This is a contribution from *Language Contact in Africa and the African Diaspora in the Americas. In honor of John V. Singler*.
Edited by Cecelia Cutler, Zvjezdana Vrzić and Philipp Angermeyer.

Crosslinguistic effects in adjectivization strategies in Suriname, Ghana and Togo

Margot van den Berg, Evershed Kwasi Amuzu,
Komlan Essizewa, Elvis Yevudey and Kamaïloudini Tagba

Our paper seeks to honor John Singler's longstanding contribution to the field of Pidgin and Creole studies by doing a comparison of outcomes of language contact under different social circumstances in the past and the present, in order to contribute to a better understanding of the interaction between sociohistorical and linguistic factors and language contact outcomes, a central topic in John Singler's work. Our in-depth comparison of adjectivization strategies in the Surinamese Creoles and the Akan and Gbe languages of Ghana and Togo shows that adjectivization strategies in the Surinamese Creoles not only include traces of the European and African languages that contributed to their emergence via substratum influence, but also traces of innovative strategies that are typically found in contemporary multilingual discourse.

Keywords: adjectivization, codeswitching, creole formation, Sranantongo, Gbe, Akan

1. Introduction

Throughout history, European and African languages have been in contact in several parts of the globe. In the Caribbean, contact between the European languages English and Dutch and the West African Akan and Gbe languages gave rise to creole languages such as Sranantongo (Suriname) and Virgin Islands Dutch Creole, the now extinct Dutch-derived creole language of the Virgin Islands, among others. In West Africa, intricate language mixing patterns can be observed that result from prolonged contact between the European languages English and French on the one hand, and various African languages, including the Gbe and Akan language clusters on the other. Although there is already a great deal of research available on language contact and multilingual language use in West Africa (e.g., Forson 1979; Singler 1981; Amuzu 2005; Essizewa 2007; Yevudey 2015, etc.), and

DOI 10.1075/cll.53.15ber

the same languages that are in contact there now earlier gave rise to many of the Caribbean creole languages (e.g., Smith 1987; Arends 1995; Migge 2003), few studies on creole formation take insights on multilingual language use in West Africa into account.[1]

Traditionally, multilingual language use and creole formation have been investigated in different sub-disciplines of linguistics, each with its own theoretical frameworks and methodologies. While multilingual language acquisition and use is studied in the field of Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism, creole formation belongs to the field of Pidgin and Creole Studies. Both fields, however, share a focus on language restructuring resulting from multilingual language use. Furthermore, they have in common the bilingual speaker as the locus of language contact. Language mixing and codeswitching can occur only in the speech of bilinguals. Creole languages could not have arisen without some degree of bilingualism of the speakers involved in creole formation and subsequent development. For example, most Sranantongo word forms derive from European languages, but their meanings, uses and functions often diverge from their European models in ways that upon closer examination correspond to African models, or that exemplify linguistic creativity and innovative language change away from both African and European models (Essegbey, van den Berg & van de Vate 2013; Borges 2014; Muysken & Smith 2014). Similar innovations have been documented in the speech of language learners who attempt to be creative in a target language, among speakers who accommodate to an external model by re-shaping the structures of their first languages, as well as among balanced bilinguals who are levelling the structures of both languages (Matras & Sakel 2007). Linguistic creativity is typically associated with high-contact multiethnic and multilingual communities of speakers in urbanized settings where it can result in substantial changes in language use, a significant increase in language variability and an exceptional acceleration of language change (Mous 2009; Migge & Léglise 2013).

Present day Ghana and Togo are multiethnic and multilingual nations. Different numbers of indigenous languages are mentioned in the literature, ranging from 50 to 80 languages in the case of Ghana (Kropp Dakubu 1988; Ethnologue), and about 40 languages in the case of Togo (Gblem-Poidi & Kantchoa 2013; Ethnologue).[2] Foreign languages include English and French among others. English has been spoken in Ghana, known as the Gold Coast in previous times, since the early 16th century (Kropp Dakubu 1997; Huber 1999; Adika 2012). Ghana declared

1. Singler (1988) and Huber (1999) are notable exceptions.

2. We acknowledge that the problems surrounding the listing and counting of languages are complex and multifaceted.

independence from British colonization in 1957, but English is still the main language of education and mass communication, and it is the most widely spoken language in the country if all its forms are considered, that is from pidgin to standard educated English (Bodomo, Anderson & Dzahene-Quarshie 2009).

French has been the official language of Togo since the French invasion of the German protectorate of Togoland in 1914. Togo declared independence from French colonization in 1960. Ewe and Kabiye are national languages since 1975, but French is still the main language of education and mass communication. Furthermore, the Gen influenced Ewe variety spoken in the capital, also known as Mina, has become a lingua franca for many Togolese as it is the dominant language of the capital and an important language of commerce (Essizewa 2007). A similar process of diffusion can be observed in Ghana, where Akan is spreading (Yankson in prep.).

Earlier we stated that creole formation studies rarely make use of insights on multilingual language use in West Africa. Singler (1988), however, is a notable exception. The paper reveals a correlation between degree of homogeneity of substratal input and extent of substratal influence based on an insightful study of the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in pidginized Liberian English, and argues that the impact of substrate languages on creole formation will therefore vary from creole to creole. Furthermore, the paper argues for slow nativization of creole languages as the societies in which they emerged nativized slowly, so that the incipient creole would have co-existed with African languages and substratum influence would have been "inevitable" (Singler 1988: 28).[3]

The present paper can be regarded as a follow-up on Singler (1988) in that we will argue that slow nativization facilitates not only substratum influence, but various types of crosslinguistic effects that are attested in multilingual language practices. We will compare 18th century Surinamese creole language features not only with their equivalents found in monolingual Gbe or Akan language practices, but also with their equivalents in multilingual language practices in Ghana and Togo. This is not to equate 18th century Suriname with 21st century Ghana and Togo; we acknowledge that the sociolinguistic and sociopolitical aspects of language contact in these settings differ with regard to the nature, intensity and duration of contact between the languages, the degree of multilingualism and attitudes towards the languages and the demographics and power and prestige relationships at the level of the individual as well as the society. We set up the comparison in order to explore the multiple ways in which the substrate languages

3. The process of slow nativization of creole languages is also known as gradual creolization. Arends (1995) presents a case for gradual creolization in Suriname, see also Selbach, Cardoso & van den Berg (2009).

may have impacted creole formation in Suriname, that is directly via transfer or more indirectly via multilingual language use strategies that can be observed for example in codeswitching.

2. Methodology

The NWO VENI project titled 'Creoles at birth? On the role of nativization in language formation' (principal investigator: Margot van den Berg, now Utrecht University) compares contemporary practices of multilingual language use in Ghana, Togo and The Netherlands with historical varieties of the Creole languages Sranantongo and Virgin Islands Creole (also known as Negerhollands) in order to advance our understanding of creole formation. Historical data on the creole languages are obtained via qualitative and quantitative analysis of texts that are stored in the Suriname Creole Archive (SUCA) and the Negerhollands Database (NEHOL).[4]

The data that sample contemporary multilingual language use in Ghana, Togo and The Netherlands were collected by means of several referential communication tasks in collaboration with the Ewe Contact Research group of Evershed Amuzu (University of Ghana, Legon), Komlan Essizewa (Université de Lomé), Elvis Yevudey (Aston University) and Kamal Tagba in 2010, 2011 and 2012. In this paper we focus on one of these tasks, the Toy Task. It is a Director-Matcher task that was originally developed for the elicitation of colour terms and locative expressions in Papiamentu-Dutch mixed speech (Gullberg, Indefrey & Muysken 2009). The task involves two participants, who are seated at two opposing sides of a table. They are separated by a screen that is placed in the middle of the table. On both sides of the screen the same set of objects is found, but the objects differ in terms of position. One participant, the Director, orders the other participant, the Matcher, to rearrange the objects so that by the end of the task, all objects appear in the same position on both sides of the screen. When the same object occurs twice on both sides of the screen, they differ in terms of colour and/or size, causing the Director to name the difference ('take your big/yellow slipper and place it on top of the small/blue one'). Some objects on the table are deeply rooted in West African

4. SUCA and NEHOL are financed by the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) and CLARIN – NL. They are collaborative projects of the Radboud University of Nijmegen, the University of Amsterdam and the Max Planck Institute in Nijmegen aimed at collecting, digitalizing and distributing historical data on the creole languages of Suriname and Virgin Islands Dutch Creole respectively. The archives can be accessed via the Max Planck website www.mpi.nl

culture and are expressed through native words (pepper, pepper grinder, calabash), whereas others are contemporary European objects (toy car, Christmas tree, tennis ball). The latter are often referred to by means of loan words or borrowings from English or French.

The Toy Task corpus includes recordings from 64 pairs of participants, who were selected via the personal networks of the authors. Each participant did the Toy Task four times, twice as a Director, and twice as a Matcher. Participants were instructed to use a Gbe (Ewe, Mina), Gur (Kabiye) or Akan language in one session and English or French in another session. In this manner we collected comparable data on the African languages that earlier contributed to the formation of Sranantongo and Virgin Islands Dutch Creole, namely the Akan and the Gbe languages. The Gur languages function in our study as a control group, for, as far as we know, no substantial number of Gur speakers were deported to the Caribbean in the Atlantic slave trade. The enslaved Africans working on the Surinamese plantations in what historians call 'the long 18th century' were mostly speakers of Akan and Gbe languages (Smith 1987; Arends 1995).

The findings reported in this paper stem from a representative sample (about 10%) of the collected data as not all interviews have been transcribed and analyzed at present.

3. Property concepts in monolingual language use in the present and the past

The paper focuses on the expression of property concepts such as size and colour expressions among others (Dixon 1977; Thompson 1988). In all of the languages under investigation, property concepts are expressed through items that display flexible categoricality. They can be used as attributes as well as predicators. The examples presented below illustrate the attributive use of colour and size expressions in unmarked declarative sentences in Sranantongo, English, Dutch, Ewe, Akan and French. Sranantongo, English and Dutch share the same ordering of property item (PI) and nominal (NP). The property item precedes the nominal it modifies in these languages (PI NP). In Ewe, Akan and French, the property item generally follows the nominal (NP PI), except for a small number of frequently used property items that occur in front of the nominal in French (PI NP).[5]

5. The reader interested in the distribution and interpretation of French adjectives is referred to Fox & Thuilier (2012).

(1) a. *A de wan pikin man* Size Sranantongo
3SG COP DET PI NP
'He is a small man.'

b. *A de weti krosi* Colour Sranantongo
3SG COP PI NP
'It is a white cloth.'

(2) a. *He is a small person* Size English
3SG COP DET PI NP

b. *It is white cloth* Colour English
3SG COP PI NP

(3) a. *Hij is een klein persoon* Size Dutch
3SG COP DET PI NP
'He is a small person.'

b. *Het is witte stof* Colour Dutch
3SG COP PI NP
'It is a white cloth.'

(4) a. *E- nye ame sue* Size Ewe
3SG- COP NP PI
'He is a small person.'

b. *E- nye avɔ ɣi* Colour Ewe
3SG- COP NP PI
'It is a white cloth.'

(5) a. *ɔ- yɛ onipa krokrowa* Size Akan
3SG COP NP PI
'He is a small person.'

b. *ɛ- yɛ ntoma fitaa* Colour Akan
3SG COP NP PI
'It is a white cloth'

(6) a. *C'est une petite personne* Size French
3SG-COP DET PI NP
'He is a small person.'

b. *C'est un tissu blanc* Colour French
3SG-COP DET NP PI
'It is a white cloth.'

Note that in Ewe as well as in Akan the attributively used property item can alternatively be nominalized via *-tɔ* and *-no* respectively, so that the resulting construction can function as the head of a nominal phrase that subsequently can modify another

nominal phrase in an adpositional structure (see also Ameka 1991), as the following example illustrates for Ewe:

(7) a. *Evu ɣi a*
car white DEF
'The white car.'

b. *Evu ɣi-tɔ a*
car white-one DEF
'THE white car.'[6]

In their predicative use, property items may occur in two types of constructions: (i) they can occur as main verbs or verbal heads and/or (ii) they may be complements of copular verbs. Verbal property items are rare in English, but they do occur, see for example *redden* 'to become/make red' (< Engl. *red*) or *whiten* 'to become/make white' (< Engl. *white*). They typically express change of states. The default pattern, however, consists of the property item that appears as a complement of a copula verb, such as *be*, *get*, become etc, which is similar to Dutch, where property items occur as complements of the verb *zijn*. Note that there are no equivalents of *redden* or *whiten* in Dutch; the verb *worden* 'become' is used in combination with the property items *rood* 'red' or *wit* 'white' to express changes in colour states, as shown by the following examples:

(8) a. *He is small* — Size COP PI English
Hij is klein — Size COP PI Dutch
3SG COP PI

b. *The cloth is white* — Colour COP PI English
De stof is wit — Colour COP PI Dutch
DEF NP COP PI

c. *The cloth whitened* — Colour PI_V English
DEF NP PI

De stof werd wit — Colour V PI Dutch[7]
DEF NP V PI

(9) a. *Il est petit* — Size COP PI French
3SG COP PI
'He is small.'

b. *Le tissu est blanc* — Colour COP PI French
DEF NP COP PI
'The cloth is white.'

6. The NPs in (7a) and (7b) are definite, but (7b) is contrastive because of the presence of *-tɔ*.

7. Dutch *werd* is the 3SG preterit of the copula verb *worden* 'become'.

c. *le tissu a blanchi*[8] Colour PI_V French
DEF NP PAST-AUX PI
'The cloth whitened.'

Predicatively used property items in Sranantongo and Ewe function generally as main verbs, see (10) and (11) respectively.

(10) a. *A pikin* Size PI_V Sranantongo
3SG PI
'He is small.'

b. *A krosi weti* Colour PI_V Sranantongo
DEF NP PI
'The cloth is white' or 'The cloth whitened.'

(11) a. *E-sue* Size PI_V Ewe
3SG-PI
'He is small.'

b. *Avɔ-a fu* Colour PI_V Ewe
NP-DEF PI
'The cloth whitened.'

Akan too has predicatively used property verbs, as with *wa* 'be tall, long, far' and *sõ* 'be big, large', and *wo* 'be dry':

(12) a. *akɔra no wa* Size PI_V Akan
NP DEF PI
'the child is tall.'

b. *dan no sõ* Size PI_V Akan
NP DEF PI
'the building is big.'

c. *ntoma no wo* Physical Property PI_V Akan
NP DEF PI
'the cloth is dry.'

In Ewe, property items can occasionally appear as complements of copular verbs to underscore a stative interpretation, but that is not the default pattern. Furthermore, when they appear as complements to copular verbs, category conversion of the property item is marked by the adverbializing suffix *–(ɖ)e*, as illustrated by the following examples:

8. The past auxiliary *a* (from *avoir*, 'to have') only codes for the tense of the French verb *blanchir*. In present, for example, the sentence would read *le tissu blanchit*, 'the cloth whitens/is whitening', with no auxiliary used.

(13) a. *E-le* *sue-ɖe* Size COP PI Ewe
3SG-COP PI-ADV
'He/she/it is small.'

b. *Avɔ-a* *le* *ɣi-e/-ɖe* Colour COP PI Ewe
NP-DEF COP PI-ADV
'The cloth is white.'

In Sranantongo as well as in the other Surinamese Creoles, property items may appear as complements to copulas, but only after reduplication.

(14) *A* *krosi* *de* *wetiweti* Size COP PI Sranantongo
DEF NP COP PI_REDUP
'The cloth is white.'

There are a few property items in the Surinamese Creoles that can appear with a copula without reduplication (Huttar & Koating 1993; Huttar & Huttar 1994; Winford 1997; Migge 2000, 2003; Sebba 1986; van den Berg 2012):

- They may be derived from a small set of so-called true adjectives (*bun* 'well' in Sranantongo and Ndyuka); *bunu*/*bumbuu* 'good; well' in Saramaccan);
- They may belong to the class of ideophones (*pii* 'quiet', *gufuu* 'very angry and quiet' in Ndyuka and *pioo* 'black' in Saramaccan);
- They may express a temporary state;
- Property items derived from Dutch occur more frequently with copular verbs than English-derived property items (Winford 1997).

Contemporary Sranantongo property items are in many ways similar to their 18th century equivalents, but there is the following notable difference. In addition to instances of property items that function as main verbs (see 15b and 16b), we find 18th century property items in constructions that can be analyzed as an adjectival complement to a copula or as a verbal head, as the copula and the imperfective aspect marker have the same form in Early Sranan (van den Berg 2007), which is not the case in contemporary Sranantongo, where the imperfective aspect marker *e* and the copula *de* are clearly different forms due to grammaticalization of the imperfective aspect marker (*e* < *de*). The 18th century Examples in (15) and (16) illustrate that both strategies are used interchangeably without any apparent change in meaning (van den Berg 2007, 2012).

(15) a. *alla* *Ningre* *de* *blakka* (Schumann 1783: 18)
all black ASP/COP black

b. *alla* *Ningre* Ø *blakka* (Schumann 1783: 122)
all black black
'All blacks are black.' (intended meaning: 'The pot is calling the kettle black.')

(16) a. *a de morro langa leki mi* (Schumann 1783: 100)
3SG COP more long like 1SG
'He is taller than me.'

b. *a Ø langa morro na mi* (Schumann 1783: 100)
3SG long more/exceed LOC 1SG
'He is taller than me.'

In short, 18th century Sranantongo property items differ from their contemporary equivalents in that the COP PI construction has a wider distribution in 18th century Sranantongo than in the contemporary Surinamese Creoles. Property items mainly function as verbal heads (PI_V) in the contemporary Surinamese Creoles, they are found less frequently in COP PI constructions.

While the emergence of PI_V in 18th century Sranantongo can be accounted for in terms of L1 transfer (Migge 2003), the emergence of COP PI in 18th century Sranantongo is not likely to result from L1 transfer for the following reasons: The use of COP PI is associated with a stative interpretation instead of a temporary interpretation and further requires category conversion via the adverbializing suffix *-(ḍ)e* in the Gbe languages (see 13a and 13b).

How can we explain the emergence of COP PI in 18th century Sranantongo? On the one hand, COP PI may be modelled on the European languages that contributed to the emergence of Sranantongo; COP PI is the default construction in English as well as in Dutch as illustrated by the examples presented above.

On the other hand, COP PI constructions are encountered frequently in mixed multilingual discourse (Meechan & Poplack 1995; Amuzu 2005, 2010, Essizewa 2007). Essizewa (2007) observes that "the use of the Kabiye copula *wɛ* 'be' with Ewe adjectives appears to be the most common form of code-switched utterances among Kabiye-Ewe bilinguals" (2007: 36). Kabiye has a complex noun class system with a strong noun class agreement requirement; adjectives must agree with the noun according to its class. Ewe, on the other hand, does not have a noun class system. Hence, Kabiye nouns and Ewe attributive adjectives are rarely combined in mixed Ewe-Kabiye speech; Ewe attributive adjectives cannot be inserted without inflecting them according to the appropriate noun class concord of the noun they modify (Essizewa 2007: 36). This requirement does not apply in the case of Ewe predicative adjectives in mixed Kabiye-Ewe discourse. Predicative adjectives are not inflected when they are preceded by the Kabiye copula *wɛ* 'be', the adjective must appear in the bare form, as illustrated by the example in (17), reproduced from Essizewa (2007: 36, ex. 15):

(17) *pɛ̲lɔ́ ɛníyɔ e-tóko wɛ yiboo ɛsí aká yó* Kabiye-Ewe
girl that s/he-dress be black like charcoal EP
'That girl's dress is black like charcoal.'

Hence, it can be argued that the use of *wɛ* with Ewe adjectives is a strategy for the speakers not to violate the usual requirement that adjectives be marked for noun class agreement (Essizewa 2007).

4. Property concepts in multilingual language use

Our Ghanaian and Togolese Toy Task recordings display a wide variety of constructions with property items. In addition to the attributive and predicative monolingual constructions described in the previous section, we find various types of multilingual constructions. When used predicatively, the French or English property item always appears with an Akan, Ewe or Kabiye copula, as illustrated for Ewe and Akan in the following examples from our corpus:

(18) a. *… afɔkpa ke le bleu fe ŋgɔ* Ewe-French
sandal which be blue POSS in.front
'… in front of the sandal which is blue.'

b. *nea ne tail no yɛ red no* Akan-English
that 3SG.POSS tail DEF be red DEF
'the one whose tail is red.'

Attributively used English property items are often found with Akan or Ewe nominals (Ghana), while attributively used French property items are found with Ewe and Kabiye nominals (Togo). In those cases, the European property item frequently follows the African nominal similar to its African equivalent (Type 1).

Type 1: $_{\text{Afr}}\text{N}_{\text{Eur}}\text{PI}$ ($_{\text{Afr}}$MOD)

(19) a. *atadi yellow-a* Ewe-English
pepper yellow-DEF
'the yellow pepper'

b. *mako green paa no* Akan-English
pepper green very DEF
'the very green pepper'

However, we also find less expected cases of European property items preceding an African nominal (Type 2), as well as constructions with European property items and nominals that are headed by African determiners and/or other modifiers (Type 3).

Type 2: $_{\text{Eur}}\text{PI}_{\text{Afr}}\text{N}$ ($_{\text{Afr}}$MOD)

(20) a. *yellow fɔkpa ɖe* Ewe-English
yellow slipper INDEF
'a yellow slipper.'

b. *light green mako no* Akan-English
light green pepper DEF
'the light green pepper'

Type 3: $_{Eur}$N/PI$_{Eur}$N/PI$_{Afr}$MOD

(21) a. *o me-nye shark-a enye green tail-a*
EXCL 3SG.NEG-be shark-DEF 3SG.COP green tail-DEF
wo-a? Ewe-English
NEG-Q
'O, it isn't the shark with the green tail?'

b. *e-do jacket red-aḍe* Ewe-English
3SG-wear jacket red INDEF
'He wears a red jacket.'

Furthermore, we find complex appositional structures in which Ewe *-tɔ* is used to nominalize English or French property items that in turn modify an African or European nominal phrase (Type 4).

Type 4: $_{Afr/Eur}$N$_{Eur}$PI + *tɔ/one* ($_{Afr}$MOD)

(22) *atadi yellow tɔ* Ewe-English
pepper yellow one
'the yellow pepper.'

Alternatively, the Ewe *-tɔ* may sometimes be replaced with English *-one* in the Ghanaian recordings (for a detailed description of this strategy, see Amuzu 2005), see Example (23a). This pattern is also attested in the Akan-English data, as shown in (23b).

(23) a. *Akpa green one* Ewe-English
fish green one
'fish, green one'

b. *afei pepper red one no* Akan-English
now pepper red one DEF
'now, the red pepper'

The Togolese Ewe-French Toy Task recordings differ from the Ghanaian Ewe-English recordings in that the former display less variation than the latter. In the Togolese Ewe-French Toy Task recordings we find fewer Ewe-French combinations of attributively used property items and nominals. In the previous section we have shown that French and Ewe share the same default N PI word order. Thus, Type 2 combinations as well as some Type 3 combinations, in which a French property item should precede an Ewe or a French nominal ([$_{Fr}$PI$_{Fr}$/$_{Ewe}$N ($_{Ewe}$MOD)]), are not

expected to occur. This prediction is borne out as they are not encountered in the recordings. Furthermore, we only find a subset of Type 4 in Togolese Ewe-French mixed speech:

(24) *fifia asiké rouge tɔ-a, …*
now tail red one-DEF
'Now, the tail that is red …'

As French has no direct equivalent of Ewe *-tɔ* or English *-one* and thus no comparable means to derive nominals from property items that subsequently can occur in the $_{\text{Afr/Eur}}\text{N}_{\text{Eur}}$PI + *tɔ/one* adpositional structures, only $_{\text{Fr/Ewe}}\text{N}_{\text{Fr}}$PI or $_{\text{Fr/Ewe}}\text{N}_{\text{Fr}}$PI + *tɔ* combinations are expected to occur in the data from Togo. This is indeed what we have found.

The only counterexample in our data is the following construction that is encountered in the Ewe-French Toy Task recording of two brothers in Lomé, Togo. They were born in Lomé and spent most of their childhood there, but their father is Ghanaian. They were proficient in both French and English and mixed French, Ewe and English in their Toy Task recording. Note that the pronunciation of *orange* in (25) is French, not English.

(25) *Ok, évu orange one …*
ok car orange one
'Ok, the red car …'

Table 1 summarizes the types of attributively used property items in Ewe-French mixed speech from Togo and Ewe-English mixed speech from Ghana.

Table 1. Overview of types of attributively used property items in Ewe-French mixed speech (Togo) and Ewe-English mixed speech (Ghana)

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
Ewe-English	+	+	+	+
Ewe-French	+	−	−	+

A quantitative analysis of a representative subset of the data supports our qualitative observations presented above. We collected all instances of attributively used property items and nominals from an Ewe-English Toy Task recording made in Accra (3,200 words [tokens]) and an Ewe-French recording in Lomé (2,000 words [tokens]). We then analyzed and categorized these instances on the basis of word order (PI N vs. N PI) and language choice of the property item and the nominal (English/French vs Ewe). Table 2 lists all combinations of property items and nominals in these recordings. The first two columns list the language of the property

item (PI) and the nominal (N), that is English or French in the case of EUR and Ewe in the case of AFR. The third column lists the order in which the property and the nominal appear. The subsequent columns list absolute numbers and percentages of occurrences of combinations of attributively used property items and nominals in a Ghanaian Ewe-English Toy Task recording (E&H) and a Togolese Ewe-French recording (M&E). Note that only the Ewe Toy Task recordings were analyzed here, the English-only and French-only recordings are not included in Table 2.

Table 2. Combinations of attributively used property items and nominals in Ewe-English and Ewe-French multilingual discourse in Ghana and Togo

PI	N	Order	E&H, Accra 3200 words (tokens)		M&E, Lomé 2000 words (tokens)	
EUR	EUR	PI N	8	(14.0%)	1	(0.8%)
EUR	EUR	N PI	6	(10.5%)	16	(13.7%)
EUR	AFR	N PI	40	(70.2%)	97	(82.9%)
AFR	AFR	N PI	3	(5.3%)	0	
AFR	EUR	N PI	0		3	(2.6%)
Total			**57**	**(100%)**	**117**	**(100%)**

Table 2 shows that N PI (NA) occurs more often than PI N (AN) in all recordings, but this preference is more pronounced in the Ewe-French recording than in the Ewe-English recordings (Ewe-French: 1x PI N and 116x N PI; Ewe-English 8x PI N and 49x N PI; Chi Square test $\chi^2 = 13.5$, $p = < 0.001$). Furthermore, if N is English or French, the Ewe-English and the Ewe-French recordings differ significantly in the preferred order of the property item and the nominal: While the preferred order is N PI in Togo, both PI N and N PI occur in Ghana (Ewe-French: 1x PI N and 19x N PI; Ewe-English 8x PI N and 6x N PI; $\chi^2 = 11.5$, $p = < 0.001$). Even in cases where PI is French or English, a preference for N PI order is preferred in both the Ewe-French and Ewe-English recordings but, again, the preference for N PI is stronger for the Ewe-French recording (Ewe-French: 1x PI N and 113x N PI; Ewe-English 8x PI N and 46x N PI; $\chi^2 = 13.9$, $p = < 0.001$). In cases where either N or PI is Ewe, the order PI N is never encountered (subset N =Ewe Ewe-French: 0x PI N, 96× N PI; Ewe-English 0x PI N, 43x N PI; subset PI = Ewe, Ewe-French: 0x PI N, 3x N PI; Ewe-English 0x PI N, 3x N PI).

In conclusion, it is clear that N PI occurs significantly more often than PI N in the recordings from Ghana and Togo. Furthermore, we have shown that N PI occurs significantly more often in the Ewe-French recordings than in the Ewe-English recordings. Moreover, there are fewer combinations of attributively used Ewe-French property items and nominals in the Ewe-French recordings than there are Ewe-English combinations of property items and nominal in the Ewe-English recordings.

Thus we have shown that there is less variation in the speech of bilinguals who speak structurally similar languages (N PI), and more variation in the speech of bilinguals whose languages diverge with regard to a specific structure (PI N vs N PI).

5. Comparing adjectivization strategies in Suriname, Ghana, Togo

A comparison of our findings on predicatively and attributively used property items in contemporary Ghana and Togo with their historical Surinamese counterparts reveals a number of similarities and differences.

Predicatively used property items usually appear as verbs (PI_V) in the contemporary Creole languages of Suriname as well as the Gbe and Akan languages of Ghana and Togo (monolingual mode), although some property items may occasionally appear as complements to copulas (COP PI) in these languages. We have shown that the emergence of PI_V in Early Sranan can be explained in terms of transfer from the Akan and Gbe languages whereas the emergence of COP PI in Early Sranan can be explained as transfer from English and Dutch. The occurrence of COP PI in the Akan and Gbe languages under specific conditions may have reinforced the emergence and continued use of COP PI in the Surinamese Creoles. Furthermore, we found that, in multilingual discourse from Ghana and Togo, when property items are of English or French origin, they are always combined with the Akan or Gbe copula. These property items never occur as PI_V in our data. Our findings support other studies that propose that the use of a copular verb with a property item from another language may be a universal strategy COP_A PI_B, as it is frequently encountered in multilingual discourse (Meechan & Poplack 1995; Amuzu 2005; Essizewa 2007; Yakpo 2009). As mentioned above, Essizewa (2007) observes that combinations of the Kabiye copula and Ewe adjectives are common in code-switched utterances. The fact that COP PI is found so frequently in Kabiye-Ewe multilingual discourse from Togo, in addition to the other studies mentioned above, suggests that properties or qualities of an entity that are denoted by a non-native word prefer COP PI rather than PI_V crosslinguistically, even if native property concept words are PI_V. The emergence of COP PI in the developing Surinamese Creole language is therefore best understood as a combination of language-specific and universal influences.

A remarkable difference between Sranantongo and mixed Ewe-French and Ewe-English is that Sranantongo property items display variation in the verbal domain (COP PI, PI_V), but not in the nominal domain. Sranantongo always has PI N. This contrasts with mixed Ewe-English and Ewe-French speech, where there is hardly any variation in the verbal domain. English and French property items always occur as COP PI, never as PI_V. In the nominal domain, however, four different types

of combinations of English/French and Ewe property items and nominals are encountered as well as both orderings of property items and nominals (PI N and N PI).

These differences between Sranantongo and mixed Ewe-French and Ewe-English may be seen as manifestations of the asymmetrical power relations between the languages in contact in 18th century Suriname and in contemporary Ghana and Togo. Nowadays, many Ghanaians and Togolese are bilingual in African languages as well as in English or French due to schooling. No such schooling system existed for the enslaved people in 18th century Suriname and only a few Africans were fluent in European languages. Similarly, very few Europeans in Suriname spoke African languages (van den Berg 2013). The social distance between Africans and Europeans was extreme; the race/class hierarchical structure of the Surinamese colonial society did not support widespread multilingualism. For interethnic communication people would use the emerging creole language, that was often called *Bastert Engels* or *Neeger Engels*, literally 'Bastard English' and 'Negro English' respectively, as it had many features derived from English, the dominant language of most Surinamese planter families that lived on small homesteads with their slaves and indentured servants in the early days of the colony (1650s–1680s). From 1651 to 1667 Suriname was officially an English colony but it was conquered by the Dutch in 1667. As only a limited number of Africans had been deported yet to Suriname in the late 17th century, the slave force was still very small in comparison to what it would become in the late 18th century. It is assumed that mainly English-derived words, phrases and structures may have been used for interethnic communication at that time, including COP PI and PI N. New arrivals, Africans as well as Europeans, may have reinforced the use of COP PI, PI_V and PI N when using the emerging creole for interethnic communication, and further, to express local group identity and belonging. Even though Suriname was always under Dutch control in the long 18th century, the language of the previous colonial power had developed into the language of the land. Jan Reeps, a ship-wrecked sailor who stayed for several months in Paramaribo in 1693, when there were at least 319 European freemen and 4,756 slaves living in Suriname, observed that the language of the former colonial power was used mostly by the slaves: "De Engelse hebben hier een colonie gemaeckt en wort die taal daer nog meest bij de slaven gesproken" ['The English made a colony here and that language is mostly spoken by the slaves'] (van Alphen 1962: 307).

As Suriname's population expanded due to new arrivals and the hierarchical structure of the Surinamese colonial society became more and more pronounced, the use of COP PI, PI_V and PI N continued to be reinforced. The co-occurrence and interchangeability of COP PI and PI_V underscore the developmental stage of predicatively used property items in 18th century Sranantongo. It is indicative of slow nativization as proposed by Arends (1989) and Singler (1988).

6. Conclusion

Our findings suggest that abrupt creole formation theories may not be useful to understand the emergence of predicatively used property items in Sranantongo. New arrivals outnumbered locally-born second and third generations in Suriname throughout the 18th century. Simultaneously we observe a prolonged co-occurrence and interchangeability of COP PI and PI_V throughout the 18th century. These demographic and linguistic observations are at odds with abrupt creole formation theories (Singler 1992, 2008, Selbach et al. 2009).

Furthermore, our findings bring to light some thought-provoking differences between the outcomes of language contact in various places, different times and unlike settings, even though the languages in contact are the same. A remarkable difference between Sranantongo and Ewe-French and Ewe-English multilingual discourse is that Sranantongo property items display variation in the verbal domain (COP PI, PI_V) but not in the nominal domain. Attributively used property items are always ordered PI N in Sranantongo. This contrasts with mixed Ewe-English and Ewe-French speech, where there is no variation in the verbal domain but there is variation in the nominal domain. Furthermore, predicatively used English and French property items in Ewe-French and Ewe-English multilingual discourse always occur as COP PI, never as PI_V. In the nominal domain, however, we encountered four different types of combinations of English/French and Ewe property items and nominals, as well as both orderings of property items and nominals (PI N and N PI). The sociolinguistic and sociopolitical aspects of language contact mentioned in the introductory paragraph may offer an explanation for these findings, in particular the power relationships between the languages. When the languages in contact are in an asymmetrical power relationship, as the European languages and the African languages in the plantation society of 18th century Suriname, there is less variation as the dominant language significantly impacts the outcome of language contact: PI N and COP PI. The emergence and continued use of COP PI in Early Sranan was further strengthened by, what may be a universal, preference to use a native copula with a non-native property item in multilingual discourse. When the languages in contact are in a less asymmetrical relationship, as is the case in contemporary Ghana and Togo, the outcomes of language contact may be characterized by more variation, which is exemplified in our data by various types of combinations of English/French and Ewe property items and nominals, as well as different orderings of the property items and the nominal (PI N and N PI).

In keeping with Singler's work on creole genesis, our comparison of historical creole data from Suriname with data on contemporary multilingual discourse from Ghana and Togo contributes to a better understanding of the principles that govern language birth.

Acknowledgements

The University of Ghana (Legon), the University of Lomé, the Radboud University of Nijmegen and Utrecht University are hereby gratefully acknowledged for their support and assistance. The Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) is acknowledged for the VENI grant of Margot van den Berg (275-89-005). Heartfelt thanks to the Toy Task participants in Accra, Lomé, Amsterdam, Kara, Ho, Bolgatanga, Winneba, Kumasi, Utrecht, Nijmegen en Vlijmen for their support of our research, and the editors and reviewers for their constructive comments.

References

Adika, G. 2012. English in Ghana: Growth, tensions, and trends. *International Journal of Language, Translation and Intercultural Communication* 1(1): 151–166. doi: 10.12681/ijltic.17

Ameka, F. 1991. *Ewe: Its Grammatical Constructions and Illocutionary Devices*. PhD dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra.

Amuzu, E. 2005. *Ewe-English Codeswitching: A Case of Composite Rather than Classic Codeswitching*. PhD dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra.

Amuzu, E. 2010. *Composite Codeswitching in West Africa: The Case of Ewe-English Codeswitching*. Saarbrucken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Arends, J. 1989. *Syntactic Developments in Sranan*. PhD dissertation, Radboud University of Nijmegen.

Arends, J. 1995. Demographic factors in the formation of Sranan. In *The Early Stages of Creolization* [Creole Language Library 13], J. Arends (ed), 233–285. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/cll.13.11are

van den Berg, M. 2007. *A Grammar of Early Sranan*. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

van den Berg, M. 2012. Multilingual language use and creole formation: The case of property items in Early Sranan. *Ghana Journal of Linguistics* 1(2): 23–42.

van den Berg, M. 2013. Ningretongo and Bakratongo: Race/Ethnicity and language variation in 18th century Suriname. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 91(3): 1255–1304.

Bodomo, A., Anderson, J., & Dzahene-Quarsie, J. 2009. A kente of many colors: Multilingualism as a complex ecology of language shift in Ghana. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 3(3): 357–379.

Borges, R. 2014. *The Life of Language: Dynamics of Language Contact in Suriname*. PhD dissertation, Radboud University of Nijmegen.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? *Studies in Language* 1(1): 19–80. doi: 10.1075/sl.1.1.04dix

Essegbey, J., van den Berg, M. & van de Vate, M. 2013. Possibility and necessity modals in Gbe and Surinamese Creoles. *Lingua* 129: 67–95. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2012.03.009

Essizewa, K. 2007. *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Kabiye-Ewe Bilingualism in Togo*. PhD dissertation, New York University.

Forson, B. 1979. *Code Switching in Akan–English Bilingualism*. PhD dissertation, UCLA.

Fox, G. & Thuilier, J. 2012. Predicting the position of attributive adjectives in the French NP. *New Directions in Logic, Language and Computation [lecture notes in computer science]* 7415, 1–15. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-31467-4_1

Gblem-Poidi, H. & Kantchoa, L. 2013. *Les langues du Togo: État de la recherche et perspectives*. Paris: Éditions L'Harmattan.

Gullberg, M., Indefrey, P. & Muysken, P. 2009. Research techniques for the study of code-switching. In *The Cambridge Handbook on Linguistic Code-Switching*, B. Bullock & A. Toribio (eds), 21–39. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511576331.003

Huber, G. 1999. *Ghanaian Pidgin English in its West African Context: A Sociohistorical and Structural Analysis* [Varieties of English around the World G24]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/veaw.g24

Huttar, G. & Huttar, M. 1994. *Ndyuka*. London: Routledge.

Huttar, G. & Koating, E. 1993. Are Ndjuká comparative markers verbs? In *Atlantic Meets Pacific: A Global View of Pidginization and Creolization* [Creole Language Library 11], F. Byrne & J. Holm (eds), 165–174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kropp Dakubu, M. 1988. *The Languages of Ghana*. London: KPI Ltd.

Kropp Dakubu, M. 1997. *Korle Meets the Sea: A Sociolinguistic History of Accra*. Cambridge: CUP.

Matras, Y. & Sakel, J. (eds). 2007. *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110199192

Meechan, M. & Poplack, S. 1995. Orphan categories in bilingual discourse: A comparative study of adjectivization strategies in Wolof/French and Fongbe/French'. *Language Variation and Change* 7(2): 169–194. doi:10.1017/S0954394500000971

Migge, B. 2000. The origin of property items in the Surinamese Plantation Creole. In *Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles* [Creole Language Library 21], J. McWhorter (ed.), 201–234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cll.21.08mig

Migge, B. 2003. *Creole Formation as Language Contact: The Case of the Suriname Creoles* [Creole Language Library 25]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cll.25

Migge, B. & Léglise, I. 2013. *Exploring Language in a Multilingual Context: Variation, Interaction and Ideology in Language Documentation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Mous, M. 2009. The development of urban youth languages in Africa'. In *Transferences: The Expression of Extra-Linguistic Processes in the World's Languages*, M. Junyent (ed.), 215–232. Vic, Spain: Eumo Editorial.

Muysken, P. & Smith, N. 2014. *Surviving the Middle Passage: The West Africa-Suriname Sprachbund*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Sebba, M. 1986. Adjectives and copulas in Sranantongo. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 1(1): 109–121. doi:10.1075/jpcl.1.1.07seb

Selbach, R., Cardoso, H. & van den Berg, M. (eds). 2009. *Gradual Creolization: Studies Celebrating Jacques Arends* [Creole Language Library 34]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cll.34

Schumann, C. 1783. *Neger-Englishes Wörterbuch*. Moravian Archives, Utrecht-Paramaribo; MS 648.

Singler, J. 1981. *An Introduction to Liberian English*. East Lansing MA: Michigan State University, African Studies Center/Peace Corps.

Singler, J. 1988. On the homogeneity of the substrate as a factor in Pidgin/Creole genesis. *Language* 64(1): 27–51. doi:10.2307/414784

Singler, J. 1992. Nativization and Pidgin/Creole genesis: A reply to Bickerton. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 7(2): 319–333. doi:10.1075/jpcl.7.2.07sin

Singler, J. 2008. The sociohistorical context of creole genesis. In *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies*, S. Kouwenberg & J. Singler (eds), 332–358. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444305982

Smith, N. 1987. *The Genesis of the Creole Languages of Suriname*. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Thompson, S. 1988. A discourse approach to the cross-linguistic category "adjective". In *Explaining Language Universals*, J. Hawkins (ed.), 167–185. Oxford: Blackwell.

van Alphen, G. 1962. Suriname in een onbekend journaal van 1693. *New West Indian Guide / Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 42: 303–313. doi: 10.1163/22134360-90002329

Winford, D. 1997. Property items and predication in Sranan. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 12(2): 237–301. doi: 10.1075/jpcl.12.2.04win

Yakpo, K. 2009. Complexity revisited: Pichi (Equatorial Guinea) and Spanish in contact. In *Simplicity and Complexity in Creoles and Pidgins*. N. Faraclas & T. Klein (eds), 183–215. London: Battlebridge.

Yankson, S. In preparation. *Language Change in Multilingual Urban Centres: The Case of Akan in Accra*. PhD dissertation, Radboud University of Nijmegen

Yevudey, E. 2015. Translanguaging as a language contact phenomenon in the classroom in Ghana: Pedagogic relevance and perceptions. Learning, Working and Communicating in a Global Context. Proceedings of the *47th Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics*, J. Angouri, T. Harrison, S. Schnurr & S. Wharton (eds), 259–270. London: Scitsiugnil Press.

Appendix: Conventions for interlinear glosses and abbreviations

1SG	first person singular pronoun	INDEF	indefinite article
3SG	third person singular pronoun	LOC	locative
ADV	adverb	NEG	negation
ASP	aspect	NP	noun phrase
AUX	auxiliary	PAST	past
COP	copula	PI	property item
DET	determiner	PI_V	property item functions as main verb
DEF	definite article	POSS	possessive
EXCL	exclamation	REDUP	reduplication
FUT	future	Q	question marker