunctional lexical item. Its functions parallel in a remarkable way those of the semantically closest substrate languages lexical entries. Furthermore, a review of the early sources reveals that *táa* was already a multifunctional item in early SA. This constitutes a major drawback for a grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*. The properties of *táa* are argued to have been derived through the process of relexification. This process consists in assigning a new label to an existing lexical entry; relexification thus reduces to relabelling. Finally, the parameters of relexification/relabelling are shown to be compatible with a monosemic account of multifunctionality, and to not be compatible with a polysemic account of the phenomenon.

List of Abbreviations

ASP	aspectual marker
COMP	complementiser
DEF	definite determiner
DEF.FUT	definite future marker
ɗɔ̀	verb 'to say', complementiser, quotative marker, marker conveying similarity or manner
FOC	focus marker
FU	*fu*
FUT	future marker
HAB	habitual marker
IMP	perfective marker
INJ	injunctive
INS	marker of insistence
INTERJ	interjection
IRR	irrealis mood marker
LOC	locative marker
MO	mood marker
NEG	negation marker
PERF	perfective marker

PL	plural
PREP	preposition
SA	Saramaccan
SG	singular
SUB	subjunctive marker
TÁA	verb 'to say', complementiser, quotative marker, marker conveying similarity or manner
TNS	tense marker
TOP	topic marker

A Diachronic and Synchronic Account
of the Multifunctionality of Saramaccan *táa* **[footnote * HERE]**

Claire Lefebvre
Université du Québec à Montréal and MPI/EVA, Leipzig
and
Virginie Loranger
Université du Québec à Montréal

0. Introduction

This paper bears on the properties and on the historical derivation of the multifunctional lexical item *táa* (and related lexical items) in Saramaccan, henceforth SA. SA is a creole spoken in Surinam. Its lexifier or superstrate languages are English (50% of basic vocabulary) and Portuguese (35% of basic vocabulary according to Smith 1987, 37% according to Voorhoeve 1973 : 139, and 57% according to Holm 1989 : 438). Its substrate languages are mainly the Gbe languages (Arends 1995; Migge 1998; Smith 1987), and less importantly Twi (Plag 1993 : 34) and Kikongo (Arends 1995; Migge 1998). Gbe and Twi are Kwa languages, Kikongo is Bantu. All belong to the Niger-Congo language family.

The SA dictionary (Rountree *et al.* 2000 : 101) provides several meanings for *táa* : 'to say', 'that', 'as if'. This suggests that the form *táa* is associated with more than one grammatical function. For example, in (1) [footnote 1 HERE], it seems to have the function of a verb, and in (2), that of a complementiser. Note from example (2) that *táki* is a verb that means 'to say' in SA.

(1) *De   táa,   « Wë,   aaa   baa,   wë,   söni! »*   SA

    3pl   TÁA   « Well   aaa   brother   well   something »

    'They said : « Well, uh, well, there is something (wrong)! »'

                                      (=(104) in Rountree 1992!: 23)

(2) *A   táki   táa   á   búnu.*   SA

    3sg   say   TÁA   3sg.NEG   good

    'He said that it is not good.'   (=(3a) in Veenstra 1996a!: 155)

As we will see in section 1, *táa* may also fulfill other functions. The fact that *táa* may fulfill several functions raises the question of the source of its multifunctionality. Two options present themselves. Either the different functions of *táa* developed from within the creole, as a result of reanalysis, yielding the grammaticalisation of the verb *táa* 'to say' to a *that*-type complementiser among other functions, or SA *táa* inherited its multifunctionality from its source languages. A grammaticalisation account has been claimed by several authors (e.g. Byrne 1987; McWhorter 1992; Veenstra 1996a, 1996b). [footnote 2 HERE] On the basis of various sets of data, we argue against a grammaticalisation scenario of SA *táa*.

    On the basis of the similarity of the properties of SA *táa* with corresponding lexical entries in the substrate languages of SA, as well as in early SA sources, we argue that this lexical entry, though *labelled* on the basis of English, has inherited its semantic and syntactic properties from corresponding lexical entries in the African substrate languages. We argue that this was achieved through the process of relexification. This process consists

in assigning a new label to a given lexical entry of L_1 on the basis of a phonetic string from another language, e.g. L_2. Given the nature of the process, relexification is also referred to as relabelling (see Lefebvre and Lumsden 1994). We show that this process yields the properties of SA *táa* in a straightforward way : while the phonological form of *táa* is derived from a phonetic string in one of the lexifier languages, the semantic and syntactic properties of this lexical entry are derived from those of the corresponding lexical entries in the African substrate languages. [footnote 3 HERE] We challenge the current view according to which *táa* is derived from English *talk* and bring arguments supporting a derivation of *táa* from English *tell*.

The fact that SA *táa* and substrate-related lexical items are multifunctional raises the problem of the representation of these items in the lexicon. On a polysemic approach to multifunctionality, the various functions of a given form correspond to different lexical entries. Such an analysis of SA *táa* has been proposed by Veenstra (1996a) who claims that there are two lexical entries for *táa* : one that corresponds to its function as a verb, and one that corresponds to its function as a complementiser (this author does not discuss the other functions of *táa* [footnote 4 HERE]). In the general linguistic literature (e.g. Bouchard 1995; Cowper 1989, 1995; Ghomeshi and Massam 1994; Johns 1992; Nida 1948; Ruhl 1989, etc.), however, it has been proposed that monosemy is to be preferred over polysemy. On a monosemic approach to multifunctionality, the various functions of a given form are all represented within a single lexical entry. This approach is guided by the one form/one meaning principle formulated by Johns (1992 : 84) in the following way :

Where morphemes are identical or similar in phonological properties, in

the unmarked case, they are identical or similar in all lexical properties.

A thorough discussion of the issue of the representation of multifunctional lexical items in the lexicon is far beyond the scope of this paper. On the basis of available literature, we will, however, provide the grounds for a possible unified analysis of the various functions of *táa.*

The major contributions of the paper are the following. From a descriptive point of view, the contribution of the paper is twofold. First, it draws attention to functions of *táa* that have not yet been discussed in the literature. Second, it provides a detailed comparison of the SA and Gbe (Fongbe) as well as other substrate data. From a historical point of view, the particular case of SA *táa* adds to an already large body of creole lexical entries argued to have been produced by relexification/relabelling (see Lefebvre 1998 and the references therein). The fact that SA *táa* was created by relabelling shows that multifunctional lexical entries do undergo relabelling, just like other lexical entries do. Finally, the relexification account of creole genesis provides a context for constructing a strong argument in favour of a monosemic approach to multifunctionality (a unique lexical entry), over a polysemic one (several lexical entries), as the relabelling of the multifunctional substrate lexical items as *táa* is compatible only with monosemic approaches to multifunctionality.

The paper is organised in the following way. Section 1 provides data showing the multifunctional character of SA *táa* and how these properties contrast with those of *táki*, a verb meaning 'to say', 'to talk' (see (2)). Section 2 provides a comparison of the properties

of *táa* and *táki* with those of the closest corresponding lexical items in the source languages of the creole. It will become evident that, while *táa* and *táki* derive their label from English, their semantic and syntactic properties are derived from those of corresponding lexical items in the SA substrate languages. Detailed data from Fongbe, a language of the Gbe dialect cluster (Capo 1984, 1991) will be presented. Data from other SA substrate languages, that is, other Gbe and other Kwa languages, as well as Bantu languages with particular reference to Kikongo, will also be referred to on the basis of the literature. Section 3 studies the properties of *táa* and *táki* in early sources and discusses the consequences of this state of affairs for a grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*. Section 4 provides a diachronic account of the multifunctionality of SA *táa* within the framework of the relexification account of creole genesis developed in Lefebvre (1998 and the references therein). It also addresses the issue of the historical source of the two forms *táa* and *táki*. Section 5 argues that the relexification of multifunctional lexical items is compatible only with monosemic approaches to multifunctionality. Section 6 concludes the paper.

The bulk of the data cited in this paper is drawn from the literature. For SA, Marvin Kramer has also volunteered some of his unpublished data; they are identified as such. Tones and orthographic conventions are as in the authors cited. We did not regularised transcriptions. Original data collected by Lefebvre (January 2005) from three Saramaccan speakers from Surinam (two of which from the region of Libasè) will also be cited. The bulk of the Fongbe data is also drawn from the literature with a few additions from

Lefebvre's field notes. Unless otherwise stated, data on other languages discussed in the paper are all drawn from the literature.

1.   The functions of SA *táa* and *táki*

This section documents the properties of *táa* and *táki*. It is shown that *táa* can function as a verb, a complementiser, a quote introducer, and a conjunction of similarity/manner. The verbal status of *táa* requires precisions. First, *táa* does not function as a verb for all speakers. Second, for speakers for whom *táa* may function as a verb, *táa* is a defective verb as it does not exhibit all the properties of verbs. In contrast, *táki* can function only as a verb and it has all the properties of verbs.

According to some authors, SA *táa* may be used as a verb. Arguments presented to support this analysis are the following. First, as a verb, SA *táa* may introduce direct and indirect discourse, as is shown in (3) and (4), respectively.

(3) *Hén   a   táa :   mi   nángó.*   SA

and.then 3sg   TÁA   1sg   ASP.go

'And then he said : I am leaving.'   (=(1a) in Veenstra 1996a : 155)

(4) *Di   womi   táa   an   o-go.*   SA

DEF   man   TÁA   3sg.NEG   MO.go

'The man said that he is not going.'   (=(91) in Rountree 1992 : 19)

Second, as a verb, *táa* may be preceded by tense, mood and aspect markers. In (5), *táa* is preceded by the imperfective aspect marker *tá*.

(5) *Hen   a   tá   táa: mi   nángó.*   SA

   and.then 3sg   ASP   TÁA 1sg ASP.go

   'And then he is saying: I am leaving.'   (=(6a) in Veenstra 1996a : 156)

Third, as a verb, *táa* may undergo predicate cleft, as in (6).

(6) *Táa   a   táa : m'e   nángó.*   SA

   TÁA   3sg   TÁA 1sg. NEG   ASP.go

   'He really said: I'm not leaving.'   (=(6b) in Veenstra 1996a : 156)

Fourth, as a verb, *táa* may occur as a second verb in a series. An example where *táa* can

possibly be claimed to occur as a second verb in a series is provided in (7).

(7) *Mi   manda hen   táa   fu   a   go.*   SA

   1sg   send   3sg   TÁA   FU   3sg   go

   'I sent him away.'   (=(31) in Wijnen and Alleyne 1987 : 46)

In Rountree *et al.* (2000), *mandá* is translated as 'to send', 'to command'. The sentence in

(7) literally translates as 'I ordered (='send' + 'say') him to go away'.

   In spite of these arguments, the claim that SA *táa* is a verb suffers from a few

drawbacks. As will be seen later in the text, in (3), (4) and (5), *táa* may be analysed as

having another function than that of verb. While the possibility of predicate clefting *táa*

constitutes a strong argument in favor of its verbal status, since only verbs may undergo

predicate cleft, the possibility for *táa* to undergo predicate cleft is not shared by all SA

speakers. If the speakers in Veenstra can predicate cleft *táa,* the speakers that Lefebvre

worked with cannot. This shows that *táa* may not have the function of verb for all speakers.

The status of *táa* as a serial verb also needs to be further documented. On the one hand,

examples from the literature are scarce. On the other hand, Veenstra (1996a : 156, 157) refers to *táa* as a former serial verb having been reanalysed as a complementiser. He, however, provides no examples of *táa* occurring as a second verb in a series. As will be seen below, in example (7), *táa* may be analysed as having another function than that of a verb. Finally, while SA verbs may undergo reduplication to form nouns (e.g. *táki* 'to say', *tákitáki* 'disagreement, dissension', Rountree *et al.* 2000), SA *táa* cannot undergo reduplication. It thus appears that, even for the speakers who use *táa* as a verb, *táa* does not have all the properties of verbs.

SA *táa* may also be used as a complementiser. In this function, it is selected by verbs. It may be selected by utterance verbs, as in (8).

(8) *A   tákí   táa   dí   mujée   bi-gó   a   dí   kéiki.*   SA

3sg   say   TÁA   DEF   woman   TNS-go   LOC   DEF   church

'He said that the woman had gone to the church.'

(=(85b) in Byrne 1987!: 147)

It may be selected by cognition verbs, as in (9).

(9) *Mi   sabi   táa   ju   o-ganjan   mi.*   SA

1sg   know   TÁA   you.NEG   MO.deceive   1sg

'I know that you will not deceive me.'   (=(90) in Rountree 1992 : 19)

It may be selected by verbs of (indirect) perception, as in (10).

(10) *Mi sí táa dí wómi kumútu   a*[footnote 5 HERE]*dí wósu káá.* SA

    1sg see TÁA the man come.out LOC   DEF house finish

    'I saw that the man had already come out of the house.'

                       (=(3c) in Veenstra 1996a : 155)

Other verbs that select *táa* include : *begi* 'to pray', *piki* 'to answer', *piimisi* 'to request pardon', *hakisi* 'to ask', *meni* 'to think', *sábi* 'to know', *feni* 'to find/consider', *pakisei* 'to think/consider', *jei* 'to hear'. As a complementiser, *táa* is in complementary distribution with other complementisers in the language. For example, it is in complementary distribution with *fu* when the latter is used as a complementiser. [footnote 6 HERE] As a complementiser, *fu* is selected by emotion verbs, such as *ke* 'to want,' *da táanga* [Lit. : 'give strength'] 'to encourage', *duingi* 'to force', *paamisi* 'to promise', *da piimisi* [Lit. : 'give permission'] 'to permit', etc. This is illustrated in (11).

(11) *Di mii an kë fu i sindo.*   SA

    DEF child NEG want FU 2sg sit

    'The child doesn't want you to sit down.'   (=(30) in Rountree 1992 : 11)

According to Lefebvre's informants, the combination *ké fu* yields the interpretation 'to wish'. The combination *ké táa* is more forceful. It is interpreted as an order, as is illustrated in (12).

(12) *Dí míi ké táa i músu sindó.*   SA

    DEF child want TÁA you must sit

    'The child wants/orders you to sit down.'   (Lefebvre's field notes)

The data in (11) and (12) show that *kέ* is a volitional verb when occurring with the complementiser *fu*, but an utterance verb when occurring with the complementiser *táa*.

As complementisers, *táa* and *fu* are in a paradigmatic relationship. While *táa* is selected by utterance, cognition and perception verbs, as we saw in (8)-(10) and (12), *fu* is selected by emotion verbs, as above. While the event described by the clause introduced by *táa* is presupposed to have occurred or to occur in the near future, the event described by the clause introduced by *fu* is not presupposed to have occurred nor to occur in the near future (Bickerton 1984 : 181; Damonte 2002 : 9; Rountree 1992 : 65; Veenstra 1996a : 155). The distinction between the two complementisers thus appears to be that, while *táa* is indicative, *fu* is subjunctive. [footnote 7 HERE] As complementisers, *táa* and *fu* are mutually exclusive.

There is one example, cited by Veenstra (1996a : 96), that appears to constitute a counter example to the expected mutual exclusion of the two forms. This example is reproduced in (13). [footnote 8 HERE]

(13) *I   táki   táa fu   a   náki   dí   dágu.*   SA

    2sg   say   TÁA FU   3sg   hit   DEF dog

    'You told him to hit the dog.'   (=(5) in Veenstra 1996a : 156)

Damonte (2002) and Aboh (2002) both argue that the data in (13) constitute only an apparent counterexample to the claim that, as complementisers, *táa* and *fu* are mutually exclusive. Damonte (2002) proposes that *táa* and *fu* fill different syntactic positions. He adopts the split CP analysis of Rizzi (1997), where CP decomposes into four projections :

ForceP, TopicP, FocusP and Fin(iteness)P. On the one hand, ForceP is the projection where the relation of dependence between the embedded and the matrix clauses is expressed. Hence, ForceP is the position for selected complementisers. On the other hand, FinP is a projection that contains material that is interpreted as part of the embedded clause. Hence, FinP is not a position for selected complementisers. Damonte proposes that, while *táa* occurs as head of ForceP, *fu* always occurs as head of FinP. This analysis predicts correctly that *táa* and *fu* will be allowed to co-occur, as in (13). It does not tell us about the data of the type in (11), however, where *fu* is clearly selected by the matrix verb. Aboh's (2002) slightly different proposal provides a solution to this problem.

On Aboh's proposal, *táa* and *fu* occurring as complementisers selected by matrix verbs are both generated as the head of ForceP—and are thus mutually exclusive in this position—, whereas the irrealis mood marker *fu*, interpreted as part of the embedded clause, is the head of FinP. On this analysis, in (11), *fu* would head ForceP, since it is selected by the matrix verb, but in (13), it would head FinP, since it is interpreted as the irrealis mood marker of the embedded clause. Aboh's (2002) analysis thus accounts in a straightforward way for the data in (13); in this sentence, *táa* heads ForceP, and *fu* FinP. On this analysis, the sentence in (13) would be best translated as 'You said that he should hit the dog', where *táa* introduces the clausal complement of the verb 'to say', and *fu* is the irrealis mood marker interpreted as part of the embedded clause. Thus, as complementisers, *táa* and *fu* are in complementary distribution; *fu* can co-occur with *táa* only when it is interpreted as a mood marker belonging in the embedded clause.

The above analysis can also account in a straightforward way for the ambiguity of the structures in (14) and (15).

(14) *De   táa   fu   de   hasuwa.*   SA

     3pl   TÁA   FU   3pl   wrestle

     'They decided to wrestle.'   (=(106) in Rountree 1992 : 24)

(15) *A   táa   fu   i   go.*   SA

     3sg   TÁA   FU   2sg   go

     'She said for you to go.'   (=(29) in Rountree 1992 : 10)

Both sentences may be assigned two interpretations. Sentence (14) is interpreted as 'They decided to wrestle' in Rountree; however, Lefebvre's informants interpret it as 'They said (that) they should wrestle'. Likewise, sentence (15) is interpreted as 'She ordered you to go' in Rountree, but as 'She said (that) you should go' by Lefebvre's informants. In both cases, the first interpretation is triggered by *fu* heading ForceP, thus being interpreted in conjunction with the predicates of the main clause with the conflated meanings 'to decide' and 'to order', respectively. In both cases as well, the second interpretation is triggered by *fu* heading FinP, and thus interpreted as the mood marker of the embedded clause.

So far we have seen that the SA lexical item *táa* shares properties with verbs (for some speakers) and with complementisers. The two functions of *táa* may be distinguished on the basis of syntactic tests provided in Veenstra (1996a). First, as a verb, *táa* may undergo predicate cleft, but as a complementiser, it may not. This contrast is illustrated in (16).

(16) a. *Táa   a   táa : m'e   nángó.*   SA

        TÁA   3sg TÁA 1sg. NEG ASP.go

        'He really said: I'm not leaving.'   (=(6b) in Veenstra 1996a : 156)

     b.   **táa   a   táki táa á   búnu*   SA

         TÁA   3sg say TÁA 3sg.NEG good

                                 (=(8a) in Veenstra 1996a : 157)

(Recall that not all speakers accept (16)a. Both Kramer's and Lefebvre's informants are such speakers. This aspect of variation among speakers will be taken up below). Second, as a verb, *táa* may be preceded by tense, mood or aspect markers, but as a complementiser, it may not be. This contrast is illustrated in (17).

(17) a. *Hen   a   tá   táa: mi   nángó.*   SA

        and.then 3sg ASP TÁA 1sg   ASP.go

        'And then he is saying: I am leaving.' (=(6a) in Veenstra 1996a : 156)

     b.   **a   táki tá   táa á   búnu*   SA

        3sg say ASP TÁA 3sg.NEG good

                                 (=(7a) in Veenstra 1996a : 157)

Since for some speakers *táa* fulfills the functions of a verb meaning 'to say' and that of a *that*-type complementiser, we expect that contexts involving 'to say that' will exhibit a sequence of two consecutive *táa*s. In (4), however, there is only one occurrence of *táa*. Furthermore, there could not be a sequence of two consecutive *táa*s, for SA doesn't allow for two *táa*s to co-occur, as is shown by the ungrammaticality of (18) (see also Rountree 1992 : 19).

(18) *a   *táa*   *táa*   *a*   *gó*   SA

     3sg   TÁA   TÁA   3sg go   (=(1b) in Veenstra 1996a : 155)

One way of explaining these facts would be to say that the verb *táa* does not select *táa* as its complementiser. Since utterance verbs do select *táa* as their complementiser, as we saw above, and since *táa* is an utterance verb, an explanation along these lines would be rather *ad hoc*. Another way of looking at these facts is to treat them as the result of a surface constraint preventing the pronunciation of two adjacent identical forms, in this case two *táa*s. Several examples of this type of constraint have been reported in the literature (see e.g. Hyman 2002 and the references therein; Lefebvre 1998 and the references therein; Menn and MacWhinney 1984 and the references therein). There are ways around this constraint, however. One of them consists in using the form *táki* instead of *táa* to encode the verb meaning 'to say'. The latter can be followed by the complementiser *táa*, as is illustrated in (19).

(19) *A*   *táki* *táa* *dí*   *mujée* *bi-gó* *a*   *dí*   *kéiki.*   SA

     3sg say TÁA DEF woman TNS.go LOC DEF church

     'He said that the woman had gone to the church.'

                                         (=(85b) in Byrne 1987 : 147)

Another way around this constraint consists in pronouncing only one occurrence of *táa*, as in (20) below.

(20) *Di*   *womi* *táa* *an*   *o-go.*   SA

     DEF man   TÁA 3sg.NEG incom-go

     'The man said he is not going.'   (=(91) in Rountree 1992 : 19)

Although the literature on SA does not directly address the question of which of the two *táa*s is pronounced in cases like these, it is generally assumed that it is the verb that is pronounced, and that it is the complementiser that is deleted (e.g. Arends 1997; Rountree 1992 : 19; Veenstra 1996a : 155). This assumption most probably carries over from languages like English, where complementisers can be deleted in some environments. The question of which of the two *táa*s is pronounced in the above SA examples will be taken up in section 2.

The proposal that a sequence involving two consecutive *táa*s is not possible in SA as a consequence of a surface constraint preventing the pronunciation of two adjacent identical forms would be reinforced if there were a context where the sequence could be broken up allowing for two *táa*s to both be pronounced. Such a hypothetical context could be created if *táa* could be followed by a Goal as in '…say to x that…'. The literature on SA contains no example of *táa* 'to say' followed by a Goal. Both Kramer's (p.c.) and Lefebvre's informants refuse sentences such as (21), where *táa* is followed by a Goal argument.

(21) **a   táa   da   mi   táa…*   SA

      3sg   TÁA   to   1sg   TÁA

      [Lit. : 'he said to me that…']   (Marvin Kramer p.c. and Lefebvre's field notes)

The ungrammaticality of (21) shows that SA *táa* does not take a Goal argument. There thus appears to be no context in SA, where a potential sequence of two *táa*s could be broken up. This point will be taken up in light of data from West African languages.

In addition to functioning as a verb (for some speakers) and as a complementiser, *táa* fulfills two other functions. In Rountree and Glock (1982 : 173-174) there are examples

where *táa* is used as a quote introducer. As such, it is glossed as 'saying'. This use of *táa* is exemplified in (22).

(22) *Hën mi táa : « Mi taki e», taki «aai» táa,*   SA

Then 1sg TÁA 1sg say INTERJ say yes TÁA

«hii mundu o-manda i táa fii kii di mii fii».

all earth MO.send 2sg TÁA FU.2sg kill the child of.yours

'I said : «Listen». She said : «Yes?» (I) said «Everybody is urging you to kill your child».'   (=(4) in Rountree and Glock 1982 : 173)

A similar use of *táa* is reproduced in (23).

(23) *Mi hákísi táa : "Mi kɛ́ bebé wáta".*

1sg ask TÁA I want drink water

'I asked : "I want to drink water".'   (Lefebvre's field notes)

Finally, *táa* is used as a marker conveying similarity or manner. With this function, it is glossed as 'as if' or as 'like'.

(24) *A mbei táa a nango.*   SA

3sg do TÁA 3sg IMP.go

'He acted as if he was going.'   (Rountree *et al.* 2000 : 101, 102)

(25) *Joo*   *tja*   *nën*   *táa*   *i*   *kii*   *sëmbë*   *(Leti sö.)*   SA

2sg.MO   carry   name   TÁA   2sg   kill   person   (right thus)

kaa   *na*   *i*   *bi*   *kii*   *ën*   *(Leti sö.)*

already   NEG   2sg   TNS   kill   3sg   (right thus)

'You will get a reputation for shooting people, even though it was an accident.'

(=(25) in Rountree and Glock 1982!: 184)

Lefebvre's informants noted that *kuma* 'as if/like' can be used instead of *táa* in the context of the sentences in (24) and (25).

The data presented above show that SA *táa* can fulfill the function of a verb meaning 'to say', that of a *that*-type complementiser, that of a quote introducer translated as 'saying', and that of a marker conveying similarity or manner, translated as 'as if'. The lexical item *táa* is thus a multifunctional lexical item. Recall from the discussion about (16) that speakers divide into two groups with respect to the possibility of predicate clefting *táa* : some speakers accept it and some don't. We interpret this discrepancy in the following way. For those speakers who accept predicate clefting of *táa*, *táa* is analysable as a verb. For those who do not accept it, *táa* is not analysable as a verb. Additional data that support this interpretation of the data will be presented in section 2.3. There thus appears to be two slightly different SA lexicons : SA$_1$, where *táa* may fulfill all four functions, and SA$_2$, where *táa* may fulfill three out of four functions, the verbal one being excluded from the

latter lexicon. The properties of *táa* in the two slightly different SA lexicons are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 : The properties of *táa* in two slightly different SA lexicons.

	SA₁ *táa*	SA₂ *táa*
Speech verb meaning 'to say'	+	–
Serial verb	?	–
Complementiser	+	+
Quote introducer	+	+
Conjunction conveying comparison/manner	+	+

The SA lexicon also contains *táki*, a speech verb meaning 'to say' (see (2), (8), (13) and (19)). To our knowledge, all speakers have *táki* in their lexicon. *Táa* and *táki* do not have the same properties. We begin by comparing the properties of *táki* with those of *táa* in SA₁ lexicon. As a verb, *táa* can only be interpreted as 'to say' whereas *táki* can also be interpreted as 'to talk' (see Rountree *et al.* 2000). While *táa* can be used as a (serial?) verb, a quote introducer, a *that*-type complementiser, and a conjunction meaning 'as if', *táki* can only function as a main verb. While *táki* may be used as a noun meaning 'authority, decision, agreement', as a result of morphological conversion (see Rountree *et al.* 2000 : 102), *táa* cannot be used as a noun. While *táki* can be reduplicated to form *tákitáki*, a deverbal noun meaning 'disagreement, dissension' (Rountree *et al.* 2000), *táa* cannot be so reduplicated. Furthermore, *táki* and *táa* do not have exactly the same selectional properties. While both lexical items may select a clause as their complement (see e.g. (2) and (4)), *táki*, but not *táa*, may also select a Goal. In (26), the Goal argument of *táki* 'him' is introduced

by the benefactive preposition *da* (e.g. Rountree *et al.* 2000). The preposition and the pronoun contract to *dëën*. The grammaticality of (26) contrasts with the ungrammaticality of (21).

(26) *Di   soní   e,   gaama táki   dëën   tu   táa   te*   SA

      DEF thing INTERJ chief say to-3sg also TÁA   when

      mama   fëën   dëdë,   an   musu   bei   ën   a   goon.

      mother of-3sg die   3sg-NEG   must   bury 3sg in ground

      'Another thing : the chief said to him that when his mother dies, he shouldn't

      bury her in the ground.'   (=(65) in Rountree and Glock 1982 : 179)

So, aside from sharing the function of speech verbs meaning 'to say', and from selecting clauses as their complements, SA$_1$ *táa* and *táki* have quite different properties. On the one hand, *táki* has all the properties of verbs, including the possibility of being nominalised either by morphological conversion or by reduplication, but SA$_1$ *táa* lacks this major property of verbs. On the other hand, *táki* does not have the versatility that *táa* has as a multifunctional lexical item. As for SA$_2$, *táa* and *táki* have no properties in common except for that of selecting a clause. The properties of *táa* in SA$_1$ and SA$_2$, and those of *táki* are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2 : The properties of SA *táa* and of SA *táki*.

	SA$_1$ *táa*	*táki*	SA$_2$ *táa*
Speech verb meaning 'to say'	+	+	−
meaning 'to talk'	−	+	−
Serial verb	?	−	−
Complementiser	+	−	+
Quote introducer	+	−	+
Conjunction conveying comparison/manner	+	−	+
Used as a noun	−	+	−
Nominalised by reduplication	−	+	−
Select a clause	+	+	+
Select a Goal	−	+	−

Before we turn to the discussion of the source of the properties of these two lexical items, let us mention that two other lexical entries are relevant for the present discussion : *fàn*, a verb meaning 'to speak', and a noun meaning 'talk', 'speech' (Rountree *et al.* 2000), and *fa*, a *that*-type complementiser. These two lexical items will be discussed in section 3.

2.   The source of the properties of SA *táa* and *táki*

The problem of the source of the properties of SA *táa* and *táki* is explored on the basis of a comparison of the properties of *táa* (in SA$_1$ and in SA$_2$) and *táki* with those of the closest lexical entries in the source languages of SA. Since these forms are assumed to be ultimately related to English *talk* (but see section 4.3), we begin by comparing the properties of *táa* and *táki* with those of English *talk*. We then compare the properties of *táa* and *táki* with those of the corresponding lexical entry in Fongbe. Recall from the

introduction that Fongbe is an important substrate language of SA. This detailed comparison is followed by a survey of the properties of corresponding lexical items in other African languages that have been shown to contribute to the make up of SA.

2.1.   SA *táa* and *táki*, and English *talk*

We begin by comparing the properties of SA *táki* and English *talk*. Both lexical entries mean 'to talk', but in addition, *táki*, but not *talk*, means 'to say'. Both lexical entries share the property that they can be used as verbs but not as complementisers, quotation introducers nor as a marker conveying similarity or manner. Both lexical items can be used as nouns and they can be nominalised. In this case, however, they do not have exactly the same meaning. As was shown in section 1, as a noun, *táki* means 'authority, decision, agreement'. As a noun, *talk* appears in expressions such as 'to give a talk', 'to have a talk', etc. As a deverbal noun, *tákitáki* means 'disagreement, dissention', but as a deverbal noun, *talking* refers to the action denoted by the verb. Finally, the two verbs do not have exactly the same subcategorisation properties. While both may select a Goal, only *táki* may select a clause. This is a consequence of the fact that, in contrast to *talk*, *táki* also means 'to say'. The properties of SA *táki* and those of English *talk* are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 : The properties of SA *taki* and of English *talk*

	táki	*talk*
Speech verb meaning 'to say'	+	−
meaning 'to talk'	+	+
Serial verb	−	−
Complementiser	−	−
Quote introducer	−	−
Conjunction conveying comparison/manner	−	−
Used as a noun	+	+
Nominalised by reduplication	+	−
Select a clause	+	−
Select a Goal	+	+

So, although SA *táki* and English *talk* share a number of properties such as being verbs, verbs that can be nominalised by means of morphological conversion, they are not equivalent. From a semantic point of view, although they share some element of meaning, they are not equivalent. The same observation goes for their nominal counterpart. From a selectional point of view, they are not identical either. The details of the properties of the SA lexical entry are thus not easily explainable in terms of the properties of English *talk*.

The comparison of SA₁ *táa* and English *talk* shows even more difference between the two lexical items. Although *táa* and *talk* share some elements of meaning, both being speech verbs, they are far from being equivalent. As we saw in the introduction and in section 1, as a verb, SA *táa* means 'to say', but not 'to talk'. As a verb, English *talk* means 'to talk', but not 'to say'. In addition to being used as a verb, SA *táa* can also be used as a

quote introducer, as a complementiser and as a conjunction conveying similarity or manner. English *talk* cannot be used as a quote introducer, nor as a complementiser, nor as a conjunction conveying similarity or manner. While English *talk* can be used as a noun as in 'a talk'[footnote 9 HERE], there is no nominal function associated with SA *táa*. Furthermore, English *talk* can be nominalised with the affix *-ing* to form *talking* referring to the action denoted by the verb. SA *táa* cannot be nominalised in this way nor in any other way. The selectional properties of SA *táa* and those of English *talk* are also quite distinct. While SA *táa* selects complement clauses, English *talk* does not select clauses as its complement. While English *talk* can select a Goal (e.g. 'talk to x'), SA *táa* does not select a Goal argument (see (21)). The properties of SA_1 and SA_2 *táa*, and those of English *talk* are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4 : The properties of SA *táa* and of English *talk*

	SA_2 *táa*	SA_1 *táa*	*talk*
Speech verb meaning 'to say'	−	+	−
meaning 'to talk'	−	−	+
Serial verb	−	?	−
Complementiser	+	+	−
Quote introducer	+	+	−
Conjunction conveying comparison/manner	+	+	−
Used as a noun	−	−	+
Nominalised by reduplication	−	−	+
Select a clause	+	+	−
Select a Goal	−	−	+

The only feature that SA₁ *táa* and English *talk* appear to have in common is that of being speech verbs. SA₂ *táa* has no feature in common with English *talk*. Given the contrastive properties of SA *táa* and English *talk,* there is no way that the details of the semantic and syntactic properties of *táa* can be derived from those of English *talk*. A different picture presents itself, however, when the properties of the Fongbe lexical entry that is closest to SA *táa* are considered. This lexical entry is the lexical item *ɖɔ*.

2.2.   SA *táa* and *táki* and Fongbe *ɖɔ*

The properties of Fongbe *ɖɔ* are first compared with the SA₁ lexicon in which *táa* has all four functions, then with the SA₂ lexicon in which *táa* does not have the function of a verb, and finally with SA *taki* which sole function is that of verb. Fongbe *ɖɔ* is glossed as 'to say, to tell; to talk, to chat'; it is also glossed as 'that' (see Segurola 1963). These glosses reflect its functions as a verb and as a complementiser. Furthermore, *ɖɔ* can be used as a quote introducer glossed as 'saying'. Finally, it can be glossed as 'as if' or 'like', which reflects its function as a marker conveying similarity or manner.

Like SA *táa*, the Fongbe lexical item *ɖɔ* shares properties with verbs. As such, it conveys the meaning 'to say' and it introduces direct and indirect discourse, as is shown in (27) and (28), respectively. [footnote 10 HERE]

(27) *Kɔkú ɖɔ Kòjó ná dá Àsíbá.*   FONGBE

  Koku ɖɔ Kojo IRR marry Asiba

  'Koku said!: Kojo will marry Asiba.'   (=(16a) in Kinyalolo 1993 : 207)

(28) *Kòkú ɖɔ̀ Kòjó ná dá Àsíbá.*   FONGBE

    Koku ɖɔ̀ Kojo IRR marry Asiba

    'Koku said that Kojo will marry Asiba.'   (=(7b) in Kinyalolo 1993 : 205)

The Fongbe sentences in (27) and (28) correspond to the SA sentences in (3) and (4),

respectively.

    Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* may also occur as the second verb of a series. This is shown in (29).

Provided that SA *táa* in (7) is analysable as a serial verb, Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* in (29) would parallel

SA *táa* in (7).

(29) *Kòkú sɔ́ hwènùxó ɖɔ̀ nú Àsíbá.*   FONGBE

    Koku take story ɖɔ̀ to Asiba

    'Koku told a story to Asiba.'   (=(46a) in Kinyalolo 1993)

    Like SA *táa*, Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* also shares properties with complementisers. [footnote 11

HERE] In this function, *ɖɔ̀* is selected by verbs. It may be selected by utterance verbs, as in

(30), which parallels SA (8).

(30) *É ɖɔ̀ nú mì ɖɔ̀ à ná wá.*   FONGBE

    3sg ɖɔ̀ to 1sg ɖɔ̀ 2sg DEF.FUT come

    '(S)he told me that you would come.'   (from Anonymous 1983 : X, 1)

It may be selected by cognition verbs, as in (31), which parallels SA (9).

(31) *Kòkú lìn ɖɔ̀ Àsíbá gbà mótò ɔ́.*   FONGBE

    Koku think ɖɔ̀ Asiba destroy car DEF

    'Koku thinks that Asiba destroyed the car.'   (=(3b) in Lefebvre 1992)

Or, it may be selected by (indirect) perception verbs, as in (32), which parallels SA (10).

(32) *É mɔ̀ ɖɔ̀ ví ɔ́ yàví.*   FONGBE

   3sg   see   ɖɔ̀   child   DEF   cry

   '(S)he saw that the child cried.'   (=(47a) in Tossa 1994 : 181)

Other verbs that select *ɖɔ̀* include *flín* 'to remember', *mɔ̀* 'to see/to notice', *ɖí* 'to believe', *lín* 'to think', *túun* 'to know', *byɔ̀* 'to request/to ask', etc. (see Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002).

As a complementiser, *ɖɔ̀* is in a paradigmatic relationship with *nú/ní* when the latter are used as complementisers. [footnote 12 HERE] While *ɖɔ̀* is indicative, being selected by cognition, utterance and perception verbs, as above, *nú/ní* are subjunctive, as is illustrated in (33).

(33) *Ùn jló ní/nú à ní wá.*   FONGBE

   1sg   want   COMP   2sg   SUB   come

   'I want you to come.'

   [Lit.: 'I want that you come.'] (from Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002 :116,117)

Furthermore, as is pointed out in Lefebvre and Brousseau (2002 : 117), *nú* and *ní* are mutually interchangeable in this context, and according to the Fongbe speakers consulted, the selection of either of these two forms as complementisers does not affect the meaning of the sentence. [footnote 13 HERE]

As complementisers, *ɖɔ̀* and *nú/ní* are mutually exclusive. Some verbs, such as *jló* 'to want' may select either *ɖɔ̀* or *nú* (see Akoha 1990; Anonymous 1983; Kinyalolo 1993). In

this case, the illocutionary force of V+*ɖɔ̀* is greater than that of V+*nú/ní*. The former entails an order, whereas the latter entails a wish (e.g. Anonymous 1983 : X,2). Thus, *jló ɖɔ̀* expresses an order ('to want with force'), whereas *jló nú* expresses a wish ('to wish for'). These Fongbe facts parallel the SA ones in (11) and (12). Sequences of *ɖɔ̀* and *nú/ní*, occurring as complementisers, are excluded.

Within the framework of Rizzi's (1997) split CP, Aboh (2002) proposes an account of the left periphery of the clause in Gungbe, a language of the Gbe cluster very close to Fongbe. As complementisers selected by matrix verbs, *ɖɔ̀* and *ní* (and presumably *nú,* not discussed by Aboh) are generated as the head of ForceP—and are thus mutually exclusive in this position. This is illustrated in (34).

(34) a. *Ùn kànbíɔ́ ɖɔ̀ été wɛ̀ Kòfí hù?*   GUNGBE

   1sg ask   ɖɔ̀   what FOC Kofi kill.PERF

   'I asked what did Kofi kill?'   (=(1c) in Aboh 2002)

   b. *Ùn kànbíɔ́ ní làn lɔ́ yà Kòfí wɛ̀ Asíbá ní ɖà-ɛ̀ ná?*GUNGBE

   1sg ask   if meat DEF TOP chief FOC Asiba INJ cook-3sg for

   'I asked if as for the meat Asiba should cook it for Kofi?'

                                   (=(2b) in Aboh 2002)

When *ní* is interpreted as part of the embedded clause, it is base generated as the head of FinP. Aboh's analysis based on Gungbe can be carried over to Fongbe in a straightforward way.

With Aboh (2002 : 7), we conclude that the Gungbe/Fongbe and the SA complementiser systems parallel one another, that the "SA left periphery expresses the morphosyntax of the Gbe left periphery", and that the striking similarities between the two "cannot be accidental or regarded as the manifestation of some unmarked feature of UG". These complementisers systems are summarised in (35).

(35) SPLIT CP :   Force P, TopicP, FocusP, FiniteP

        GBE *ɖɔ̀//nú/ní ………………….nú/ní*

        SA *táa//fu …………………. fu*

So far, we have seen that the Fongbe lexical item *ɖɔ̀* shares properties with verbs and with complementisers. The two functions of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* can be distinguished on the basis of syntactic tests. These tests are the same as those identified for SA *táa*. As a verb, *ɖɔ̀* may undergo predicate cleft, but as a complementiser, it may not. As a verb, *ɖɔ̀* may be preceded by tense, mood or aspect markers, but as a complementiser, it may not be. As a verb, *ɖɔ̀* may be duplicated as *ɖiɖɔ̀* 'action of saying' (Segurola and Rassinoux 2000). As a complementiser, *ɖɔ̀* may not be duplicated. So, like SA *táa*, Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* can be argued to have at least two functions, that of a verb and that of a *that*-type complementiser.

Since *ɖɔ̀* fulfills the functions of a verb basically meaning 'to say', and that of a *that*-type complementiser, we expect that contexts involving 'to say that…' will exhibit a sequence of two consecutive *ɖɔ̀s*. Therefore, one may wonder why there is only one occurrence of *ɖɔ̀* 'say' in (28). As is the case in SA, in Fongbe, there is a surface constraint preventing the pronunciation of two adjacent identical forms, in this case two *ɖɔ̀s* (Lefebvre

and Brousseau 2002 : 116 and the references therein). For the Fongbe speakers who have this surface constraint, (36) is not grammatical. The Fongbe sentence in (36) compares with the SA one in (18).

(36) *Kòkú ɖò ɖò Àsíbá yàví   FONGBE

Koku   ɖò   ɖò   Asiba   cry

[Lit.: 'Koku said that Asiba cried']

Not all Fongbe speakers have this constraint, however, for the sentence in (37) appears to be grammatical for some speakers (see also Aboh 2002 for similar examples).

(37) É ɖò ɖò Kòjó ná dà Àsíbá.   FONGBE

3sg   ɖò   ɖò   Kojo   DEF.FUT   marry   Asiba

'(S)he said that Kojo will marry Asiba.'   (=(47d) in Tossa 1994 : 182)

There thus seems to be variation among Fongbe speakers with respect to this surface constraint. Whether this is also the case for SA speakers will have to await further research.[footnote 14 HERE]

As is the case of SA, Fongbe offers several ways around this constraint. Recall from section 1 that, in such a context, SA speakers have the option of selecting *táki* as the form of the verb 'to say', which can then be followed by *táa* as a complementiser. Fongbe does not have a parallel option, for there is no other verb than *ɖò* meaning 'to say' in this language. However, as is the case of SA, one way around this surface constraint consists in pronouncing only one occurrence of *ɖò*, as in (38), which parallels SA (20).

(38) *Ùn ɖɔ̀ é kún wá ó.*   FONGBE

     1sg ɖɔ̀ 3sg NEG come INS

     'I said that (s)he did not come (with emphasis).' (from Hounkpatin 1985: 141)

In the literature on Fongbe, it is sometimes assumed that the form that is not pronounced is the one that plays the function of complementiser (e.g. Kinyalolo 1993). We return to this point in section 2.3. Another strategy around this constraint consists in separating the two *ɖɔ̀*s by lexical material. In (39), the two *ɖɔ̀*s are separated by the Goal argument of the verb *ɖɔ̀*. [footnote 15 HERE]

(39) *É ɖɔ́ nú mí ɖɔ̀ à kún ná wá ó.*   FONGBE

     3sg say to 1sg ɖɔ̀ 2sg NEG DEF.FUT come INS

     '(S)he told me that you will not come (with emphasis).'

                                 (from Anonymous 1983 : VI, 3)

Recall from section 1 that this strategy is not available to SA speakers, for SA *táa*, unlike Fongbe *ɖɔ̀,* does not take a Goal argument. [footnote 16 HERE] On the basis of the above discussion, we conclude that, in both SA and Fongbe, there is a surface constraint preventing the pronunciation of two identical adjacent forms. In both languages, there are similar ways around it.

Having shown that Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* can function as a verb and as a complementiser, we now turn to the discussion of its other functions. In the following example from Segurola (1963), *ɖɔ̀* has the function of a quote introducer, glossed as 'saying'. Fongbe (40) parallels SA (22) and (23). [footnote 17 HERE]

(40) *Mi   nyɔ̀n-ὲ   ɖɔ̀   έ   ɖɔ̀   nú   mὲ-jìxomɛ-tòn-lέ   ɖɔ̀!:…*   FONGBE

    2pl   know   ɖɔ̀   3sg   ɖɔ̀   to   old-people-PL   ɖɔ̀

    'You know that it was said to the elderly people saying :…'

<div align="right">(Segurola 1963 : 143).</div>

In (41), *ɖɔ̀* has the function of a marker conveying similarity or manner. The Fongbe data in (41) parallel the SA data in (24).

(41) a. *É   nɔ̀   wà   nú   ɖɔ̀   έ   wὲ   nyí   gàn   ɔ̀   ɖɔ̀hὺn.*   FONGBE

      3sg   HAB   do   thing   ɖɔ̀   3sg   it.is   be   chief   DEF   like

      'He acts as if it was him who was the chief.'

   b. *É   nɔ̀   wà   nú   ɖɔ̀   έ   wὲ   nyí   àjótɔ́   ɔ́   ă   ɖɔ̀hὺn.*   FONGBE

      3sg   HAB   do   thing   ɖɔ̀   3sg   it.is   be   thief   DEF   NEG   like

      'He acts as if it was him who is not the thief.'

The parallels between the properties of SA₁ *táa* and of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* are striking. As verbs, both lexical items can introduce direct and indirect discourse. As complementisers, both are selected by the same classes of verbs : utterance, cognition and (indirect) perception verbs. Both are indicative and in complementary distribution with subjunctive complementisers. In both cases, there is a surface constraint that prevents the pronunciation of two adjacent identical forms. In both cases as well, the two lexical items can be used as quote introducers and as markers conveying similarity or manner.

There are also a few differences between the properties of SA *táa* and those of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*. While *táa* can be used with the meaning 'to say', *ɖɔ̀* has a wider range of

meanings, as it can also be used with the meanings 'to tell', 'to talk' and 'to chat'. While *táa* cannot be nominalised through reduplication, as we saw in section 1, *ɖɔ̀* can be nominalised through reduplication yielding *ɖìɖɔ̀* meaning 'action of saying' (Segurola and Rassinoux 2000). [footnote 18 HERE] Finally, while *táa* does not take a Goal argument, as we saw in section 1, *ɖɔ̀* does, as is shown in (40) above. These latter differences show that *táa* lacks some verbal properties that *ɖɔ̀* has.

The properties of SA$_1$ and SA$_2$ *táa*, of SA *táki* and those of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5!: The properties of SA *táa* and *táki* and of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*

	SA$_2$ *táa*	SA$_1$ *táa*	*ɖɔ̀*	SA *táki*
Speech verb meaning 'to say'	–	+	+	+
meaning 'to talk', 'to tell', 'to chat'	–	–	+	'talk'
Serial verb	–	?	+	–
Complementiser	+	+	+	–
Quote introducer	+	+	+	–
Conjunction conveying comparison/manner	+	+	+	–
Used as a noun	–	–	–	+
Nominalised by reduplication	–	–	+	+
Select a clause	–	+	+	+
Select a Goal	–	–	+	+

In spite of the few differences between the properties of SA$_1$ *táa* and those of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*, the parallels between them are striking, particularly as regards to their multifunctionality. We can thus hypothesise that the bulk of the properties of SA$_1$ *táa* have been inherited from

ɗɔ̀-like corresponding lexical items in the creole's substrate languages. As will be seen in section 3.2, data from other substrate languages of SA support this hypothesis. For the SA speakers of SA₂ who do not have *táa* as a verb, the comparison between *táa* and *ɗɔ̀* reduces to a few features. But again, there are striking similarities between the SA₂ *táa* and Fongbe *ɗɔ̀* as regards to their multifunctionality. Again, the data suggest that SA₂ *táa* has inherited the bulk of its properties from the SA substrate languages. Data from other substrate languages of SA, discussed in the following section, not only support this hypothesis, they also provide us with an explanation of the variation found in the SA data. As for SA *táki*, its properties compare with those of *ɗɔ̀* in the following way. As we saw in section 1, *táki* does not have the multifunctional character of *ɗɔ̀*. However, it shares with *ɗɔ̀* the property of being able to be nominalised by reduplication and that of selecting a Goal as its argument, in addition to selecting a clause. As can be seen from Table 5, Fongbe *ɗɔ̀* appears to combine the properties of both SA *táa* and *táki*. This is because Fongbe has only one lexical item meaning 'to say'. As we will see in the next section, other substrate languages of SA have more than one lexical entry meaning 'to say'.

2.3. SA *táa* and *táki* and the lexical items meaning 'to say' in other SA substrate languages

Recall from the introduction that the substrate languages of SA are mainly Gbe and Twi of the Kwa family, and Kikongo of the Bantu family. In this section, data from Ewe (another language of the Gbe cluster), Twi and other West African languages, Kikongo and other

Bantu languages will be discussed from two points of view : the multifunctionality of the lexical items meaning 'to say', and the range and properties of verbs meaning 'to say'.

2.3.1. The multifunctionality of the lexical items meaning 'to say' in the substrate languages of SA

Lord (1976, 1993), and Heine and Kuteva (2002) extensively document the fact that, in Ewe, the form *bé* has the function of a verb meaning 'to say' and the function of a *that*-type complementiser. In its function as a complementiser, *bé* is selected by utterance, cognitive and perception verbs, and it is in complementary distribution with the subjunctive complementiser selected by emotional verbs. [footnote 19 HERE] Ewe *bé* may also be used as a quote introducer, as is illustrated in (42).

(42) *Me   gblɔ   bé   me   wɔ   e.*   EWE

      I   say   saying   I   do   it

      'I said, "I did it".'/'I said that I did it.'   (=(5) in Lord 1976 : 179)

The Ewe sentence in (42) parallels the Fongbe one in (40). Based on Westerman (1907), Güldemann (2001) further calls attention to the fact that the lexical item *ábe* and its allomorph *abé*, related to *bé*, conveys notions such as 'just like', 'thus', 'as how', etc.

As is extensively documented in Lord (1993), the form *sè* in Twi has properties that are quite similar to the forms discussed above : it is a verb meaning 'to say' that introduces direct and indirect discourse; it is also a complementiser selected by utterance, cognition and perception verbs. Christaller (1881 : 433) also notes that, in some contexts, *sè* "serves as a mere quotation marker". (See also Heine and Kuteva 2002 for similar data on Twi.)

In Yoruba, a neighbouring language to the Gbe cluster, spoken mainly in Nigeria, the verb *pé* meaning 'to say' is also used as a *that*-type complementiser. According to Bamgbose (1986 : 84), "there is a controversy as to whether *pé* is a report verb meaning 'to say' or a complementiser meaning 'that'." In fact, *pé* is both a (former) verb and a complementiser (see e.g. Bamgbose 1986; Lawal 1991; Lord 1976). [footnote 20 HERE] It is also used as a marker conveying similarity or manner as in (43).

(43) a. *Ó   jo   bí   eni pé   òjò   féé   rò.*   YORUBA

        it   seem manner one as.if rain want fall

        'It looks as if it is going to rain.'   (=(i) in Oyelaran 1982 : 116)

   b. *Ó   dà   bí   eni pé   mo   ti   pàdé   re   rí.* YORUBA

        it   appear manner one as.if I   PERF meet you see

        'It seems as if I have met you before.'   (=(ii) in Oyelaran 1982 : 116)

Lord (1993) reports that the form *ga* in Eugenni has the same properties as the lexical items discussed above. Lord (1976) reports on similar lexical items for Ga, Igbo, Asante and Idoma, and Heine and Kuteva (2002) for Vai, Ga, Gokana, Efik and Igbo. [footnote 21 HERE] At the end of her survey of the Niger-Congo languages in which a 'say'-verb is also used as a complementiser, Lord (1993 : 209) remarks that "many of these languages also have related subordinating conjunctions marking clause relations such as purpose, result, reason and condition".

Kikongo constitutes a dialect cluster of the Bantu language family. According to Lumwamu's (1973) description of Kikongo, the lexical entry labelled as *ti* has several

functions. The first one could possibly be that of a verb meaning 'to say'; based on Swartenbroeckx (1973 : 134), the form *ti* is reported to be part of the '(say) that' circumlocution. The second function is that of a quote introducer, as is illustrated in (44).

(44) *Yandi   gò   (ti)!: '…'*   KIKONGO

     3sg.   go   saying

     'He goes saying: …'   (Lumwamu 1973 : 61)

The third one is that of a complementiser, as is illustrated in (45).

(45) *Té   le   tí   yendé: nó.*   KIKONGO

     say   past   say   2sg.should   leave

     'He said that you should leave.'   (Lumwamu 1973 : 190)

The fourth one is that of a conditional clause introducer, as is shown in (46).

(46) *Wé!: ti na.zabá   nga   nzye lé   kwa!: ni.*   KIKONGO

     [no glosses provided]

     'If I had known, I would have left.'   (Lumwamu 1973 : 190)

These functions of Kikongo *ti* parallel those already reported on for Kwa languages. We refer the readers to Plag (1995), based on Bentley (1887), Laman (1936) and Seidel and Struyf (1970), for the discussion of another similar multifunctional lexical item, namely *vo,* in the Kikongo lexicon.

    Lord (1993) provides a list of Niger-Congo languages that have a lexical item that serves as a verb meaning 'to say' and as a complementiser, and possibly also as a subordinating conjunction marking clause relations such as purpose, result, reason and

condition. This list includes several Bantu languages, such as Luganda, Chinyanja, Chibemba and Zulu. Güldemann (2001, 2002) reports that Bantu languages have a form — reconstructed as *-ti* by Guthrie (1967-71) — which plays a role in reported discourse, and that this form manifests semantic and functional versatility. For example, in Shona, the major language of Zimbabwe, *-ti* has the following functions : it introduces reported discourse, marks sentential complementation and related clause linkage (e.g. 'that', 'as if', 'because', 'such that', etc.), introduces ideophones and related expressions, identifies an entity by name, introduces nominal lists and expressions of quality and manner. The semantic and functional versatility of Shona *–ti* is of the same type as that of comparable lexical entries in the Kwa languages.

Our survey of the African languages shows that the multifunctionality of the 'say'-like lexical items is a widespread phenomenon in the Niger-Congo languages. In several languages, both Kwa and Bantu, a word meaning 'say' cumulates the functions of verb, complementiser, quote introducer, marker conveying similarity or manner (and possibly other functions). The type of multifunctionality discussed in this paper appears to be an areal feature of African languages. As Güldemann (2001 : 431) writes :

> "While the phenomenon is of geographical far wider relevance, it is especially widespread in Africa in general and the assumed substrate languages of Atlantic creoles in particular which come in the majority from Mande, Atlantic, Kwa, and Benúe-Congo. Note that it is also found in various sample languages spoken along the West African coast and

which are attested as important substrates of Atlantic creoles : Mandinka

[…], Izon […], Ewe […], Yoruba […]."

This supports our claim that the multifunctionality of *táa* must have been inherited from corresponding lexical items in the African substrate languages.

It goes without saying that this position is tenable only if the relevant lexical items in the substrate languages of SA were already multifunctional at the time the creole was formed, that is, between 1680 and 1695 (see e.g. Migge 2003). The literature offers different options concerning this issue. A first view, advocated by Lord (1976) for Ewe, Fongbe and Yoruba, and by Westerman (1907) for Ewe, holds that verbs meaning 'to say' have been grammaticalised as complementisers (and eventually in some cases, as conjunctions). The time when the grammaticalisation is supposed to have taken place is not specified. So, on the basis of their account, there is no way to know whether the lexical items involved were already multifunctional at the time SA was formed. A second view, advocated by Güldemann (2001), holds that, in most African cases involving the type of multifunctionality discussed in this paper, there are little or no facts supporting a grammaticalisation analysis. Furthermore, and as was mentioned above, the type of multifunctionality under investigation here is an areal feature of African languages, such that it would be most unlikely for it to be a recent development. It is thus reasonable to assume that the multifunctional character of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* and of similar lexical items in other substrate languages of the Atlantic creoles was already established at the time the creoles

were formed. The conclusion that SA *táa* has inherited its multifunctionality from its substrate languages is therefore well motivated.

2.3.2. The range of verbs meaning 'to say' and their properties in the SA substrate languages

As we saw in section 2.2., Fongbe has only one verb meaning 'to say'. This situation is not usual, however, for most substrate languages of SA appear to have two (or more) words meaning 'to say' : one that is monofunctional and that has all the properties of verbs, and one that is multifunctional, thus more versatile, and that lacks some (or all the) properties of verbs. This section documents this fact as well as its relevance for the analysis of the SA data under scrutiny.

Ewe has two words meaning 'to say' : *gblɔ̀* and *bé*. *Gblɔ̀* is only used as a verb, not as a complementiser. It selects *bé*, verb and complementiser, as its *that*-type complementiser (see e.g. Lord 1993 : 185). This is shown in (47).

(47) *Me   gblɔ   be   me   wɔ   e.*   EWE

    1sg say   say 1sg do   that

    'I said, "I did it."' or 'I said that I did it.'   (=(315) in Lord 1993 : 185)

This more versatile lexical item appears to lack some verbal properties as it "is highly defective with respect to conjugational, derivational, and valence properties" (Güldemann 2001 : 272, 3; Heine and Reh 1994 : 252; Lord 1993 : 185, 6).

Similarly, Twi has two verbs meaning 'to say' : *ka* and *sè*. *Ka* is only used as a verb, not as a complementiser. It selects the more versatile lexical item *sè* (verb, complementiser and quote introducer) as its *that*-type complementiser. This is illustrated in (48).

(48) *Ko   ka-kyerre   no   se   ommere.*   TWI

     go   speak-show   3sg   say   3sg.shall.come

     [Lit.: 'Go, tell him, say, he shall come.']   (=(310) in Lord 1993 : 178)

As is noted by Lord (1993 : 179), the more versatile lexical item lacks some verbal properties "as shown by decreasing ability to take the affixes normally carried by verbs".

Likewise, Yoruba has several verbs meaning 'to say', *so*, *wí* and *ní*, that are not used as complementisers. They select the more versatile lexical item *pé* (verb, complementiser and marker conveying similarity and manner) as their complementiser (see Bamgbose 1986; Oyelaran 1982 : 111, 112).This is exemplified in (49).

(49) *Won   so   wí   pé   e   wá.*   YORUBA

     3pl   say   say   say   2sg   come

     'They said that you came.'   (Oyelaran 1982 : 112)

Yoruba *pé* is also claimed to lack verbal properties (Bamgbose 1986!:!85; Güldemann 2001; Lawal 1991; but not Oyelaran 1982, see below).

Several other West African languages present similar data, as is reported in Heine and Kuteva (2002), and in Lord (1993). So, it seems that several African languages (but not Fongbe) tend to have at least two lexical entries meaning 'to say'!: one that functions only as a verb and that has all the properties of verbs, and one that is more versatile and that

lacks some (or all the) properties of verbs. This division of labour between these two types of lexical entries is reminiscent of that observed between *táki* and *táa* in SA.

Recall from Table 1 that *táki* can only be used as a verb, and that it has all the properties of verbs including the possibility of being nominalised either through morphological conversion or by reduplication. The properties of SA *táki* thus parallel those of the African languages verbs meaning 'to say' that cannot be used with other functions and that have all the properties of verbs. Like these verbs, *táki* does not serve as a complementiser. Like these verbs, *táki* selects the more versatile *táa* lexical entry as its *that*-type complementiser, as is shown in (50).

(50) *A   táki   táa   dí   mujée   bi-gó   a   di   kéiki.*   SA

    3sg   say   TÁA   DEF   woman   TNS.go   LOC   the   church

    'He said that the woman had gone to the church.'

                                                     (=(85b) in Byrne 1987 : 147)

In contrast, SA *táa* can assume several functions and it lacks some of the properties of verbs, namely that of being able to undergo nominalisation. The properties of SA *táa* thus parallel those of the African languages lexical items meaning that can assume several functions and that lack some of the properties of verbs, as we saw in the preceding section. It thus appears that the properties of *táa* and *táki* have straightforward independent sources in the substrate languages.

The comparison between SA *táa* and the similar versatile lexical items in the substrate languages can even be pushed one step further. In his discussion of Ewe *bé,* Clements

(1975 : 165-169) goes as far as to proposing that *bé* is a defective verb (or even a 'verbid'

following Ansre's 1966 terminology) [footnote 22 HERE], and that in sentences of the type

in (51), it is the main verb *gblɔ* 'to say' that has been deleted in the context of *bé*. [footnote

23 HERE]

(51) *Kofi*   *Ø*   *bé* *yè* *va.*   EWE

Kofi   (say)   say 3sg come

'Kofi said that he came.'   (Clements 1975 : 168)

So, on Clements' analysis, there is a rule that deletes the main 'say'-verb in the context of

bé. Güldemann (2001 : 208-210) points out that speech verbs are frequently omitted in

West African languages. He supports Clements' analysis and proposes a similar rule for the

Yoruba data discussed above. [footnote 24 HERE] In fact, it seems that, in contrast to verbs

such as 'think', 'shout', etc., 'say'-verbs may be deleted in the context of the versatile

lexical item because, by hypothesis, the information that they convey is recoverable by the

'say'-complementiser.

Let us now consider the bleached verbal properties of SA *táa* in light of the above

data. For speakers for whom *táa* may undergo predicate cleft, as in (16) – that is, the

speakers in Veenstra (1996a) –, *táa* is still a verb. Can *táa* be nominalised for these

speakers? Veenstra provides no information on this point. For Kramer's and Lefebvre's

informants, *táa* cannot undergo predicate cleft, it cannot be used as a noun, nor can it be

nominalised through reduplication. For these speakers, is there anything left of the verbal

properties of *táa*? It looks like for these speakers *táa* is deprived of verbal properties in

much the same way as comparable lexical items in the substrate languages of SA. Could it be, then, that for these SA speakers, there is also a verb deletion rule that deletes *táki* in the context of *táa*? This could very well be the case, for one of Kramer's informants reported that (52)a is a short for (52)b.

(52) a. *A   táa   a   o   ko.*   SA

3sg TÁA 3sg FUT come

'He said that he will come.'   (Marvin Kramer p.c.)

b. *A   táki   táa   a   o   ko.*   SA

3sg say   TÁA 3sg FUT   come

'He said that he will come.'   (Marvin Kramer p.c.)

Sentences (3), (4) and (5) can also be analysed along these lines. There is no doubt that the two SA lexicons distinguished in section 1 need to be further documented on the basis of a larger sample of speakers presented with systematic syntactic tests. The available data, however, do match in a remarkable way the data from the substrate languages of SA. Except for Fongbe, all the language varieties that were considered, including both SA and its substrate languages, have a monofunctional verb having all the properties of verbs, and a versatile multifunctional lexical item that lacks some (or all the) properties of verbs.

2.4. Summary

The data discussed in this section show that the properties of the SA lexical items *táa* and *táki* divide between its source languages in the following way : while the label of the lexical entry is related to English *talk*, most, if not all of the semantic and syntactic properties of

SA *táa* and *táki* come from the West African substrate languages. How does this division of properties obtain? In section 4, we argue that it follows from the process of relexification. Before turning to the discussion of this process, however, we consider early SA data and the grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa.*

3. Early SA data and the grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*

Having considered, in section 1, the properties of modern SA *táki* and *táa*, and having considered, in section 2, the properties of the closest lexical items in the source languages of SA, we now turn to the discussion of the properties of the lexical items involved in early SA. In light of these data, and of the discussions in earlier sections, we evaluate the grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*. The section ends with a recapitulation of the data that need to be accounted for.

3.1. The properties of 'say'-verbs and related items in early SA

The early sources that will be discussed in this section are the following : Schumann's (1778) dictionary and texts, as presented by Schuchardt (1914), letters written to Schuchardt in 1882 by J. Kersten, based on the speech of a SA native speaker named D. Ijveraar [footnote 26 HERE], Riemer's (1779) dictionary as presented by Perl (in Arends and Perl 1995) [footnote 26 HERE], and Wietz (1805) as reported by Arends (1997).

The lexical item *takki* is listed in both Schumann's (1778) and Riemer's (1779) dictionaries as a verb meaning 'to talk', 'to say'. Examples are provided in (53) from 1882 cited in Schuchardt (1914), and in (54) from Wietz (1805), as cited in Arends (1997).

(53) De   gaansembe taki : Di   sondi di   ta   kie Abo ...   SA

DEF old.one   say DEF thing DEF IMP kill Abo

'The old one said : the thing that is killing Abo…'

                           (from the 1882 letters cited by Schuchardt 1914: 38)

(54) Dem   haksi Hem, dem   takki :   Massra jus a   hoppo   SA

they   ask   him   they   say :   master you shall lift

kondre   va   Israel djusnu?

country of   Israel now

'They asked him, they said: Master, will you lift up the land of Israel now?'

                           (Wietz 1805 : 1, as cited in Arends 1997)

In both dictionaries, the lexical item *takki* is also mentioned as being able to occur as a noun meaning 'conversation' or 'talk' (Schumann 1778), and 'conversation' or 'discourse' (Riemer 1779). In both dictionaries as well, a reduplicated form of *takki, takkitakki*, is attested as a deverbal noun translated as 'gossip' or 'small talk' (Schumann 1778), and as 'tittle-tattle' or 'prattle' (Riemer 1779).

In Schumann's dictionary, the forms *taa,* without tone, and *ta* have been added by Schuchardt (1914) as variants of *takki*. This addition, based on the 1882 letters is reproduced in (55).

(55) *takki* [*taa, ta…*]

Example sentences containing these variants are reproduced in (56)-(59). In (56), *taä*, appears to have the function of a verb meaning 'to say'.

(56) *Mi taä, Misi Bakoema, oefa i   doe i   ta   wie di   koto zo?* SA

I   say dear madam   how you do you IMP wear DEF skirt thus

'I say, dear Madam, how do you thus neatly dress?'

(from the 1882 letters cited by Schuchardt 1914: 39)

In (57) and 0, *taa* appears to function as a quote introducer.

(57) *en a go kai Mbata   taa   mee mi koei   go kisi fisi*   SA

and he go call Mbata   saying let   me with.you go   catch fish

'… and he went to call Wild Donkey saying : let's go catch fish'

(from the 1882 letters cited by Schuchardt 1914: 41)

(58) *Mi kai-en   taa   gogo ta   tombi.*   SA

I   call-her saying rear   IMP   fall

'I called her saying 'the rear is spilling/falling.'

(from the 1882 letters cited by Schuchardt 1914: 39)

The next example is most interesting for the status of *ta* is ambiguous. Consider (59).

(59) *En   a   ta   mee mi koei   go kisi fisi na wan peti   wata.* SA

and   he say let   me with.you go catch fish in a   puddle water

'And he said that me and you should go catch fish in a puddle of water.'

(from the 1882 letters cited by Schuchardt 1914: 41)

In the latter example, *ta* could be analysed as a verb meaning 'to say'. However, in light of the analysis proposed for African languages (see section 2.3), could it be that *ta* has the

function of a complementiser preceded by a deleted 'say'-verb? (see also the SA sentences in (52))

From the data in (56)-(59), it appears that *taa/ta* was already a multifunctional lexical item in early SA, since it could occur as a verb, a quote introducer, and possibly, a complementiser. This situation calls for two important remarks. First, in (55), *taa/ta* should not have been merely added as variants of *takki* because they are not equivalent. Indeed, *takki* appears to be a verb, being able to be nominalised; but there is no indication in Schumann, nor in any other source, that *takki* may have been used as a quote introducer or as a complementiser. In contrast, *taa/ta* is a multifunctional lexical item, and there is no indication in the available sources that it could have been nominalised. We thus conclude that *taa/ta* should have been listed as a lexical entry separate from *takki* in the early SA dictionaries. Second, the properties of early SA *taa/ta* and *takki*, as revealed by the data presented above are quite similar to those we find associated with *táa* and *táki*, respectively, in modern SA (section 1). They are also quite similar to those of the two types of corresponding lexical items in the SA substrate languages discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.3. This point will be taken up below.

Both dictionaries also list *fa* as a verb meaning 'to chatter', 'to chat'. In Schumann, the lexical entry is listed as *fa*$_1$, and the form is identified as being derived from Portuguese *falar* 'to talk', 'to chat', 'to speak'. [footnote 27 HERE] It is also mentioned that *falá* and *fla* are variants of *fa*. [footnote 28 HERE] In addition to fulfilling the function of verb, *fa* also serves as a *that*-type complementiser in early SA. Sentences illustrating this function

of *fa* are reproduced in (60)-(62), in which *va*!=!*fa*, as per Arends (1997). They are from Wietz (1805), as cited in Arends (1997).

(60) *Mi sabi, va   unu bi   du   di   sondi.*   SA

      I   know COMP you TNS do   the   thing

      'I know you have done that.'   (Wietz 1805 : 12)

(61) *A   begi dem,   va   dem da   hem wan sondi.*   SA

      he beg them COMP they give him a   thing

      'He begged them to give him something.'   (Wietz 1805 : 10)

(62) *effi a reti na feesi va gado, va   wi   harka unu morro, kuma Gado* SA

      if   it right in face of God COMP they give   him a thing

      '…if it's right in God's face that we listen to you more than to God'

                                           (Wietz 1805 : 16)

On the above description, early SA would have had three lexical entries involving 'say' lexical items!: *takki*, a verb meaning 'to talk', 'to say'; *taa/ta*, a multifunctional lexical item fulfilling the functions of verb, quote introducer and possibly complementiser; *fa*, a verb meaning 'to say' and a complementiser.

In light of these historical data, and in light of the data presented in the previous sections, we now turn to the discussion of the grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*.

3.2. The grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*.

Several authors have proposed a grammaticalisation account of modern SA *táa* (e.g. Arends 1997; Bakker, Smith and Veenstra 1995; Byrne 1987; McWhorter 1992; Veenstra 1996a, 1996b). On this account, the verb *táki* would have been grammaticalised as a *that*-type complementiser. In the process, *táki* would have been reduced to *táa*. The paragraphs that follow discuss the various aspects of this proposal.

We begin with the phonological derivation of *táa* from *táki*. The aforementioned authors assume that *táa* has been phonologically derived from *táki*. Two derivations will be considered in turn. A first derivation would involve intervocalic /k/ deletion. On Smith's (1987: 275) analysis, there are a few cases of "dropping of /k/ in intervocalic position in a few frequently used terms". The two examples he suggests for SA are reproduced in (63).

(63) *meki* (< English *make*) → *mbei* 'make'

  teki (< English *take*) → *tei* 'take'

(from Smith 1987 : 274)

However, as was pointed out to us by Silvia Kouwenberg (p.c.), /k/ deletion does not affect dramatically the quality of the second vowel of the derived word, as can be observed from the examples in (63). If we were to derive *táa* from *táki*, on the model of the phonological process assumed in (63), we would expect the unattested form **tái*. There is no evidence for *ái* → *áa* in the language. This shows that, in addition to /k/ deletion, a phonological derivation of *táa* from *táki* would involve an otherwise unattested change from **tái* > *táa*.[footnote 29 HERE]

A second derivation would involve syllable truncation.[footnote 30 HERE] Syllable truncation is a productive process in SA and other Surinamese creoles. Examples of this process are provided in (64).

(64) *fási*   'manner'   →   *fá*   'manner'   SA

      sábi   'to know'   →   *sá*   'to know'

      lóbi   'to like/love'   →   *ló*   'to like/love'

      ábi   'to have (to)'   →   *a*   'to have (to)'   (Rountree *et al.* 2000)

The process of syllable truncation already existed in early SA, as is shown by the following examples from Schumann (1778).

(65) *falá*   'to chatter'   → fa_1 'to chatter'
      (<Port. *falar*) 'to chat'   'to chat'

      fasi   'manner'   → fa_2 'manner'   (Schumann 1778)

Syllable truncation applying to *táki* would yield *ta*, a variant of *táa* mentioned by Schuchardt (1914). By analogy *táa* could be derived from *táaki. There are two drawbacks to this proposal. The first one is that the form *táaki is not attested in dictionaries. The second one is that, since none of the cases of syllable truncation in (64) and (65) involve long vowels, it is not possible to predict with certainty that, after syllable truncation, *táaki would yield *táa*.

In conclusion, the two phonological derivations that have been suggested to account for the historical derivation of *táa* from *táki* are problematic. Furthermore, there does not seem to be any other alternative. In our view, the absence of a well motivated phonological derivation of *táa* from *táki* constitutes a first important drawback for a grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*.

From a methodological point of view, the proposal that *táki* and *táa* are related through grammaticalisation generally suffers from a lack of data-based demonstration of the process. For example, on the basis of synchronic syntactic tests, Byrne (1987 : 154) concludes that *táa* has been reanalysed as a complementiser : "[…] it is evident from the extraction pattern and *that*-trace effects that many Saramaka have reanalysed *táa* in predicate adjective contexts as an actual complementiser". While the data presented by Byrne argue for the multifunctional character of SA *táa,* they do not show that it was grammaticalisation that has led to the present situation. In the same fashion, at the beginning of a chapter entitled « Serial verb constructions : Grammaticalisation », Veenstra (1996a : 153) warns the reader : "This discussion is based on synchronic data only". A few pages later, he writes : "I will now present syntactic evidence to argue that in the latter use *táa* has been grammaticalised and acquired the status of complementiser" (p.156). His arguments consist of two syntactic tests showing that the verb *táa* and the complementiser *táa* have different syntactic properties. Veenstra proposes a hypothesised grammaticalisation path whereby the serial verb *táa* would have been reanalysed as a complementiser. While the tests he presents clearly argue for the multifunctional character of *táa*, they do not show that it was grammaticalisation that has led to the present situation. In the literature, the process of grammaticalisation of *táa*, from verb to complementiser, has thus been assumed to have played a role in the make up of the modern SA complementiser system, rather than been demonstrated.

A safe way to argue for grammaticalisation is to show that, at some point in time, the hypothesised grammaticalised form was not attested, and that, at some other point in time,

it was attested. This is the strategy adopted in Arends (1997). On the basis of two early SA texts written between 1790 and 1818 – Saramaka Maroon Letters, and chapters 1 through 14 of the Acts of the Apostles, written by Wietz, a Moravian missionary (in Arends and Perl 1995) – Arends concludes that the sole complementiser in use in early SA was *fa*, and that it is only in modern SA that *táa* has become a *that*-type complementiser. On this analysis, a grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa* becomes necessary. Indeed, as is claimed by Arends (1997), since there is no contact between modern SA and English, the sole possible derivation for *táa* is one of grammaticalisation from *táki*. While Arends sources may contain no occurrence of *táa* used as a complementiser, the data presented in section 3.1 from Schuchardt do show that *táa* was already used as a multifunctional lexical item, most probably including the function of complementiser, at the same period. This suggests that, in early SA, there might have been two forms, *fa* (from Portuguese), and *táa* (from English), with more or less the same functions. Some speakers would have used one form, and other speakers would have used the other form. This point will be taken up below.

Finally, from a general point of view, the grammaticalisation scenario of the relationship between *táki* and *táa* is doubtful on the basis of the fact that the modern SA lexical entries find their match in substrate lexical entries. That is, SA *táki* finds its match in verbal lexical entries meaning 'to say' in the African substrate languages, and *táa* finds its match in more versatile lexical items in the African substrate languages as well (see section 2.3). Furthermore, the multifunctionality of the relevant substrate lexical entries was shown to be an areal feature of African languages already in place at the time the creole was

formed (see section 2.2 and 2.3). It is thus reasonable to hypothesise that the creole lexical entries started out being just like the substrate ones (see also Bruyn 1996 on this point).

3.3.   Recapitulation of the data to be accounted for

Before turning to our account of the origin of the properties of SA *táa* and *táki*, we summarise the data that we have seen so far. We begin with the substrate data.

In our survey of the lexical items meaning 'say' in the African languages we found three major types of lexical entries. They are listed in (66).

(66)   [INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

For early SA, we found three types of lexical items. They are listed in (67).

(67)   [INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

For modern SA, we have identified the lexical items in (68).

(68)   [INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

The modern SA inventory of forms calls for the following comments. The form *fa* is not listed in the modern SA word list (Rountree *et al.* 2000). We have included it in our inventory for the sake of completeness on the basis of the fact that, as is pointed out by Arends (1997), *fa* is still used as a complementiser in modern SA, though sporadically. He provides one such example reproduced as (69).

(69)   *Unu   sábi   fá   mi   'a   kína   u   m'   é   gó   a   di   kamía alá.* SA
          2sg   know say 1sg have taboo for 1sg NEG go LOC DEF place   there
          'You know that I am not allowed to go there.'   (from De Groot 1977 : 56)

So, it appears that the early SA multifunctional lexical item *fa* in (67)c is now only used sporadically as a complementiser. Lefebvre's informants do not have this form in their lexicon. As for the verb *fàn*, it is listed in the *Saramaccan-English Word List.* It is glossed as 'to speak'. The examples in (70)-(72) show that it is also used with the meaning 'to talk' and 'to tell'.

(70) *A   bi   fàn   a   mi   baka*.   SA

     3sg   TNS   speak   LOC   1sg   back

     'He spoke after me.'   (= (41a) in Muysken 1987 : 96)

(71) *A   jéi   a   tá   fàn   ku   hén*.   SA

     3sg   hear   3sg   ASP   talk   with   3sg

     'He heard her talking to him.'   (=(81a) in Veenstra 1996a : 45)

(72) *Fan   ku   hen   gbee   a   go.*   SA

     tell   PREP   him   COMP[footnote 31 HERE]   3sg   go

     'Tell him to go.'   (=(3i) in Winjen and Alleyne 1987 : 45)

Several examples of *fàn* occurring as a verb may also be found in Aboikoni (1997). This form is considered to be a retention from some Gbe languages such as Xwelagbe which has a verb *fàn* that has the properties of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* (Bettina Migge p.c.). [footnote 32 HERE] In modern SA, *fàn* appears to be used as a verb, or as a noun. Interestingly enough, *fàn* is not listed in the early SA dictionaries (Schumann nor Riemer). Since it constitutes a retention [footnote 33 HERE] from the substrate lexicons, however, no one would claim that this

lexical item was not part of the early creole lexicon. This is a good example of a missing

lexical item in the written sources that had to have been in use in the early creole.

As for the lexical entries involving *táki* and *táa* or their substrate corresponding

lexical items, they are reproduced in Table 6 drawing from (66)-(68).

Table 6 : Modern SA *táki* and *táa* and their corresponding lexical items in early SA and in

substrate languages.

lexical item	substrate	early SA	modern SA
verb 'to say' has all the properties of verbs	Ewe *gblɔ*	*takki*	*táki*
multifunctional 'to say' 'that', 'saying', 'like/as if' does not have all the properties of verbs	Twi *sè*	*taa*	SA₁ *táa*
multifunctional 'that', 'saying', 'like/as if' does not have any of the properties of verbs	Ewe *bé*	*taa/ta* (?)	SA₂ *táa*

All three modern SA lexical items find their match in the substrate languages and in early

SA with the exception of *ta* on which we do not have much information.

We now turn to an account of the properties of *táki* and *táa* in light of the distribution

in Table 6.

4. A relexification account of the multifunctionality of SA *táa*

This section provides a historical account of the properties of SA *táa* and *táki*, set within

the framework of the relexification account of creole genesis, as outlined in Lefebvre (1998

and the references therein). We begin by providing a definition of the process and by stating the constraints that are acting upon it (section 4.1). Then, we present our relexification scenario of the properties of SA *táa* and *táki* (section 4.2.) The problem of the phonological derivation of *táa* and *táki* is taken up is section 4.3. The question of why various verbs of saying can be used to relabel a given substrate lexical entry is addressed in section 4.4.

4.1.   Relexification as relabelling

Relexification is a cognitive process that consists in assigning a lexical entry of a language L_1 a new label drawn from a language L_2. The process of relexification thus reduces to relabelling. [footnote 34 HERE] This process can be represented as in (73). Given a lexical entry as in (73)a, assign this lexical entry a new phonological representation drawn from an other language, as in (73)b, and eventually remove the original phonological representation, as in (73)c. [footnote 35 HERE]

(73) a.   [INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]
       b.   [INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE]
       c.   [INSERT FIGURE 6 HERE]

The process of relabelling thus has the effect of creating new lexical entries that have the semantic and syntactic properties of the original ones, and phonological representations derived from phonetic strings drawn from another language. According to Muysken (1981 : 62), relexification is semantically driven :

> For relexification to occur, the semantic representations of source and
> target language entries must partially overlap; otherwise, the two entries

> would never be associated with one another. Other features of the two
>
> entries may, but need not, be associated with each other.

Consequently, and as is discussed in Lefebvre (1998 and the references therein), relexification/relabelling is constrained by what is available in L_2 to relabel a lexical entry from L_1.

Finally, since relexification/relabelling is a cognitive process, it is an individual activity. Thus, in relexification, each individual relexifies his/her own lexicon (Lefebvre and Lumsden 1994). Given that creole genesis involves several languages, thus several lexicons, the lexical entries created by relexification might not be uniform across speakers of an incipient creole. In Lumsden and Lefebvre (1994), it is hypothesised that levelling may apply on the early creole lexicons to reduce the variation created by the relexification of several slightly different lexicons.

In light of these preliminary remarks, we now turn to the historical derivation of *táa* and *táki*.

4.2. The historical derivation of SA *táa* and *táki*

On the basis of the correspondences established in Table 6, we propose the following scenario.

The substrate verbs meaning 'to say' and having all the properties of verbs (e.g. Ewe *gblɔ*) have been relabelled as *takki* on the basis of English *talk*, yielding *táki* in modern SA. Like these verbs, *táki* has all the properties of verbs. The relabelling of Ewe *gblɔ*-like lexical entries is illustrated in (74).

(74)   Relabelling of original lexical entry

/gblɔ/$_i$ /takki/$_{j'}$ /takki/$_{j'}$
          [verb]$_i$ →   [verb]$_i$
          ['to say']$_i$ ['to say']$_i$
[has all the properties of verbs]$_i$ [has all the properties of verbs]$_i$

The more versatile substrate lexical entries fulfilling the functions of verb, complementiser, quote introducer and conjunction of similarity or manner (e.g. Twi *sè*) have been relabelled as *táa* on the basis of English *tell* (see section 4.3). Like its substrate counterparts, SA$_1$ *táa* is multifunctional and it lacks some of the properties of verbs.

Finally, non verbal multifunctional lexical entries of the substrate languages (e.g. Ewe *bé*) will have been relexified as *táa* on the basis of *tell* yielding the modern SA$_2$ *táa* lexical entry. (As is shown in Table 6, we lack information on the status of this lexical item in early SA.)

The relabelling/relexification account of the historical derivation of *táa* and *táki* accounts in a straightforward way for the properties of these lexical entries. While their labels come from the superstrate language, their semantic and syntactic properties come from the substrate languages.

Recall from sections 2 and 3 that Fongbe *ɖɔ* cumulates all the properties of verbs meaning 'to say' plus those of a more versatile 'say'-lexical item in other substrate languages. By hypothesis, *ɖɔ*-like lexical entries will have also been relexified on the basis of English *talk* or *tell*, yielding either *takki*, *táa* or *ta* in early SA. In this case, the new lexical entry would have had the properties of Fongbe *ɖɔ*. Whether there are speakers for whom *táki* or *táa* has such properties will have to await future research. If no speaker with

such a lexicon can be found, it is an indication that levelling has taken place. That is, it is possible that, as a result of levelling, the speakers who had only one lexical entry (corresponding to Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*) instead of two or more, as in the case of speakers of other African languages, will have adopted two lexical entries on the model of those speakers who had two terms.

As for the lexical entry *fa* found in early SA, we lack information about its properties, such that, we do not know whether they correspond to those of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* or those of Twi *sè* (see the question marks in (67)c). However, since it functions both as a verb and as a complementiser in early SA, we can assume that the properties of this lexical entry result from the relexification of either one of these two types of substrate lexical entries. In this case, the relabelling proceeded on the basis of Portuguese *falar*. The fact that *fa* is hardly used in modern SA suggests that it has lost the competition it was in with lexical entries relabelled on the basis English *talk* or *tell*. It thus appears that levelling has eliminated some redundancies of the early SA lexicon created by the relexification of semantically similar items on the basis of different superstrate forms.

We now turn to the problem of the phonological source of the forms involved.

4.3.   The source of the phonological representation of *táa* and *táki* [footnote 36 HERE]

We assume that each of the two major types of 'say'-lexical entries in the SA substrate languages had to be relabelled. This requires that two different labels be found in order to

assign a new label to each of the substrate type lexical entries. We submit two sets of possible derivations of labels for evaluation by our readership.

The first set involves two different derivations from English *talk*. The first one derives *táki* from English *talk* by insertion of an epenthetic vowel, in this case /i/, yielding the two open-syllable word *ta-ki*. The second set, suggested to us by Silvia Kouwenberg, derives *táa* from English *talk* by insertion of an epenthetic vowel, in this case /a/, yielding the unattested two open syllable word **taka*. After /k/ deletion, *táa* obtains. The first step of these phonological derivations, insertion of an epenthetic vowel, is also observed in the formation of many SA words. As is shown in (75), there are three epenthetic vowels in SA : /i/, as in (75)a, /u/ as in (75)b, and /a/ as in (75)c.

(75) a. *kaabá-si*   <   'calabash'

          sa-ti   <   'short'

          ta-ki   <   'talk'

      b. *da-gu*   <   'dog'

          sa-tu   <   'salt'

          saa-fu   <   'slave'

      c. *faá-ka*   <   'flag'

          baa-sá   <   'embrace'

          baá-ka   <   'black'

(from Rountree *et al.* 2000)

Finally, the third step of the hypothesised derivation for *táa*, /k/ deletion, is compatible with the fact that this process applies in the environment of two low vowels (see note 29). The derivation of *táa* from English *talk* thus appears to be quite straightforward.

We see two potential drawbacks to this derivation. The first one is the fact that the form **táka* is not attested in any of the sources. It could very well be, however, that the form **táka* disappeared quite early from the SA lexicon leaving *táa* as the only witness of its short existence. In our view, the fact that the intermediary form **táka* is not attested does not constitute a major problem for the proposed derivation in view of the fact that there are also some problems with the derivation of *taki*. Indeed, according to Smith (1987), the rules governing the selection of the epenthetic vowels in (75) are as stated in (76).

(76) a. /i/ occurs after stems with /i/ as their last vowel, or /a/ as the last vowel followed by a coronal consonant;

   b. /u/ occurs after stems with /u/ as their last vowel, or /a/ as their last vowel followed by a labial consonant;

   c. /a/ occurs after stems with /a/ as their last vowel followed by a velar consonant

(Smith 1987)

In fact, Smith's rules predict in a straightforward way the derivation of the unattested form **táka* from *talk*, but they preclude the derivation of *táki* from *talk*. Nonetheless, *táki* is there and well attested, as an exception to the general rule in (76). Other similar exceptions include *naki* 'tree' and *dagu* 'dog'. The second drawback is more important. Assuming that /k/ does not delete between /e/ and /i/ in SA (see note 29), how many tokens of /k/ deletion are there in the language? As it turns out, an intensive search through the Saramaccan word list (Rountree *et al.* 2000) reveals that, while there are several cases of intervocalic /l/ and

/r/ deletion, as will be shown below, there are no cases of /k/ deletion between two /a/s. For example, *báka* (< En. *bake* and *back*) 'to fry', 'back', 'again' (Rountree *et al.* 2000) does not manifest /k/ deletion. Likewise, *fáka* 'knife' does not undergo /k/ deletion either, nor does *kaká* 'excrement', and so on and so forth. So if *táa* were derived from the unattested form *táka, it would constitute the only case of /k/ deletion in the language. This is a serious drawback which leads us to concluding that this derivation is problematic.

Another set of derivations involves two different superstrate lexical items. The first one, *talk*, would be the source of *táki*, derived as proposed above. The second one, *tell*, would be the source of *táa*. On the basis of the fact that English *fell* or *fall* is realised as *fáa* in SA, we can hypothesise that *tell* yields *táa*. This derivation would entail the following steps : lowering of [ɛ] to [a], insertion of an epenthetic vowel, and /l/ deletion between two /*a*/s, as illustrated in (77).

(77) *fell* > *fál* > *fála* > *fáa*

     tell > *tál* > *tála* > *táa*

As we saw above, there is evidence for insertion of an epenthetic vowel. Is there evidence for the two other processes? There are cases where English [ɛ] is realized as [a] in SA. Examples are shown in (78).

(78) *steps* > *táa-pu*

     twelve > *tuwá-lufu*   (from Rountree *et al.* 2000)

As has been pointed out to us by some participants to the 2005 SPCL meeting, these examples may not be convincing since they may be traced to Dutch *stap* 'step' and *twaalf*

'twelve', respectively. On the one hand, Dutch is not among the superstrate languages of SA. Furthermore, there are other cases of lowering of [ɛ] → [a] that cannot possibly be attributed to Dutch origin. The English word *mattress* pronounced [mǽtɹès] was interpreted as ([matarási] >) *mataási* (Rountree *et al.* 2000) after /r/ deletion. Likewise, *pair* was interpreted as ([pára]>) *páa* after /r/ deletion. There are even cases of lowering of [e] → [a]. For example, *slave* was interpreted as ([saláfu]>) *saáfu* (Rountree *et al.* 2000) after /l/ deletion. The hypothesis that [ɛ] in *tell* was lowered to [a] thus finds support elsewhere in the language. As for /r/ and /l/ deletion between two /a/s, SA offers numerous cases. A sample of these are listed in (79) and (80).

(79) *baasá*   (< barasá)   'embrace'

     faángu   (< farángu)   'fringe'

     faánsi   (< faránsi)   'French'

     jaá   (< jará)   'year'

     paamúsi   (< paramúsi)   'promise'

     paasóo   (< parasóo)   'umbrella'

(80) *kaabási*   (< kalabási)   'calabash'

     saáfu   (< saláfu)   'slave'

     faáka   (< faláka)   'flag'

     baáka   (<baláka)   'black'

     táa   (< tála)   'tar'

     paáta   (< paláta)   'flat'   (Rountree *et al.* 2000)

On the basis of these facts, we conclude that the derivation of SA *táa* from English *tell* is a most likely one. The fact that the form **tála* is not attested in any dictionary with the meaning 'to tell' is not problematic in view of the fact that in (79) and (80) most of the (reconstructed) forms with /r/ and /l/ are not attested either.[footnote 37 HERE] This suggests that /r/ and /l/ deletion between two /a/s was a productive process in early SA. As expected, there is no form **tala* in dictionaries but only *taa*. Finally, if *táa* were not derived from English *tell*, there would be no SA word derived from *tell*. Given the high frequency of this word in everyday English, we expect it to be the phonetic source of one lexical entry in an English based creole.

On the above analysis, both lexical entries of SA would have been produced by the relabelling of substrate lexical entries yielding *táki* on the basis of *talk*, and *táa* on the basis of *tell*, *táki* reproducing the properties of the substrate verbs meaning 'to say', and *táa* reproducing the properties of the more versatile lexical items of the substrate languages.

In section 2.1 we saw that *táa* cannot have derived its syntactic and semantic properties from *talk*. If *táa* is phonologically derived from *tell*, one may wonder whether its other properties might match those of English *tell*. While SA *táa* and English *tell* share some elements of meaning, both being speech verbs, they are not equivalent. Although English *tell* 'to tell' and SA *táa* 'to say' overlap in their semantics, they are not equivalent in meaning. In addition to being used as a verb (for some speakers), SA *táa* can also be used as a quotative marker, as a complementiser and as a conjunction conveying similarity or manner. English *tell* cannot be used as a quotative marker, nor as a complementiser, nor as a conjunction conveying similarity or manner. While English *tell* may be nominalised as

tell-ing, SA *táa* cannot be nominalised. The selectional properties of SA *táa* and those of English *tell* are similar in some way but they also differ in other ways. They are similar in the fact that both can select clausal complements. They differ, however, in the fact that, while SA *táa* selects tensed clauses exclusively, English *tell* selects either tensed clauses (as in *John told Mary that she should come*), or infinitival clauses (as in *John told Mary to come*). While English *tell* is a double object verb (as in *John told Mary a story*), SA *táa* is not a double object verb (*táa x y). Again, regardless of how far we push the comparison, there is no way that the semantic and syntactic properties of SA *táa* could be straightforwardly derived from those of the English verb *tell*, any more than they can be derived from those of English *talk*. This is congruent with our proposal that the properties of SA *táa* have been derived through the relabelling of substrate lexical entries on the basis of superstrate forms.

4.4. Different superstrate labels for the same substrate lexical item

SA *táki* and *táa* are phonologically derived from English *talk* and *tell*, respectively. Sranan *takki* is also phonologically derived from English *talk*. The form *fa* is derived from Portuguese *falar* 'to talk'. In other English based creoles, the phonological representation of corresponding lexical entries is derived from English *say*. For example, Sierra Leone Krio has the form *se* (Lord 1993 : 203). In Caribbean English creoles, such as Jamaican Creole, the form is also *se* (see e.g. Lord 1993; Winford 1993). Surinamese creoles, such as SA and Sranan, depart from this general pattern in having forms derived from *talk* and *tell* instead of from *say*. This situation raises the following question : how can a substrate lexical entry

be relabelled by different forms from the same superstrate language? The answer to this question lies in the fact that the substrate verbs meaning 'to say' generally cover a wider semantic range than the semantically closest superstrate lexical items. For example, in addition to meaning 'to say', Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* also means 'to talk/to chat' (Rassinoux 1987), and 'to tell' (Segurola and Rassinoux 2000). In agreement with the semantic constraint on relexification — according to which the semantic representations of substrate and superstrate lexical entries must partially overlap for relabelling to take place (see section 4.1) — the creators of the English based creoles had the choice of relabelling their 'say'-lexical entries on the basis of the superstrate forms *say*, *talk* or *tell*. While Caribbean English creoles chose *say* yielding *se*, the Surinamese creoles chose *talk* yielding *táki* or *takki* and *tell* yielding *táa*. This explains why creoles that have the same superstrate language may present different labels for corresponding lexical entries (for a different view, see Frajzyngier 1984).

4.5. Summary

In this section, we provided a relexification/relabelling account of the properties of SA *táa* and *táki*. Our analysis explains in a straightforward way why the syntactic and semantic properties of *táa* and *táki*, respectively, follow those of similar entries in the substrate languages, while the labels come from the superstrate language. We submitted two sets of phonological derivation for *táki* and *táa* from English. One involved two different derivations from English *talk*. The other one involved a derivation from English *talk > taki* and one from English *tell > táa*. Arguments were provided supporting the second set of

derivations. Another aspect of our analysis has been to illustrate how substrate and superstrate lexical entries are associated in relabelling. As we saw, both items have to share some element of meaning in order to be associated in relabelling. Since the substrate 'say'-lexical entries mean, among other things, 'to say', 'to talk' and 'to tell', there are at least three superstrate forms that they can be associated with!: *say*, *talk* and *tell*. As will be seen in the next section, this fact is most relevant for the choice between competing approaches to multifunctionality.

5.   The parameters of relexification/relabelling and competing approaches to multifunctionality

Recall from the introduction that Veenstra (1996a) has proposed a polysemic analysis of *táa*, according to which there would be one lexical entry per function of *táa*. Since he has identified only two functions, he claims two lexical entries for *táa*: one which corresponds to its function as a verb, and one which corresponds to its function as a complementiser. Recall also from the introduction that, in recent literature, it has been argued that monosemy is to be preferred over polysemy. In presenting our relexification/relabelling account of the genesis of SA *táa*, we have assumed a monosemic analysis of the substrate multifunctional lexical entries of the type of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*. In this section, we first examine whether this assumption can be substantiated. We then address the question of whether the various approaches to multifunctionality are equally compatible with the parameters defining the process of relabelling.

5.1. The monosemy/polysemy debate over multifunctionality

Recall from the introduction that on a polysemic approach to multifunctionality, the various functions of a given form correspond to different, though homophonous, lexical entries. This type of approach is represented in (81) on the basis of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*.

(81) *ɖɔ̀*$_1$ v. 'to say, to talk, to tell'

  ɖɔ̀$_2$ quotation marker 'saying'

  ɖɔ̀$_3$ complementiser 'that'

  ɖɔ̀$_4$ conjunction 'as if', 'like'

In contrast, on a monosemic approach, the various functions of a given form are all contained within a single lexical entry. Recent work on monosemy falls within two ways of looking at the formal representation of multifunctional lexical items. One is underspecification, the other, underparsing. In the underspecification view, multifunctional lexical items are semantically and syntactically less specified than other items. This gives them the flexibility to appear in more than one syntactic head position. The different meanings of the multifunctional items follow from the different head positions in which the lexical item appears (see Tardif 2000 for an underspecification analysis of Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*). In the underparsing view (e.g. Amberber 1997; Grimshaw 1997; Hanitriniaina and Travis 1998), multifunctional items are fully specified, but some of these specifications are unable to be parsed in certain environments. It is far beyond the scope of this paper to further discuss these two approaches. In what follows, we will rather concentrate on what unites them : any monosemic account of a given multifunctional item involves a semantic link

between the various functions of that item. The brief review of the literature that follows

shows that it is possible to have a monosemic analysis of the multifunctional lexical items

discussed in this paper. [footnote 38 HERE]

We begin with reviewing the literature based on languages where 'say'-verbs and

that-type complementisers are encoded in two distinct lexical entries. In languages such as

English, 'say'-verbs and *that*-type complementisers do share some features. In contrast to

other utterance verbs such as *yell*, *mumble*, etc, the 'say'-verbs are not specified for manner.

This is reflected in the following contrast : while *John yelled/mumbled* is grammatical,

*John said is not (Amberber 1997). Another semantic feature of 'say'-verbs is that they are

essentially demonstratives : *John said (this) : "…"* (Partee 1973). In some languages, 'say'-

verbs may be followed by a demonstrative, as above. According to Partee (1973 : 416),

demonstratives such as *this/that* "do not contribute to the meaning of a sentence by virtue

of having a meaning or a sense of their own. Rather, for each demonstrative there is some

kind of associated algorithm which picks out certain objects or properties of the whole

context as referent of the demonstrative." According to Davidson (1997 : 828), the referent

of demonstratives occurring next to 'say'-verbs is an utterance, not a sentence. In many

languages 'say'-verbs are reported to be intransitive, in that they cannot take an overt

demonstrative pronoun as their object; this is the case, for example, of Kambera and Buru

(Klamer 2000) and of Fongbe (Tardif 2000). The complement of 'say'-verbs is generally a

quotation or an embedded clause introduced by a *that*-type complementiser. The function

of *that*-type complementisers is to "definitise" a complement (Bresnan 1976 : 70).

Accordingly, the predicates selecting *that*-type complementisers are compatible with a

definite proposition (Bresnan 1976:72). Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1971) further proposed that *that*-type complementisers are factive, in that they assert the truth value of a proposition. This is reflected in the contrast in grammaticality between *I say that…* and **I wonder that…*

From this brief survey of literature it can already be deduced that 'say'-verbs and *that*-type complementisers have some features in common. As was mentioned above, 'say'-verbs are essentially demonstrative. They share this feature with demonstrative pronouns (e.g. *this/that*) that they may select in some languages, and with *that*-type complementisers, that they also select. *That*-type complementisers are themselves semantically and historically related to demonstrative terms, and they are definite and factive, as seen above. Furthermore, the fact that 'say'-verbs are not specified for manner, in contrast to other utterance verbs, makes them good candidates for fulfilling other functions. Thus, considering the fact that 'say'-verbs and *that*-type complementisers have some features in common, it should not come as a surprise that, in several languages of the world, among which SA and its substrate languages, 'say'-verbs also fulfill the function of a *that*-type complementiser, as well as other related functions (e.g. quotative marker, etc.). In light of this brief discussion of the properties of 'say'-verbs and of *that*-type complementisers, based on languages that encode the two functions by means of two separate lexical items, we now turn to the discussion of these properties based on languages that encode the two functions (and possibly more) by means of a single lexical item.

Klamer (2000) seeks to account in a unified way for the multifunctionality of 'say' lexical items in three related Austronesian languages : Kambera, Buru, and Tukan Besi. In

Kambera the 'say' lexical entry serves as an utterance verb meaning 'to say' and as a quotative marker meaning 'that'. In Buru, the 'say' lexical item serves as a verb meaning 'to say, think and affirm', as a quotative marker, and as a *that*-type complementiser. In Tukan Besi, the 'say' lexical item does not serve as a verb, but it does serve as a quotative marker, as a *that*-type complementiser, and as a directional preposition. Klamer (2000) proposes that the core meaning of these lexical items in all their uses is [REPORT]. She proposes the following grammaticalisation path : the loss of argument structure is accompanied by a loss of argument marking on the verb; this triggers semantic bleaching, which in turn allows the interpretation of the category neutral element as a quote marker or as a complementiser, depending on the linguistic context.

Another study is based on the Bantu language Shona, the major language of Zimbabwe. According to the description in Güldemann (2002 and the references therein), Shona *ti* has the following functions : it introduces reported discourse, it marks sentential complementation and related clause linkage (e.g. 'that', 'as if', 'because', 'such that'), it introduces ideophones and related expressions, it identifies an entity by name and introduces nominal lists, it introduces expressions of quality and manner and it serves as an adverbial clause linkage. Two aspects of the functions of *ti* have been highlighted in the literature on Shona : its introductory function (which echoes the [REPORT] core meaning in Klamer 2000), and its use to refer to the quality or manner of the constituent identified by *ti*. Abstracting away from these two general aspects of *ti*, Güldemann (2002 : 273) proposes the following definition of this lexical entry :

"The verb stem *ti* provides a cataphoric orientation for the hearer towards some subsequently identified information about the entity cross-referenced in its subject concord".

He further notes that "the cataphoric orientation entails some deictic meaning component", and he proposes that the English demonstrative term 'thus' constitutes the core meaning of *ti*, in all of its functions, including its verbal function.

Both proposals may contribute to establishing the basis for a monosemic account of the multifunctionality of SA *táa* and of its substrate languages' corresponding lexical entries. The semantic core [REPORT], or the introductory function (of similar lexical items in other languages) identified by the aforementioned authors, does cover the uses of SA *táa* as a 'say'-verb, as a quotative marker, and as a *that*-type complementiser. The functions of *táa* used to refer to the quality or manner of the constituent that it introduces parallel that of Shona *ti,* as analysed by Güldemann (2002).

A precise monosemic account of the SA lexical entry *táa* and of historically related lexical entries is beyond the scope of this paper. The point here is that, on the basis of current research on monosemic analyses of 'say' multifunctional lexical items, it is possible to provide a monosemic analysis of SA *táa*, Fongbe *ɖɔ* and other such multifunctional lexical items.

5.2. Are the various approaches to multifunctionality equally compatible with the parameters defining relexification/relabelling?

Recall from section 4 that the two lexical entries that are associated in relexification/relabelling must share some element of meaning. This section addresses the question of whether this requirement is compatible with current competing approaches to multifunctionality. First, we address the question of whether it is compatible with the two approaches to monosemy mentioned above. Second, we consider the question of whether it is compatible with a polysemic approach to multifunctionality.

Consider first an underspecification analysis of the *qɔ̀*-like substrate lexical entries. Once relabelled as *táa*, the new lexical entry is underspecified in exactly the same way as *qɔ̀*-like lexical entries, and it is used accordingly. The relexification/relabelling account of the properties of SA *táa* is thus compatible with an underspecification analysis of monosemy. On an underparsing analysis of the *qɔ̀*-like substrate lexical entries, the properties of the *qɔ̀*-like lexical entries are fully specified. A relabelling account of the properties of SA *táa* is obviously compatible with this approach given that fully specified lexical entries constitute the rule rather than the exception. On this analysis, however, we would have to specify that the creators of the creole will have kept, in the creole, the same 'underparsing principles', so to speak, as those of their original lexicon. This is not unexpected, since in creole genesis, the creators of a creole also bring into the creole the rules concatenating bases and affixes to form derived words, the rules concatenating words to form compounds, the rules concatenating verbs to form verbal series, etc. (see Lefebvre

1998 and the references therein). On the basis of the above discussion, we conclude that the relexification/relabelling account of the properties of SA *táa* is compatible with both monosemic approaches to multifunctionality. The next question is whether it is compatible with a polysemic approach to multifunctionality.

On a polysemic approach, there would be as many lexical entries for *ɖɔ̀*-like lexical items as there are functions associated with the form. Assuming relabelling to be the process yielding the creole corresponding lexical entries, could it be that such *ɖɔ̀*-like lexical entries have all been relabelled on the basis of a single superstrate lexical item, in this case *tell* yielding several SA lexical entries labelled as *táa*? Such a possibility cannot be dismissed *a priori* for there are reported cases of different substrate lexical entries having been relabelled on the basis of a single form from the superstrate language. For example, in Lefebvre (1998 : 182, 3), it is shown that the Haitian Creole lexical item *lè*, meaning 'hour, time, clock, and watch' (Valdman *et al.* 1981) is best analysed as having been derived from the relabelling of two substrate lexical entries on the basis of a single French phonetic sequence *l'heure* 'the hour', as is illustrated in (82), adapted from Lefebvre (1998 : 183).

(82) FONGBE   HAITIAN

     gàn   'hour,   *lè*   'hour,

               clock,   clock,

               watch'   watch'

     hwènù 'time,   *lè*   'time,

               moment'   moment'

A hypothetical polysemic analysis of *ɖɔ́*-like lexical entries is represented in (83) with the hypothetical corresponding SA lexical entries all relabelled on the basis of English *tell*.

(83) Hypothetical polysemic analysis of *ɖɔ́*-like lexical entries

SUBSTRATE LEXICAL ENTRIES	LABEL IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE	CREOLE LEXICAL ENTRIES
ɖɔ́$_1$ v. 'to say, to talk, to tell'	*tell* v. 'to tell'	*táa*$_1$ v.'to say, to talk, to tell'
ɖɔ́$_2$ quotative marker 'saying'	*tell* v. 'to tell'	*táa*$_2$ quotative marker 'saying'
ɖɔ́$_3$ complementiser 'that'	*tell* v. 'to tell'	*táa*$_3$ complementiser 'that'
ɖɔ́$_4$ conjunction 'as if', 'like'	*tell* v. 'to tell'	*táa*$_4$ conjunction 'as if', 'like'

Is such a polysemic analysis compatible with a relexification/relabelling account of creole genesis? Recall that, for relabelling to take place, the two entities that are associated, the substrate one and the superstrate one, must share some element of meaning. In this particular case, the verb *ɖɔ́* shares with the verb *tell* the meaning 'to tell'. There is no semantic basis, however, for the relexifiers to associate the quotative marker *ɖɔ́* and the verb *tell*, the complementiser *ɖɔ́* 'that' and the verb *tell*, or the conjunction *ɖɔ́* 'as if, like' and the verb *tell*. It thus appears that the relabelling account of creole genesis is not compatible with a polysemic approach to multifunctionality.

On a monosemic account, however, various functions of a substrate lexical entry can be associated with a superstrate form on the basis of the fact that the two entries share some element of meaning. For example, as is shown in (84), on a monosemic representation of substrate *ɖɔ́*-like lexical entries, *ɖɔ́* and *tell* are associated on the basis of the fact that they both share some element of meaning, in this case 'to tell'. The other meanings and

functions of *ɖɔ̀* are replicated in the new lexical entry, SA *táa*, simply by virtue of *ɖɔ̀* and

tell being associated through their shared meaning 'to tell'.

(84) SUBSTRATE   TARGET LANGUAGE   CREOLE
      LEXICAL ENTRY-   LEXICAL ENTRY   LEXICAL ENTRY
      ɖɔ̀ v. 'to say, to talk, to tell', *tell* 'to tell'   *táa* v.'to say, to talk, to tell'
         quote introducer 'saying'   quote introducer 'saying'
         comp. 'that'   comp. 'that'
         conjunction 'as if', 'like'   conjunction 'as if', 'like'

5.3. Summary

On the basis of the literature, we showed that it is possible to construct a monosemic

analysis of multifunctional lexical entries of the type of SA *táa* and Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*, and to offer

such an analysis as an alternative for a polysemic one. We further showed that, while a

relabelling account of the properties of SA *táa* is compatible with various monosemic

accounts of multifunctionality, it is not compatible with a polysemic account of the

phenomenon. The relabelling account of creole genesis thus provides a context for

constructing a strong argument in favour of a monosemic approach to multifunctionality

over a polysemic one.

6. Conclusion

The detailed description of the properties of SA *táa* (section 1) shows that this lexical item

has several functions, and that these functions parallel in a remarkable way those of the

semantically closest lexical entries in substrate languages (section 2). A review of the early

sources reveals that *táa* was already a multifunctional item in early SA. This constitutes a

major drawback for a grammaticalisation account of the relationship between *táki* and *táa*

(section 3). The properties of the SA lexical entry *táa* were argued to have been derived through relexification/relabelling, a process that produces lexical entries with semantic and syntactic properties inherited from L_1 and a label inherited from L_2 (section 4). A monosemic account of the multifunctionality of the lexical items under study proved to be possible; such an account can be formulated in terms of underspecification or underparsing. The parameters of relexification/relabelling are compatible with both accounts of monosemy, but they are not compatible with a polysemic account of multifunctionality (section 5).

The major contributions of this paper are the following. From a descriptive point of view, this paper has drawn attention to functions of *táa* that have not been discussed as such in the literature, and it has provided a detailed comparison of the SA, Gbe (Fongbe) and English data. From a historical point of view, the particular case of SA *táa* adds to an already large body of creole lexical entries argued to have been produced by relexification/relabelling (see e.g. Lefebvre 1998 and the references therein). It further shows that multifunctional lexical entries do undergo relexification/relabelling just like other lexical entries do. Furthermore, on the relexification/relabelling account of the historical derivation of SA *táa*, the SA complementiser system must have been present in its early stage; this conclusion is congruent with that in Arends (1997) and Aboh (2002), contra Byrne (1987, 1988). Finally, the relabelling account of creole genesis provides a context for constructing a strong argument in favour of a monosemic approach to multifunctionality over a polysemic one to the phenomenon.

References

Aboh, O. Enoch 2002, 'Morphosyntax of the Left Periphery in Saramaccan and Gbe', paper presented at *SPCL* San Francisco.

Aboikoni, Laurens 1997, *Di Duumi u Gaama Aboikoni. The Funeral of Granman Aboikoni.* Summer Institute of Linguistics. Paramaribo. Suriname.

Adone, Dany and Ingo Plag (eds.) 1994, *Creolisation and Language Change*. Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Akoha, Albert Bienvenu (1990) *Syntaxe et lexicologie du Fon-Gbe (République du Bénin)*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris.

Alleyne, Mervyn C. 1980, *Comparative Afro-American : An Historical-Comparative Study of English-Based Afro-American Dialects of the New World*. Ann Arbor, MI : Karoma.

Alleyne, Mervyn C. (ed.) 1987, *Studies in Saramaccan Language Structure*. (Caribbean Culture Studies 2.) Amsterdam : Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Amberber, Mengistu 1997, *Transitivity Alternations, Event Types, and Light Verbs*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University, Montreal.

Anderson, Stephen R. and Paul Kiparsky (eds.) 1973, *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. NewYork : Holt, Rinehead and Winston.

Anonymous 1983, *Éléments de recherche sur la langue fon*. Cotonou.

Ansre, Gilbert 1966, 'The verbid – a caveat to 'serial verbs''. *Journal of West African Languages 3.1* : 29-32.

Arends, Jacques 1994, 'Short Note: The African-born Slave Child and Creolization', in *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 9 : 115-20.

Arends, Jacques 1995, 'Demographic Factors in the Formation of Sranan', in J. Arends (ed.), pp. 233-285.

Arends, Jacques (ed.) 1995, *The Early Stages of Creolization*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Arends, Jacques 1997, 'The Development of Complementation in Saramaccan', in B. Caron (ed.), [CD-Rom, paper N° 0389].

Arends, Jacques and Matthias Perl (eds.) 1995, Early Suriname Creole Texts : A Collection of 18th-century Sranan and Saramaccan Documents. Frankfurt/Madrid : Iberoamericana.

Arends, Jacques, Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.) 1995, *Pidgins and Creoles : An Introduction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Baker, Philip and Anand Syea (eds.) 1996, *Changing Meanings, Changing Functions.* Westminster : Westminster University Press.

Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous (eds.) 1994, *Mixed Languages* [Studies in Language and Language Use 13]. Dordrecht : ICG Printing.

Bakker, Peter, Norval Smith and Tonjes Veenstra 1995, 'Saramaccan', in J. Arends, P.C. Muysken, and N. Smith (eds.), pp. 165–178.

Bamgbose, Ayo 1986, 'Reported Speech in Yoruba', in F. Coulmas (ed.), pp. 77-97.

Bentley, W. Holman 1887, *Dictionary and Grammar of the Kongo Language*. London : The Baptist Missionary Society.

Bickerton, Derek 1984, 'The Language Bioprogram Hypothesis', in *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7.2 : 173–221.

Booij, G. and J. van Marle (eds.) 2002, *Yearbook of Morphology 2002*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bouchard, Denis 1995, *The Semantics of Syntax*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.

Bresnan, Joan 1976, *Theory of Complementation in English Syntax*. New York : Garland.

Bruyn, Adrienne 1996, 'On Identifying Instances of Grammaticalization in Creole Languages', in P. Baker and A. Syea (eds.), pp. 29–46.

Byrne, Francis 1987, *Grammatical Relations in a Radical Creole. Verb complementation in Saramaccan* (Creole Language Library 3). Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins.

Byrne, Francis 1988, 'Deixis as a Non Complementizer Strategy for Creole Subordination Marking', in *Linguistics* 26 : 335-64.

Camacho, José, Lina Choueri and Maki Watanabe (eds.) 1997, *The Proceedings of the Fourteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford : Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Capo, Hounkpati B. C. 1984, 'Elements of Ewe-Gen-Aja-Fon Dialectology', in F. de Medeiros (ed.), pp. 167-178.

Capo, Hounkpati B. C. 1991, *A Comparative Phonology of Gbe*. Berlin : Foris Publications.

Caron, Bernard (ed.) 1997, *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Linguistics*. Oxford : Pergamon.

Christaller, Johann G. 1875, *A Grammar of the Asante and Fante Language Called Tshi*. Basel Evangelical Missionary Society.

Christaller, Johann G. 1881, *Dictionary of the Asante and Fante Language Called Tshi*. Basel Evangelical Missionary Society.

Clements, George N. 1975, 'The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse', in *Journal of West African Languages* 10.2 : 141-177.

Collins Cobuild English Dictionary 1995, London : Harper Collins Publishers, coll. The Cobuild Series.

Coulmas, Florian (ed.) 1986, *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam : Mouton de Gruyter.

Cowper, Elizabeth A. 1989, 'Thematic Underspecification : The Case of *have*', in *The Canadian Linguistics Association Annual Meeting*, Université Laval, Quebec City.

Cowper, Elizabeth A. 1995, 'English Participle Construction', in *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 40.1 : 1–38.

Damonte, Federico 2002, 'The Complementizer Layer in Saramaccan', in Manuel Leonetti, Olga F. Soriano and Victoria E. Vidal (eds.).

Davidson, Donald 1997, 'On Saying That' in P. Ludlow (ed.), pp. 817-831.

De Groot, Adrianus H. P. 1977, *Woordregister Nederlands-Saramakkaans*, Paramaribo : VACO.

Donohue, Mark and Lila San Rogue 2004, *I'saka : A Sketch Grammar of a Language of North-Central New Guinea*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt 1984, 'On the origin of say and se as complementiser in Black English and English-based creoles', in *American Speech* 59 : 207-210.

Ghomeshi, Jila and Diane Massam 1994, 'Lexical/Syntactic Relations without Projection', in *Linguistic Analysis* 24.3–4 : 175–217.

Gilbert, Glenn G. (ed.) 1987, *Pidgin and Creole Languages: Essays in Memory of John E. Reinecke*. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press.

Grimshaw, Jane 1997, 'Projections, Heads, and Optimality', in *Linguistic Inquiry* 28 : 373-422.

Güldemann, Tom 2001, *Quotative Constructions in African Languages : A Synchronic and Diachronic survey*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Leipzig University, Leipzig.

Güldemann, Tom 2002, 'When 'say' is not *say*, the Functional Versatility of the Bantu Quotative Marker *ti* with Special Reference to Shona', in T. Güldemann and M. Von Roncador (eds.), pp. 253-287.

Güldemann, Tom and Manfred Von Roncador (eds.) 2002, *Reported Discourse, A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains.* Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Guthrie, Malcolm 1967-71, *Comparative Bantu*, 4 volumes. Farnborough : Greg Press.

Haegeman, Liliane M. V. (ed.) 1997, *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht Holland : Kluwer Academic.

Hanitriniaina, Saholy and Lisa Travis 1998, 'Underparsing and f-nominals in Malagasy', paper presented at *AFLAV*, University of Hawaii.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva 2002, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd and Mechthild Reh 1994, *Patterns of Grammaticalisation in African Languages*, in AKUP 47, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, University of Cologne.

Highfield, Arnold and Albert Valdman (eds.) 1981, *Hitoricity and Variation in Creole Studies*. Ann Arbor : Karoma Publishers.

Holm, John. 1989. *Pidgins and Creoles. Vol. II. Reference Survey*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Hounkpatin, Basile B. 1985, *Le verbal et le syntagme verbal du fon-gbe parlé à Massè*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Université Paris III (Sorbonne Nouvelle), Paris.

Hyman, L. 2002, 'Suffix ordering in Bantu: a morphocentric approach', in G. Booij and J. van Marle (eds.), pp. 245-282.

Johns, Alana 1992, 'Deriving Ergativity', in *Linguistic Inquiry* 17 : 587–622.

Kinyalolo, Kasangati K. W. 1993, 'On some Syntactic Properties of ɖɔ̀ in Fon', in *Lingua* 91 : 201–233.

Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky 1971, 'Fact', in D. D. Steinberg and L. A. Jakobovits (eds.), pp. 345-369.

Klamer, Marian 2000, 'How Report Verbs Become Quote Markers and Complementisers', in *Lingua* 110 : 69-98.

Kramer, Marvin G. 2002, *Substrate Transfer in Saramaccan Creole*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley.

Laman, Karl E. 1936, *Dictionnaire kikongo-français avec une étude phonétique décrivant les dialectes les plus importants de la langue dite kikongo*. Brussels : n.p. (Repr. 1964, Gregg, Ridgewood).

Lawal, Adenike S. 1991, 'Yoruba *Pé* and *Kí:* Verbs or Complementizers', in *Studies in African Linguistics* 22.1 : 73-84.

Lefebvre, Claire 1992, 'AGR in Languages without Person and Number Agreement: The Case of the Clausal Determiner in Haitian and Fon', in *Functional Categories*. Special issue of *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 37.2 : 137–156.

Lefebvre, Claire 1998, *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar : The Case of Haitian Creole.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Lefebvre, Claire 2001, 'The Properties of the Creole Languages in the Caribbean: The Case of Papiamento', in *Studies in English Language and Linguistics* 3 : 99-123.

Lefebvre, Claire and Anne-Marie Brousseau 2002, *A Grammar of Fongbe.* Berlin/New York : Mouton de Gruyter.

Lefebvre, Claire and Virginie Loranger (in press), 'On the Properties of Saramaccan *fu* : Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives'.

Lefebvre, Claire and John S. Lumsden (eds.) 1989, *Le créole haïtien,* Special issue of the *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 18(2).

Lefebvre, Claire and John S. Lumsden 1994, 'Relexification in creole genesis', in C. Lefebvre and J.S. Lumsden (eds.), 28 pages.

Lefebvre, Claire and John S. Lumsden (eds.) 1994, *The Central Role of Relexification in Creole Genesis: The Case of Haitian Creole*. Research report prepared for SSHRCC on the project *La genèse du créole haïtien: un cas particulier d'investigation sur la forme de la grammaire universelle*, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal.

Leonetti Manuel, Olga F. Soriano and Victoria E. Vidal (eds.) 2002, *Current Issues in Generative Grammar. 10th Colloquium on Generative Grammar Selected Papers*. Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.

Loranger, Virginie 2004, *Multifonctionnalité des items táa et fu en Saramaccan : Un cas de relexification*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal.

Lord, Carol 1976, 'Evidence of Syntactic Reanalysis : From Verb to Complementizer in Kwa', in S. B. Steever, A. Walker and S. S. Mufwene (eds.), pp. 179-191.

Lord, Carol 1993, *Historical Change in Serial Verbs Constructions*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ludlow, Peter (ed.) 1997, *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge : MIT Press.

Lumsden, John S. and Claire Lefebvre 1994, 'The genesis of Haitian Creole', in Lefebvre and Lumsden (eds.), 15 pages.

Lumwamu, François 1973, *Essai de morphosyntaxe systématique des parlers kongo*. Paris : Éditions Klincksieck.

McWhorter, John 1992, 'Substratal Influence in Saramaccan Serial Verb Constructions', in *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 7 : 1-54.

McWhorter, John 1995, 'Sisters Under the Skin : A Case for Genetic Relationship Between the Atlantic English-based Creoles', in *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 10.2 : 289-333.

McWhorter, John 1997, *Towards a New Model of Creole Genesis*. New-York : Peter Lang.

Medeiros, François de (ed.) 1984, *Peuples du Golfe du Bénin (Aja-Ewé)*, Paris : Éditions Karthala.

Menn, L. and B. MacWhinney 1984, 'The repeated morph constraint: toward an explanation', in *Language* 60: 519-541.

Migge, Bettina 2003, *Creole Formation as Language Contact : The Case of the Suriname Creoles*. Creole Languages Library 25. Amsterdam : John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Migge, Bettina 1998, *Substrate Influence in the Formation of the Surinamese Plantation Creole : A Consideration of Sociohistorical Data and Linguistic Data from Ndyuka and Gbe*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Muysken, Pieter (ed.) 1977, *Amsterdam Creole Studies I*. University of Amsterdam : Institute of General Linguistics.

Muysken, Pieter 1981, 'Half Way Between Quechua and Spanish : The Case for Relexification', in A. Highfield and A. Valdman (eds.), pp. 52-79.

Muysken, Pieter 1987, 'Prepositions and Postpositions in Saramaccan', in M. C. Alleyne (ed.), pp. 82-102.

Nida, Eugene 1948, 'The Identification of Morphemes', in *Language* 24 : 414–441.

Oyelaran, Olasope 1982, 'On the Scope of the Serial Verb Construction in Yoruba', in *Studies in African Linguistics* 13.2 : 109-146.

Partee, Barbara 1973, 'The Syntax and Semantics of Quotation', in S. Anderson and P. Kiparsky (eds.), pp. 410-418.

Plag, Ingo 1993, *Sentential Complementation in Sranan. On the Formation of an English-based Creole Language* (Linguistische Arbeiten 300). Tübingen : Max Níemeyer.

Plag, Ingo 1995, 'The Emergence of *taki* as a Complementiser in Sranan : On Substrate, Universals, and Gradual Creolization', in J. Arends (ed.), pp. 113–148.

Rassinoux, Jean 1987, *Dictionnaire français-fon.* Cotonou : Imprimerie Dumas.

Riemer, Johann Andreas 1779, *Wörterbuch zur Erlernung der Saramakka-Neger-Sprache.* Published with an English translation in J. Arends and M. Perl (eds.), 1995, pp. 251-374.

Rizzi, Luigi 1997, 'The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery', in L. Haegeman (ed.), pp. 281-337.

Rountree, Catherine S. 1992, *Saramaccan Grammar Sketch.* Paramaribo : Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Rountree, Catherine S. and Naomi Glock 1982, *Saramaccan for Beginners : A Pedagogical Grammar.* Paramaribo : Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Rountree, S. Catherine, Jajo Asodanoe and Naomi Glock 2000, *Saramaccan-English Word List* (with idioms). Paramaribo : Institut voor Taalwetenschap.

Ruhl, Charles 1989, *On Monosemy : A Study in Linguistic Semantics.* Albany : State University of New York Press.

Schumann, Christian Ludwig. (1778) *Saramaccanish Deutsches Wörter-Buch*. MS. In H. Schuchardt (1914), 6-116.

Schuchardt, Hugo (1914) *Die Sprache der Saramakkaneger in Surinam*. Amsterdam : Johannes Müller.

Segurola, Basilio 1963, *Dictionnaire fon-français*. Cotonou : Procure de l'Archidiocèse.

Segurola, Basilio and Jean Rassinoux (2000) *Dictionnaire fon-français*. Cotonou : Société des missions africaines.

Seidel, August and Ivo Struyf 1970, *La langue congolaise : Grammaire, vocabulaire systématique, phrases graduées et lectures*. Paris : Groos.

Smith, Norval 1977, 'Vowel Epithesis in Surinam Creoles' in P. Muysken (ed.), pp. 1-30.

Smith, Norval 1987, *The Genesis of the Creole Languages of Surinam*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Steever, Sanford. B., Carol A. Walker and Salikoko S. Mufwene (eds.) 1976, *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Steinberg Danny D. and Leon A. Jakobovits (eds.) 1971, *Semantics : An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Philosophy*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Swartenbroeckx, Pierre 1973, *Dictionnaire kikongo et kituba-français. Vocabulaire comparé des langues kongo traditionnelles et véhiculaires*. Ceeba publications, Série III : Bandundu (République du Zaire).

Tardif, Olivier 2000, *Multifonctionnalité et sous-spécification : Le cas de ɖɔ̀ en fongbe*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal.

Tossa, Colman Z. 1994, *Adjonctions et séries verbales dans les langues gbé*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa.

Valdman, Albert *et al.* 1981, *Haitian Creole-English-French Dictionary* [2 volumes]. Bloomington : Indiana University, Creole Institute.

Veenstra, Tonjes 1996a, *Serial Verbs in Saramaccan : Predication and Creole Genesis*. Dordrecht : Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.

Veenstra, Tonjes 1996b, 'Grammaticalized Verbs in Saramaccan', in P. Baker and A. Syea (eds.), pp. 95–112.

Voorhoeve, Jan 1964, 'Creole Languages and Communication' in *Symposium on Multilingualism*, London, Committee for Technical Cooperation in Africa 87 : 233-242.

Voorhoeve, Jan 1973, 'Historical and linguistic evidence in favor of the relexification theory in the formation of creoles', in *Language in Society 2* : 133–145.

Voorhoeve, Jan and Antoon Donicie 1963, *Bibliographie du négro-anglais du Surinam.* 'S-Gravenhage : Martinus Nijhoff.

Westerman, Driedich 1907, *Grammatik der Ewe-Sprache.* Berlin : Dietrich Reimer.

Wietz Van, I. L. 1805 [ca 1793], *Die Apostel Geschichte in Die Saramakka Neger Sprache Uebersetzt Durch Br. Wietz,* Revedirt und Abgeschrieben 1805. MS no EBGS 632, Moravian Archives Utrecht/MS no H III A 13 (16), Moravian Archives Paramaribo. Transcription published in Hugo Schuchardt (1914), Amsterdam : Johannes Müller, pp. 2-35.

Wijnen, Beppy and Mervyn C. Alleyne 1987, 'A Note on *fu* in Saramaccan', in M.C. Alleyne (ed.), pp. 41-49.

Winford, Donald 1993, *Predication in Caribbean English Creoles.* Amsterdam : John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Notes

positions taken in this paper. Last but not least, Andrée Bélanger, Claude Dionne, Sanja Obradovic, Maribel Olguin and Isabelle Therrien for their contribution to the final form of the manuscript.

1.   In order to help the reader follow the SA examples, we have made the glosses uniform across authors. In doing this, we were careful not to alter authors' interpretation of their data.

2.   A grammaticalisation account has also been proposed by Plag (1993) for the corresponding lexical entry *táki* 'to say' in Sranan. Bruyn (1996), Güldemann (2001), and even Plag (1995) challenge this analysis to various degrees.

3.   The process of relexification has been argued to play a central role in the genesis of pidgin and creole languages in general (see Lefebvre 1998 and the references cited therein).

4.   To our knowledge, other authors who have written on SA do not address the polysemy/monosemy issue.

5.   The original sentence (=(3c) in Veenstra 1996a : 155) does not contain the Locative marker *a* added in (10) as per Veenstra's request.

6.   *Fu* is also a multifunctional lexical item. *Fu* may function as a preposition meaning 'for'. In this function, it can select either NPs or purposive clauses, as is illustrated in (i)a and (i)b, respectively.

(i)   a. *I   ó-   páká   fu   dí   moté.*   SA
          2sg   MO   pay   FU   DEF   motor
          'You will pay for (the use of) the motor.'   (=(9) in Byrne 1987 : 111)

b. *Lanti   da unú dee   wëti fu un musu sa   libi bunú.* SA

   government give 2pl DEF.pl law FU 2pl must can/may live well

   'The government gave you those laws so that you will be able to live well.'

(=(212) in Rountree 1992 : 43)

Fu can also function as an irrealis mood marker. With this function, it may occur either between the subject and the verb, as head of MoodP, or, it may occur before the subject, as head of FinP, as is illustrated in (ii)a and (ii)b, respectively.

(ii) a. *I   ku   en   fu   go.*   SA

       2sg   with   him   FU   go

       'You and he should go.'   (=(5a) in Muysken 1987 : 90)

    b. *A   o-puu   ma e   i   kë   fu   a*   SA

       3sg MO-come.out but if   2sg want FU   3sg

       puu   möön hesi nöö sö fu   i   du.

       come.out   more fast   so FU   2sg do

       'It will come out, but if you want it removed more quickly, this is what you have to do.'   (Rountree and Glock, 1982 : 80)

Fu can also function as a complementiser as is discussed in the text. For a detailed description of the various usages of *fu*, see Lefebvre and Loranger (in press) and Loranger (2004), mainly based on Bickerton (1984), Byrne (1987), Damonte (2002), Kramer (2002), McWhorter (1997), Muysken (1987), Rountree (1992), Rountree and Glock (1982), Veenstra (1996b), Wijnen and Alleyne (1987).

7.   We are using indicative and subjunctive following the terminology in Winford (1993 : 290) for Caribbean English based creoles.

8.   Veenstra (1996 : 96) notes that for some speakers, those from Balinsula, *táa* is only optionally pronounced in the context of (13). For speakers of other villages in the same region, *táa* is obligatory in this context.

9.   The source of the English data is the *English Dictionary Collins Cobuild* (1995).

10.   All the Fongbe examples are presented within the framework of the conventions adopted in Lefebvre and Brousseau (2002) : the orthography has been standardised on the basis of the Benineese orthographic conventions; all the tones are phonemic, rather than phonetic; the various names used by authors have been changed to *Kɔ̀kú* and *Àsíbá* (=John and Mary); the glosses have been made uniform across authors. This explains why, in the Fongbe examples cited in this paper, some details may depart from the original examples.

11.   Kinyalolo (1993) constitutes an exception to this otherwise shared analysis, as he considers Fongbe *ɖɔ̀* to always be a verb. On his view then, *ɖɔ̀* selects clausal complements that are introduced by a phonologically null complementiser.

12.   *Nú/ní* are multifunctional lexical items. *Nú* may function as a preposition meaning 'for'. In this function, it can select either NPs or purposive clauses, as is illustrated in (i.a) and (i.b), respectively.

(i)   a.   *Kɔ̀kú   xɔ̀   àsɔ́n   nú   Àsíbá.*   FONGBE

          Koku   buy   crab   for   Asiba

          'Koku bought crab for Asiba.' (=(12) in Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002 : 303)

b. *K̀kú wà àzɔ́ ɔ́ nú Àsíbá ní mɔ̀ àkwé.*　　FONGBE

Koku do work DEF for Asiba SUB find money

'Koku did the work in order that Asiba would have money.'

(=(125a) in Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002 : 173)

Ní can function as an irrealis mood marker. With this function, it may occur either between the subject and the verb (see Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002 : 93) or, it may occur as head of FinP (see Aboh 2002 : 2). A comparison of the Fongbe data involving *nú/ní* with the SA data involving *fu* reveals a striking parallel in functions between the two sets of lexical items. These are discussed in detail in Aboh (2002), Loranger (2004), and Lefebvre and Loranger (in press).

13.　Recent fieldwork done with additional Fongbe speakers on this topic reveals that not all Fongbe speakers accept *ní* as an alternate form for *nú.* There thus seems to be variation among speakers in this area of the lexicon as well. We leave it to future research to further discuss the consequence of this variation on the structures analysed in this paper.

14.　Anne-Sophie Bally (p.c.) remarks that SA allows for sequences of two *dè*s, as in *Di buku dè dè* 'The book is there' showing that all sequences of identical adjacent forms are not necessarily ruled out in the language.

15.　Note that in Fongbe the verb *ɖɔ̀* can also take a Goal argument even in contexts that do not involve two *ɖɔ̀*s. This is exemplified in (i) and (ii).

(i) *Kɔkú sɔ́ hwèníxò ɖɔ̀ nú Àsíbá.*   FONGBE

Koku take story   ɖɔ̀ to Asiba

'Koku told a story to Asiba.'   (=(46a) in Kinyalolo 1993 : 223)

(ii) *Vɔ̀ xò ɔ́ ɖɔ̀ nú mí.*   FONGBE

repeat word DEF ɖɔ̀ to me

'Tell me that word in question again.'   (=(46b) in Kinyalolo 1993 : 224)

16. One speaker has a strategy of replacement of forms. In the context of *ɖɔ̀* 'to say', but only in this context, he uses the form *lé* as a complementiser, as is illustrated in (i).

(i) *Ùn ɖɔ̀ lé á ní wá.*   FONGBE

1sg ɖɔ̀ LÉ 2sg MO come

'I said that you should come.'

The form *lé* (or *lèé)*otherwise means 'like' (see e.g. Anonymous 1983 : X,2). Such a strategy is found in other contexts as well. For example, the negative interrogative sequence form *ǎ à* involving two consecutive /a/s is realised as *ǎcé* (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002 : 128,129). Whether a strategy of replacement of forms is also available in SA will have to await further research.

17. The translation of sentence (40) is Segurola's. Fongbe speakers consulted on the meaning of (40) corroborate Segurola's interpretation.

18. The principles of reduplication in Fongbe are fully described in Lefebvre and Brousseau (2002 : 195-215), and the references therein.

19. For further discussion of Ewe *bé*, see also Clements (1975), Güldemann (2001), Westerman (1907).

20. Oyelaran (1982) departs from this general analysis. In his view, *pé* is a verb wherever it occurs. His analysis is akin to that of Kinyalolo's (1993) for Fongbe *ɖɔ̀.* See note 11.

21. Lord (1993) further shows that Kusal, a Gur language of Ghana, has a lexical item *ye*, a former verb meaning 'to say', functioning as a complementiser.

22. For phonological evidence supporting this proposal, see Clements (1975 : 167; 1977).

23. Arguments supporting this analysis are presented in Clements (1975: 168, 169).

24. Recall that for Oyelaran, and in contrast to other authors cited on Yoruba, Yoruba *pé* is a verb in all its occurrences; it is thus never a complementiser. He writes : "no process […] deletes the verb of a clause in Yoruba" (Oyelaran 1982 : 113).

25. Schuchardt (1917: 36) notes that the C. Raatz, a missionary, double-checked the data and found them to be correct.

26. According to Perl, "the majority of entries [in Riemer] coincide to a large degree with Schumann's dictionary, but there are also some differences. To a certain extent Riemer uses different turns or phrases as examples and adds a short version of the grammar of the German and Saramaccan language. The edition of the Riemer dictionary is therefore not just an amendment of Schumann's dictionary but also gives new grammatical rules and different entries" (Perl in Arends and Perl 1995 : 247).

27. See also Alleyne (1980 : 95) and Arends (1997) on this point.

28. Schuchardt (1914) has added a second lexical entry *fa* to Schumann (1778): *fa₂* glossed as 'like'. He identifies *fasí* 'manner' or 'characteristic' as the source of *fa₂*.

29. As has been pointed out to us by Juliette Blevins (p.c.), an account of the pairs in (63) in terms of /k/ deletion presents additional problems. First, there is no language in which /k/ lenites/deletes only between /e/ and /i/. Second, /k/ lenition/deletion typically occurs cross-linguistically between low vowels (see e.g. Donohue and San Rogue 2004). Third, the pairs *meki* and *mbei* as well as *teki* and *tei* may have entered the language independently. *Meki* and *teki* result from insertion of the epenthetic vowel /i/. *Mbei* and *tei* on the other hand may result from English [meik] and [teik] being interpreted as [mei] and [tei], respectively. These additional problems shed even more doubt on the first derivation discussed in the text.

30. Several creolists had a proposal of this type at the 2005 SPCL meeting in Oakland.

31. Winjen and Alleyne (1987 : 45) identify *gbee* as a complementiser. This lexical item is, however, not listed in any SA dictionary or word list, and no information is available on it. Pending further research on this lexical item, we do not discuss it further.

32. Enoch Aboh (p.c.) also suggests to link SA *fan* to Fongbe *fàn*. According to Segurola and Rassinoux (2000), the verb *fàn* means 'to chatter, to prattle, to babble; to low, to bellow; to bleat; to twitter, to warble'. According to Fongbe speakers that we have consulted, *fàn* can also mean 'to talk gibberish, to jabber'. In any case, the word has negative connotation and, according to our informants, it is even injurious. We thus very much doubt that the Fongbe verb *fàn* would have been retained in the creole as a general verb meaning 'to talk'. The semantic link is much clearer with Xwelagbe.

33. According to Voorhoeve and Donicie (1963), *fàn* would come from 18th century *fa*. In this view, *fa* would have become *fàn*. The phonological process underlying this change is not at all clear. Given that the form *fàn* already existed in the Gbe languages, we see no reason not to assume that SA *fàn* is a retention from the Gbe languages.

34. See e.g. Lefebvre and Lumsden (1994); Lefebvre (1998).

35. A reviewer points out that the process of relexification as represented in (73) does not capture the fact that the process is semantically driven. Our approach to the phenomenon is 'modular', so to speak. In our view, the nature of the process defines a module, and can be described as such. The constraints that are acting upon this process are stated independently. For a definition of relexification that attempts at incorporating the constraints on the process as part of its definition, see Lefebvre and Lumsden (1994), as discussed in Lefebvre (1998 : 16,17).

36. We are indebted to Juliette Blevins, Jeff Good, Mohamed Guerssel, Silvia Kouwenberg, Bettina Migge and to Norval Smith for most fruitful discussions on issues raised in this section of our analysis. Following the usual disclaimer, they are in no way responsible for our implementation of the various proposals.

37. But see *tála*/*táa* 'tar' in Rountree *et al.* (2000).

38. The content of this section builds on preliminary work by Tardif (2000).

Figures

FIGURE 1

a. *Form₁* multifunctional
'to say', 'to talk', 'to tell', 'to chat'
'that', 'saying', 'like/as if'
has all the properties of verbs
(e.g. Fongbe *ɖɔ̀*)

b. *Form₂* verb
'to say'
has all the properties of verbs
(e.g. Ewe *gblɔ*)

c. *Form₃* multifunctional
'to say'
'that', 'saying', 'like/as if'
does not have all the properties of verbs
(e.g. Twi *sè*)

c'. *Form₄* multifunctional
'that', 'saying', 'like/as if'
does not have any of the properties of verbs
(e.g. Ewe *bé*, Clements 1975 : 168)

FIGURE 2

a. *takki*   verb
            'to talk', 'to say'
            has all the properties of verbs

b. *táa/ta*   multifunctional
            'to say'
            'that', 'saying', 'like/as if' (?)
            does not have all the properties of verbs

c. *fa*   multifunctional
            'to chatter', 'to chat'
            'that', 'saying' (?), 'like/as if' (?)
            has all/some/none of the properties of verbs (?)

FIGURE 3

a.	*táki*	verb 'to say', 'to talk' has all the properties of verbs
b.	SA₁ *táa*	multifunctional 'to say' 'that', 'saying', 'like/as if' does not have all the properties of verbs
b'.	SA₂ *táa*	multifunctional 'that', 'saying', 'like/as if' does not have any of the properties of verbs
c.	*fa*	complementiser 'that'
d.	*fàn*	verb 'to speak', 'to talk', 'to tell'

FIGURE 4

$$\begin{bmatrix} /\text{phonology}/_i \\ [\text{semantic}]_i \\ [\text{syntactic}]_i \end{bmatrix}$$

FIGURE 5

$$\begin{bmatrix} /\text{phonology}/_i \; /\text{phonology}/_{j'} \\ [\text{semantic}]_i \\ [\text{syntactic}]_i \end{bmatrix}$$

FIGURE 6

$$\begin{bmatrix} /\text{phonology}/_{j'} \\ [\text{semantic}]_i \\ [\text{syntactic}]_i \end{bmatrix}$$