Betwixt and between

Causatives in the English-lexicon creoles of West Africa and the Caribbean[*]

Kofi Yakpo

Radboud University Nijmegen &

Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies (FRIAS)

kofi@the-linguist.net

Abstract

Causative formation in the family of Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles (AECs) can be ordered along a continuum with an "African" and a "European" pole. On one end we find biclausal structures: A causative main verb takes a clausal complement marked for subjunctive mood. These structures appear to conform to a West African areal pattern in which subjunctive mood, instantiated in a modal complementizer, appears in a range of deontic contexts, including causatives. At the other end, causative formation involves English-style "raising", hence reduced clauses. The prevalence of either pattern strongly correlates with the contact trajectory of an individual AEC. Languages that have been in continuous contact with English generally feature a more fragmented modal system in which causative formation follows idiosyncratic strategies. AECs that have been insulated from English for a longer period, and the African AECs in general, feature more unitary modal systems in which causative constructions are formally part of a larger functional domain of deonticity.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of causative formation in the family of Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles and Pidgins (henceforth AECs) that spans the Atlantic basin from West Africa to the Caribbean. A closer look at causatives in the AECs reveals a fascinating range of typological variation across the family. To my knowledge, this is the first comparative study of causative formation in the AECs.

In terms of speaker numbers and geographical distribution, the chain of often mutually intelligible AECs must be counted as one of the largest lectal continua of the Western hemisphere.[1] The AECs form a comparatively young family. They arose during the European slave trade from the 16th century onwards, crystallized as stable linguistic systems and native languages to the enslaved and free African-descended population of the colonial Caribbean, have since then differentiated along the political and geographical fragmentation of the territories they have been spoken in, and have seen a massive expansion in speaker numbers, particularly in West Africa in the wake of nation-building in the post-independence period since the 1960s.

A consensus is beginning to emerge about the genesis of the AECs and the roles of the colonial, superstrate language English, which provided the bulk of the lexicon of the AECs, and the African substrate languages, spoken by the enslaved African-descended peoples of the colonial Caribbean, have played in this process. According to a growing number of scholars of the field, the AECs are types of mixed languages that combine lexical, grammatical and phonological features from English and the relevant African languages in innovative ways, mediated by general cognitive principles of language acquisition (cf. e.g. Mufwene 2008; Aboh 2006, also the collection of articles in Ansaldo, Matthews & Lim 2007).

There appears to be a certain degree of difference between the linguistic scenario involving an English-lexicon creole with English as the current superstrate language, and one with a different superstrate, e.g. Spanish with Pichi in Equatorial Guinea or Dutch with Sranan in Suriname. A large body of work in creole linguistics points to the possibility that after an initial creolization period of varying length, the lexical, and in some cases structural similarity between the creole and its lexicon-providing superstrate, compounded by socio-political factors, may make the creole more susceptible to lexical and grammatical transfers from the superstrate than in cases where the superstrate is not the lexicon-providing language (cf. e.g. Whinnom 1971; Dillard 1972; Bickerton 1975).

The ease of transferability of words and structures between lexically and grammatically akin languages has also been argued for in the contact literature (Muysken 2000: 122ff.). The data assembled here seems to support this hypothesis, at least with respect to the grammar of causative-formation. A second purpose of this paper is therefore to show in how far causative formation in the AECs reflects the typological spread found between the Indo-European lexifier English and the West African substrate and adstrate languages of the Niger-Congo phylum.

---

[1] This can be extrapolated from speaker numbers in the largest AEC-speaking countries, i.e. Nigeria, ~80M (Ihemere 2006), Ghana ~5M (Huber 2012); Sierra Leone ~5M (Finney 2011); Jamaica ~3M.

This paper is structured as follows: In section 2, I provide a brief case study of causative formation within its systemic context in Pichi, an African AEC spoken in Equatorial Guinea. In section 3, I look at causative formation in representative AECs on both sides of the Atlantic. The picture is complemented by an analysis of causative formation in relevant adstrate and substrate languages of the AECs in section 0. In section 5, I sum up the principal findings. Section 0 concludes this paper. All unreferenced examples stem from my field data gathered in West Africa and the Caribbean between 2007-11. The corpus consists of a diverse range of naturalistic and elicited text types, with a total of about 100'000 words.

2. Causatives in Pichi

In this section, I present an overview of causative formation in Pichi. I will show that Pichi represents a type of AEC that is close to the West African pole of causative formation. Pichi is also interesting in the degree of formal unity of the entire functional domain to which the expression of causative belongs and is therefore an example for a neat form-function isomorphism. We will see that the coding of causative suggests that in functional-semantic terms, it is firmly integrated into a modal meta-domain of deontic modality in the AECs.

Pichi belongs to the African group of the family of Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles and is spoken on the island of Bioko, Equatorial Guinea (Yakpo 2009a). Equatorial Guinea was colonized by Spain, hence Pichi is the only African AEC that has not been in direct contact with English for at least hundred and fifty years. Pichi therefore shows very few, if any traces of contact with English. In contrast, its sister languages, Krio (Sierra Leone), Nigerian and Ghanaian Pidgin, all of which are covered in section 3, have been in direct, uninterrupted contact with English since their creation or implantation in West Africa and have thereby invariably been affected and shaped by English.

Pichi factitive (i.e. 'making') causatives (called causatives "proper" in Comrie 1985) are periphrastic (henceforth referred to as "analytic"); they are biclausal and involve the use of subordinating predication. The subordinate clause of effect is a subjunctive clause introduced by the modal complementizer and subjunctive marker *mek* 'SBJV'. This strategy of causative formation can be seen as a representative of the "purposive type" (Song 1996: 49–67). The main clause event is carried out for the purpose of realizing the subordinate clause event, which accordingly receives modal (in this case subjunctive) marking. Such a goal orientation

may also be seen to permeate the entire modal domain of deonticity which the causative forms a part of in the AECs:[2]

(1)   *è*   *bìn*   **mek**   *mek*   *à*   **gi**   *dì*   *gɛl*   *dì*   *plàntí.*
     3SG.SBJ   PST   make   SBJV   1SG.SBJ give   DEF   girl   DEF   plantain
     'He made me give the plantain to the girl.' (Pichi)

Three aspects of the causative construction in (1) are particularly noteworthy: (1) the subordinate effect clause is introduced by a modal element, namely the subjunctive complementizer *mek* 'SBJV'; (2) the subjunctive complementizer is homophonous with and diachronically related to the (lexical) causative verb *mek* 'make'; (3) the causee is expressed as the subject of the subordinate clause of effect. The analyticity of the Pichi causative construction is evident in certain characteristics. First, the causative event is expressed in two finite clauses rather than via a main clause and a more reduced structure involving a non-finite predicate (cf. e.g. Hans-Bianchi, this volume for Standard German). Second, there is no argument-merging or sharing of the "raising"-type, in which a causee is at once a syntactic argument of the main verb while functioning as a notional argument of the subordinate clause (cf. e.g. Dalmi, this volume for Hungarian, and Leino, this volume for Finnish). Third, the subjunctive complementizer alone caters for the expression of mood in the construction, i.e. there is no additional overt mood marking on the effect verb. Finally, the subjunctive complementizer is fully grammaticalized and there are no intermediate stage effects such as distributional restrictions on the cooccurrence of *mek* 'SBJV' and *mek* 'make' in the same clause.

     When turning to the lexical class of labile verbs in Pichi, we see that the construction in (1) above is analytic in a fifth way. With labile verbs, the causative can also be expressed derivationally (by "null derivation", if you wish). Example (2) illustrates the two options for rendering causative meaning with labile verbs within a single sentence:

(2)   *à*   *drɔngo=àn,*   *à*   **mek**   *mek* *è*   *drɔngo.*
     1SG.SBJ be/get.drunk=3SG.OBJ   1SG.SBJ   make   SBJV 3SG.SBJ be/get.drunk
     'I made him drunk, I got him drunk.' (Pichi)

---

[2] In view of the functional distribution of subjunctive marking in Pichi and the other languages that follow, I employ the traditional label "deontic" modality rather than "speaker-oriented" vs. "agent-oriented" (e.g. Bybee & Fleischman 1995: 6) or "dynamic" modality (e.g. Palmer 1990). The three latter labels cut across the formal-semantic unity of the subjunctive domain in a way that is not relevant for the distribution of this modal category in Pichi and the other languages treated in this paper.

Before the comma, the labile verb *drɔngo* 'be/get drunk' is used as a transitive and causative verb followed by the patient object pronoun *=àn* '3SG.OBJ'. In the second half of sentence (2), causative meaning is expressed periphrastically through the *mek* causative construction. When the second option is used, the speaker may optionally want to express that causation is less direct. Meanwhile, the use of the transitive variant of a labile verb implies a direct, possibly even physical implication of the causer.

The subjunctive marker *mek* also introduces the complement clauses of other main verbs that induce deontic modality over their subordinate clauses. This includes other strong deontic verbs, e.g. a verb of ordering in indirect imperatives like *tɛl* 'tell (to)' in (3), the desiderative verb *want,* as in (4), and the permissive verb *lɛf* 'let, allow', as shown in (5):

(3) *dèn* **tɛl*=àn*   **se**   **mek** *è*   *go.*
    3PL   tell=3SG.OBJ   QUOT   SBJV 3SG.SBJ go
    'They told him to go.' (Pichi)

(4) *us=say*   *yù*   **want**   **mek** *dì*   *smok*   *kɔmɔt?*[3]
    which=side   2SG   want   SBJV   DEF   smoke   come.out
    'Where do you want the smoke to come out?' (Pichi)

(5) *à*   **lɛf** *mì*   *pìkín*   **mek**   *è*   *go*   *Pànyá.*
    1SG.SBJ leave 1SG.POSS   child   SBJV   3SG.SBJ go   Spain
    'I let my child go to Spain.' (Pichi)

Note that (3) above contains the complementizer sequence *se mek* 'QUOT SBJV' featuring the general complementizer/quotative marker *se*. Contrary to *mek* 'SBJV' whose use is obligatory in the complements of deontic verbs, the presence of *se* 'QUOT' is optional with this class of verbs. Owing to its core function of quotation, the additional use of *se* is, however, particularly common in the subjunctive complements of deontic speech verbs like *tɛl* and rather uncommon with modal deontic verbs like *want* or the causative verb *mek*.

Weak deontic verbs expressing a preference, aversion, fear, intent and other volitional nuances also induce subjunctive mood over their complements. An example follows with the verb *fia* 'fear':

---

[3] The use of biclausal structures involving subjunctive clauses is very common with same-subject *want-* complements and obligatory with different-subject complements of *want*. Same-subject complements may alternatively be expressed via a more reduced serial verb structure, e.g. *à want go* 'I want to go'. This distribution of subjunctive clauses holds for all the African AECs covered in this paper.

(6) *à   dè   fia **mek** è   no gi   mi   dì   mɔ̀ní   tumara.*
    1SG.SBJ IPFV fear SBJV 3SG.SBJ NEG give 1SG.INDP DEF money tomorrow
    'I fear that he should not give me the money tomorrow.' (Pichi)

Besides that, *mek* 'SBJV' may introduce directive main clauses throughout the entire person paradigm and thereby renders categories traditionally referred to as imperative, jussive (7), optative and cohortative (8):

(7) ***mek** è   no fɔ̀dɔ́n nà grɔn!*
    SBJV 3SG.SBJ NEG fall   LOC ground
    'Don't let it it fall to the ground!' (Pichi)

(8) ***mek**   wì   go!*
    SBJV   1PL go
    'Let's go!' (Pichi)

The subjunctive marker also introduces purpose clauses when the subjects of the main and subordinate clause are co-referential (where it is optional), when the subjects have disjoint reference (where it is obligatory) and when the purpose clause verb is negated (where it is also obligatory), cf. (9):

(9) *nà   in   dɛn tay=àn   **mek** è   no kɔ̀mɔ́t.*
    FOC 3SG.INDP 3PL tie=3SG.OBJ SBJV 3SG.SBJ NEG go.out
    'That's why they tied it [the dog] so that it wouldn't leave.' (Pichi)

Givón (1995) suggests the existence of a functional continuum in the domain of modality. In this continuum, the use of subjunctive mood in complement clauses is associated with the presence of a deontic meaning component (i.e. "manipulation") in the main verb. Givón suggests a cut-off point in the use of subjunctive forms in the transition zone from weak deontic main predicates denoting subtle volitional nuances such as aversion coupled with weak epistemic certainty (e.g. *(to) fear*) and predicates that only denote a weak epistemic certainty (e.g. *be possible)* (cf. Givón 1995: 125ff.). This is confirmed by the Pichi data. The expression of weak epistemic certainty involves the use of the potential mood, marked by the preverbal particle *gò* 'POT' rather than the subjunctive mood, expressed by a complementizer.

Compare (10) below featuring the epistemic predicate *fit* 'can' with the subjunctive complement of *fia* 'fear' in (6) above:

(10) *è*   ***fit***   *bi*   *se*   *è*   ***gò***   *gi*   *mi*   *dì*   *mɔ̀ní*   *tumara.*

     3SG.SBJ can   COP   QUOT 3SG.SBJ POT   give   1SG.INDP   DEF   money   tomorrow

     'It's possible that he might give me the money tomorrow.' (Pichi)

The functional distribution of subjunctive marking in Pichi presented so far is representative of all the AECs and African adstrate/substrate languages covered in this paper. It possibly qualifies as an areal-typological trait common to a West African linguistic area and its Caribbean extension in the AECs. Non-West-African languages, amongst them both English and Pichi's superstrate language Spanish, show a different functional distribution of the subjunctive mood. While English employs reduced clauses with many strong deontic verbs (e.g. *I told him **to go***), uses of the Spanish subjunctive extend into the realm of epistemic modality (e.g. *es posible que se **vaya** mañana* 'it's possible that he might leave tomorrow').

3. From African unity to Caribbean fragmentation

We have seen that the causative and the entire deontic domain show a neat form-function overlap in Pichi. I now turn to three other AECs of West Africa for a further discussion of causative formation in its systemic context. I shall show that in Krio, Nigerian Pidgin and Ghanaian Pidgin, the general picture is one of African unity in the formation of causatives. I then pick out three exemplary Caribbean AECs in order to show that causative formation and the organization of the relevant part of the modal systems is more fragmented in the Caribbean AECs. I argue that this fragmentation is on the one hand a consequence of varying degrees of intensity of contact with English. On the other hand, it is due to the absence of West African adstrates in the Caribbean that could have continually reinforced "African" features of causative formation in the Caribbean AECs. However, all the Caribbean AECs still show systematic correspondences with the African AECs in causative formation. Even in Trinidadian Creole, the most anglicized AEC in my corpus, causative formation manifests similarities with at least one pattern that is present in virtually all the AECs covered in section 2 and 3, as well as in some of the substrates discussed in section 4.

The first of the three African creoles covered in this section is Krio, an AEC of Sierra Leone. It was transplanted from its homeland to other parts of West Africa during the 19th century and played an important role in the rise of national AEC varieties like Nigerian Pidgin (Faraclas 1996: 2f.) and Ghanaian Pidgin (Huber 1999: 59ff.). Krio also shows a high degree of lexical and grammatical similarity with Caribbean AECs (Jamaican Creole and Sranan in particular, cf. Hancock 1969), with which it also shares direct historical links. Krio features all three patterns of causative formation attested in the other AECs covered in this study Krio thereby shows the largest range of alternative strategies of causative formation of all AECs, a possible result of the accretions inherited from the complex circumstances of its genesis.

One pattern of causative formation in Krio parallels the one seen with Pichi in (1) above: The causative construction is biclausal, the causative verb is directly followed by a subordinate clause introduced by a subjunctive complementizer and the causee is coded as the subject of the subordinate clause, compare (11). Contrary to Pichi and all other African AECs, Krio makes use of a second subjunctive complementizer next to *mek*, namely *lɛ* (>let('s)). Both these modal complementizers may be used interchangeably to introduce the subordinate clauses of strong deontic verbs without an appreciable difference in meaning. We will encounter the subjunctive complementizer *lɛ* again further below in Tobagonian Creole, a fact that speaks to the partial Caribbean lineage of Krio.

(11) *à*　　**mek**　**mek/lɛ**　*ì*　　*kɔ̀mɔ́t*　*Amɛrika*　*kam.*
　　 1SG.SBJ make　SBJV/SBJV　3SG.SBJ exit　　USA　　　 come.
　　 'I made her leave the USA (and) come (back).' (Krio)

A second strategy of causative formation shares all the features of the structure in (11), with one notable exception: The subjunctive complementizer is absent, as indicated by the underscore in (12) unterhalb. We will see in due course that this structure has the widest distribution among the AECs on both sides of the Atlantic:

(12) *à*　　　*gò*　　**mek**　　_　*ì*　　*kɔ̀mɔ́t*　*Amɛrika*　*kam.*
　　 1SG.SBJ POT　make　　　3SG.SBJ exit　　USA　　　 come
　　 'It's me (who) will make her leave the USA (and) come (back).' (Krio)

I interpret the structure in (12) as a complementizer-less subjunctive clause. TMA marking in the subordinate clause can be adduced as evidence: While the main clause is future-referring

(as indicated by the presence of the potential mood/future tense marker *gò* 'POT')   the subordinate clause verb *kòmɔ́t* has no marking for future tense; it appears stripped of TMA marking as verbs in subjunctive clauses introduced by *mek* 'SBJV' normally do (cf. (11)). Hence the *absence* of TMA marking could be seen as a diagnostic of subjunctive clauses just as much as the *presence* of a modal complementizer. Alternatively, the causative construction in (12) above could be analyzed as a type of resultative serial verb construction (SVC), hence a form of verb sequencing rather than embedding. Resultative SVCs are indeed a common form of event integration in all African AECs, save Pichi, and in the historically most important substrate languages covered in section 0 (Akan, Ewe and Yoruba). A common diagnostic test for SVCs involves checking for negation. Like in many languages with SVCs, the events designated by each verb in the series cannot be negated individually (cf. e.g. Hale 1991 for Misumalpan, Ameka 2006 for Ewe). Hence the SVC in (13) must be negated in its entirety by placing the negator before the first verb in the series, cf. (14):

(13) *dì   human **fray** plàntí   **sɛl**.*
       DEF   woman fry   plantain   sell
       'The woman fried plantain (and) sold it.' (Krio)

(14) *dì   human no   **fray** plàntí   (***no**) sɛl.*
       DEF   woman NEG fry   plantain NEG   sell
       'The woman didn't fry plantain (and) sell it.' (Krio)

In all the AECs covered in more detail below including Krio, the causative verb and the verb of effect can however be negated individually in causative constructions in which the subjunctive complementizer is absent. The following examples from Ghanaian Pidgin are representative:

(15) *à   **no** mek   ì   bring   mi   dè   glas.*
       1SG.SBJ NEG make   3SG.SBJ bring   1SG.INDP   DEF   glass
       'I didn't make him bring me the glass.' (Ghanaian Pidgin)

(16) *à   mek   ì   **no**   bring   mi   dè   glas.*
       1SG.SBJ make   3SG.SBJ NEG bring   1SG.INDP   DEF   glass
       'I made him not bring me the glass.' (Ghanaian Pidgin)

A second argument for viewing complementizer-less causatives as biclausal structures is that we find them in Pichi and Trinidadian Creole (see (36) unterhalb). The former language makes little use of SVCs and has no resultative SVC (Yakpo 2009a: 17), and the latter language makes only very limited use of SVCs, and in ways that I would classify as idiomatic (e.g. in the expression *tel see* [tell say] 'tell that'). Thirdly, complementizer-less subjunctive clauses are also found with other deontic main verbs in the AECs surveyed for this study even if some of these languages feel more comfortable with such structures than others. The biclausal complementizer-less structure in (17), from Pichi, involves two clauses that are syntactically quite independent from each other and features the deontic main verb *want:*

(17) *è   no   **want**   _   ìn   màmá   nak=àn.*
  3SG.SBJ NEG want   3SG.POSS mother hit=3SG.OBJ
  'He doesn't want his mother to beat him.' (Pichi)

The third type of causative formation attested in Krio involves an English-style "raising" structure. In (18), the notional subject (the causee) of the subordinate clause of effect is "raised" into the main clause, where it functions as an object to the causative main verb. I see the clause of effect to be more reduced in such structures than in the subjunctive clauses encountered above because they involve argument merging or sharing. An argument could probably also be made in favour of analyzing the embedded verb as less finite. Due to its wide currency, I will continue using the term "raising" when referring to this kind of construction, without necessarily subscribing to its theoretical underpinnings. In morphosyntactic terms, the Krio "raising" construction maps one-to-one onto the corresponding English structure:

(18) *à   mek=**àm**   go   Amɛrika.*
  1SG.SBJ make=3SG.OBJ   go   USA
  'I made her go to the USA.' (Krio)

As to subjunctive use, Krio shows exactly the same functional distribution as its close relative Pichi. For want of space, I will not go into details on this matter in Krio, but I will provide examples with other, more distantly related AECs that follow, in order to show how pervasive the use of a subjunctive complementizer throughout the modal domain of deonticity is within the entire family.

With such diversity in the formation of Krio causatives, it would be unusual if there were no semantic and usage-related differences between the three Krio strategies of causative formation. I have not been able to put my finger on these differences based on the intuitions and comments of my informants, however. This certainly warrants further investigation at a later point.

I now turn to Nigerian Pidgin, where the "raising" construction, as shown in (19), appears to be the more central means of expressing the causative for many speakers of Nigerian Pidgin,. However, my language informants, all of whom hail from the Yoruba-speaking South West of Nigeria, also produced the subjunctive pattern as a possible means of expressing causative, albeit with two alternative causative verbs, namely *du* 'do' and *mek* 'make':

(19) *à*   ***mek=àm***   *bay dis klɔt fɔ   mì.*
      1SG.SBJ make=3SG.OBJ   buy   PROX cloth PREP 1SG.OBJ
      'I made her buy this (piece of) cloth for me.' (Nigerian Pidgin).

(20) *à*   ***mek/du***   ***mek*** *ìm*   *bay dis klɔt fɔ   mì.*
      1SG.SBJ make/do   SBJV 3SG.SBJ buy   PROX cloth PREP 1SG.OBJ
      'I made her buy this (piece of) cloth for me.' (Nigerian Pidgin).

Nigerian Pidgin also features the complementizer-less causative construction that we have already seen in Krio (cf. (12) above). But it appears to be less central compared to the "raising" and the subjunctive clause structures in the two examples above:

(21) *à*   ***mek*** *ìm*   *bay dis klɔt fɔ   mì.*
      1SG.SBJ make 3SG.SBJ buy   PROX cloth PREP 1SG.OBJ
      'I made her buy this (piece of) cloth for me.' (Nigerian Pidgin).

Beyond the expression of causative, Nigerian Pidgin shows the same kind of indicative-subjunctive opposition in subordinate clauses along the deonticity cline as the other African AECs. Compare example (22) involving the permissive verb *lɛt* 'let, allow'. Note that here too, "raising" is an option:

(22) à   **lɛt**=*am*   **mek** *ìm*   *bay*   *dì*   *klɔt.*
     1SG.SBJ let=3SG.OBJ   SBJV 3SG.SBJ buy   DEF   cloth
     'I allowed her to buy the cloth.' (Nigerian Pidgin)

Nigerian Pidgin therefore features the same range of biclausal and "raising" causatives as Krio. There appears to be some micro-variation with respect to the frequency of the different constructions however.

    The third African AEC treated in this section is Ghanaian Pidgin. This language diverges slightly from the patterns of causative formation established for Krio and Nigerian Pidgin. With deontic modality-inducing main verbs other than the causative verb *mek* 'make', we find the usual pattern of subjunctive marking via the modal complementizer *mek* 'SBJV'. Compare (23), featuring subjunctive mood in the complement of the desiderative main verb *wɔnt* 'want':

(23) à   **wɔnt mek** *dɛ̀m* *sit*   *dɛ̀*   *bak.*
     1SG.SBJ want SBJV 3PL   sit   DEF   back
     'I want them [the children] to sit (at) the back [of the car].' (Ghanaian Pidgin)

The use of *mek* as a causative verb may trigger the use of two types of constructions. One is the "raising" construction involving argument sharing that we have already seen in Krio and Nigerian Pidgin, compare (24):

(24) à   **mek**=*àm*   *bring*   *mi*   *dɛ̀*   *glas.*
     1SG.SBJ make=3SG.OBJ   bring   1SG.INDP   DEF   glass
     'I made him bring me the glass.' (Ghanaian Pidgin)

However, the alternative, and with my informants preferred variant is given in (25). It involves a complementizer-less subjunctive clause:

(25) à   *gò*   **mek** *(*mek)* *ì*   *bring*   *mi*   *dɛ̀*   *glas.*
     1SG.SBJ POT   make SBJV   3SG.SBJ bring   1SG.INDP   DEF   glass
     'I'll make him bring me the glass.' (Ghanaian Pidgin)

A sequence of the homophonous causative verb and the subjunctive complementizer is not normally accepted by Ghanaian Pidgin speakers. I hypothesize that Ghanaian Pidgin features an "Obligatory Contour Principle" (henceforth OCP) (Leben 1973) in contexts like (25) above. The OCP disallows adjacent identical morphemes and thereby disallows the appearance of a *mek mek* 'make SBJV' sequence in causative constructions. Evidence comes from the likely existence of a similar OCP in Akan and Ewe, two major adstrate languages of Ghanaian Pidgin (see (37)-(44) unterhalb). Ghanaian Pidgin therefore differs from Krio and Nigerian Pidgin in that it features a "gap" in the coding of deontic subordinate clauses: Causative constructions are excluded from the use of the subjunctive mood.

At the same time, Krio, Nigerian Pidgin and Ghanaian Pidgin differ from Pichi in that they allow the "raising" construction. Other than that, all four African AECs feature biclausal causative constructions. Except for Ghanaian Pidgin, these biclausal causatives may involve overt subjunctive complementizers. We will see that the presence of biclausal causatives and the prolific use of subjunctive complementizers place the African AECs closer to the "African" pole of causative formation patterns (cf. section 0). Additionally, the circumstance that most African AECs allow sequences of the homophonous causative verb and the subjunctive complementizer, speaks for an advanced stage of grammaticalization of the subjunctive complex in these languages..

I now move on to the Caribbean AECs, where the functional domain of deonticity is more fragmented in the way it is encoded, in some languages more, in some less. Tobagonian Creole (Trinidad & Tobago) has been described as a conservative Caribbean AEC that has thrived in isolation from the much larger and far more English-like Trinidadian Creole for the past two centuries or so (cf. James & Youssef 2002). In this language, we find a more unitary system of subjunctive marking along the functional network established for the African AECs. This includes the use of the subjunctive complementizer in the subordinate clauses of strong deontic main verbs like *want* 'want'. However, contrary to the African AECs, the use of subjunctive complements does not appear to represent the majority pattern.

Examples (26)-(27) show the possible permutations of functional elements involved in the formation of *want*-complements in Tobagonian. It is noteworthy that Tobagonian Creole (henceforth "Tobagonian") features two subjunctive complementizers, namely the ubiquitous reflex of 'make', here *meek*, as well *le*, a form that we have already encountered in the African AEC Krio in (11) above. Krio and Tobagonian are the only two languages of my corpus to use *le* 'SBJV':

(26) *mii   want (fo)   le/meek   i   kom   hoom.*
    1SG.SBJ want (MOD)   SBJV/SBJV 3SG.SBJ come   home
    'I want him to come home.' (Tobagonian)

Despite the grammaticality of the possibilities in (26) above, the use of the preposition and modal element *fo* in the slot before *kam* as in (27) unterhalb is the preferred option in Tobagonian. This construction, which is ungrammatical for all African AEC speakers that I consulted, is structurally equivalent to the English "raising" construction, i.e. *I want him to come home*.

(27) *mii   want am   fo kom   hoom.*
    1SG.SBJ want 3SG.OBJ   MOD come   home
    'I want him to come home.' (Tobagonian)

This hints towards the possibility that even a conservative AEC like Tobagonian has actually been converging towards English. This impression is confirmed with respect to the formation of causatives. The Tobagonian causative main verb *meek* is the only strong deontic verb that may not take subjunctive complements. Instead, an English-style "raising" construction represents the canonical way of expressing causative. Contrast this with the African AECs where the "raising" construction is optional:

(28) *mii   **meek   am**   goo bay chiken bring   kom.*
    1SG.SBJ make   3SG.OBJ go   buy chicken bring   come
    'I made him go buy a chicken (and) bring it to me.' (Tobagonian Creole)

The use of a subjunctive complement to the causative verb is not accepted by my informants, nor is the use of Ghanaian-Pidgin like, biclausal structure in which the subjunctive complementizer remains unexpressed, and in which the causee is coded as subject (cf. (25) above):

(29) **mii   **meek**   (*meek) **ii**   goo bay chiken bring   kom.*
     1SG.SBJ make   (SBJV) 3SG.SBJ go   buy chicken bring   come
    'I made him go buy a chicken (and) bring it (to me).' (Tobagonian Creole)

Moving out of the insular Caribbean to Suriname, we find causative constructions that approximate those of the African AECs more closely. Sranan Tongo (henceforth "Sranan") has been insulated from direct English influence since the mid-17th century, when Suriname became a Dutch colony. Since then, the superstrate language has been Dutch. Sranan features the use of the subjunctive complementizer *meki*, a cognate of *mek*, in the usual deontic-modality contexts. Amongst them is the use of the subjunctive marker as a purpose clause introducer, as shown in (30):

(30)   *sma   musu   man   piki   den ini   Sranan* **meki** *den ferstan.*
       person   must   be.able answer 3PL in   Sranan SBJV 3PL   understand
       'One should be able to answer them in Sranan so that they understand.' (Sranan)

The only strategy of causative formation attested in my Sranan corpus is the one already identified for Ghanaian Pidgin in (25) above: The Sranan causative construction features a complementizer-less subjunctive clause; a sequence of the homophonous causative verb and subjunctive complementizer is not accepted. The "raising" pattern common to all the other AECs save Pichi is not attested either.

(31)   *a   sa   * **meki**   _   *a /*en   nyan.*
       3SG POT   make   3SG/3SG.INDP eat
       'She might make him eat.' (Sranan)

The absence of sequences of the causative verb and the homophonous subjunctive complementizer in Tobagonian and Sranan might be due to the operation of the same OCP in these two languages that we have already encountered in Ghanaian Pidgin. It seems then that the two Caribbean AECs Tobagonian and Sranan represent an intermediate type situated somewhere between the "African" and the "European" poles of causative formation. Both languages feature "un-English" unitary subjunctive complexes. At the same time, we find a "gap" in the form-function mapping with respect to the coding of deontic modality: Tobagonian causatives are exclusively formed via "raising" and Sranan employs the biclausal complementizer-less causative construction.

      I now turn to Trinidadian Creole (henceforth "Trinidadian"), a heavily anglicised AEC spoken in Trinidad. This language generally displays the same kind of fragmented coding of

the functional domain of deonticity as English, albeit with important language-specific differences.

Consider the following three examples from Trinidadian. The use of equivalent predicates would require the presence of subjunctive complements in all African AECs. And in Sranan and Tobagonian, the use of subjunctive complements in these three contexts is at least possible. Contrast this with Trinidadian, where *want*-complements with different subjects can appear without an overt complementizer, as in (32). Other strong and weak deontic verbs take complements introduced by *tu* 'to', as in (33), and the complement of an evaluative predicate like 'not good/bad' may be introduced by the clause linker *wen* 'when', as in (34):

(32) *shii   doon **wont**   noobodi   sii   shii.*
     3SG.F   NEG   want   nobody   see   3SG.F
     'She doesn't want anybody to see her.' (Trinidadian)

(33) *shii   perens **fos shii**   tu   wosh   di   dish.*
     3SG.F   parents force 3SG.F   to   wash   DEF   dishes
     'Her parents forced her to wash the dishes.' (Trinidadian)

(34) *is   nat **gud** (*dat/) **wen**   Koosi   du   dat, yu   noo.*
     COP   NEG good (that)   when   Koosi   do   that 2SG   know
     'It's not good for Koosi to do that/when Koosi does that, you know.' (Trinidadian)

Turning to the causative, we however encounter a pattern that may be indicative of a residual form of subjunctive marking. In Trinidadian, two personal pronouns may be employed to express 3SG object case with a masculine referent. The first form, *im* is specified for masculine gender *and* object case. The second pronoun, *hii,* is also specified for masculine gender. However, this form is case-neutral and may appear in both the subject and object positions. Hence, both alternatives separated by the slash in (35) are in order:

(35) *a   sii **hii/im**   yestadee.*
     1SG.SBJ see   3SG.M/3SG.M.OBJ yesterday.
     'I saw him yesterday.' (Trinidadian)

In causative constructions featuring the causative verb *meek* 'make', however, some of my informants express a preference for the use of the case-neutral pronoun *hii* when referring to a causee with masculine gender, compare (36) unterhalb. The causee is best seen to be the subject of the subordinate clause of effect in the Trinidadian Creole structure in (36). This sentence could therefore be seen as another manifestation of the complementizer-less biclausal structure encountered in all the other AECs. The alternative featuring a causee encoded by the object pronoun *im* was commented on by one of my informants as "you're trying to sound more like the Standard (i.e. English)". All the same the "raising" pattern is preferred in other, less basilectal registers and is accepted as grammatical by all speakers. Thus, there seems to be a variational space in Trinidadian Creole that reflects the interaction of more English-like and more "African"-like lectal features in this AEC:

(36) *a   meek   **hii**(?/im)   bay mii   a   kaa.*
      1SG.SBJ make   3SG.M/3SG.OBJ.M buy 1SG.OBJ INDF   car
      'I made him buy me a car.' (Trinidadian Creole)

In sum, Trinidadian appears to be closest to the "European" pole of causative formation. It features the most English-like, formally fragmented modal domain and employs "raising". Nevertheless, we also encounter a pattern of causative formation that is reminiscent of the biclausal, complementizer-less strategy, even if it is only expressed in a tendency rather than an either-or pattern.

A final observation that can be culled from the data presented in this section is that all African and Caribbean AECs that have been in direct contact with English for a considerable time (ranging from about one and a half to four centuries) whether African or Caribbean, feature an English-style "raising" construction. In contrast, the only two AECs that have had no direct contact with English for a long time (about one and a half centuries in the case of Pichi and three and a half for Sranan) do not employ "raising".

4. Causative formation in West Africa

I now turn to the question of the origins of AEC causative constructions. I suggest that the West African substrates and adstrates provide(d) the model for the biclausal analytic causative construction (with or without overt subjunctive marking) found in the AECs covered in the previous two sections. In this section, I show the existence of typologically identical constructions in a cross-section of West African languages. My argument rests on the observation that English, neither in its contemporary nor historical forms, employs biclausal constructions as a central strategy of causative formation. English can therefore not have provided a template for AEC analytic causatives of the biclausal type.

The importance of West African substrate languages in the formation and development of the AECs has been argued for in a large body of literature. Large parts of West Africa, where the majority of enslaved Africans were deported from during the European slave trade, form a linguistic area in which a substantial number of traits are shared across genealogical groupings (cf. Güldemann 2008; Brauner 2000; Zima 2000; Kastenholz 2006; Vossen & Ermisch 2006 for recent discussions). A substratist argument for the existence of a particular trait in the AECs should therefore provide evidence that substrate features found in the AECs indeed show an areal distribution. The Kwa languages of the West African coastal belt are seen to have played a particularly important role as substrates to the AECs (cf. e.g. Alleyne 1980; Boretzky 1983; Migge 2003 for systematic studies).

There is an important difference between the contact scenarios of which the Caribbean AECs form part and those in which the African AECs participate. The Caribbean AECs have not had large-scale contact with African languages for centuries. Meanwhile, the African AECs have been in continuous contact with West African languages, with which they interact in complex patterns of multilingualism. For the Caribbean AECs, West African languages are therefore exclusively historical substrate languages, while for the African AECs, West African languages are at once (historical) substrates *and* present-day adstrates. We will see in the following that continuous contact with West African adstrates has exposed the African AECs to the transfer of West African grammatical and lexical material in ways that surpass the degree of West African substrate influence on all AECs. In the remainder of this section, I will draw on examples from Akan, Ewe, Yoruba, Susu and Hausa, hence a genealogically diverse cross-section of West African languages.

In Akan (Niger-Congo, Kwa, Tano), as spoken in Ghana, we find analytic causative constructions featuring the causative verb *má* 'cause'. In the Asante Twi dialect of Akan, the

clause of effect is a reduced structure, in which the causee is realized as a "raised" argument, see (37):

(37) *papa no*   ***má*-*à***   *no*   *sú-ì.*
     man DEF cause-COMPL 3SG.OBJ cry-COMPL
     'The man made him cry.' (Asante Twi; Osam 2003: 21)

In contrast, causative constructions in the Fante dialect of Akan feature a biclausal structure, in which the causee is coded as the subject of the subordinate clause of effect, cf. (38):

(38) *papa no*   ***má*-*à***   *ò-sú-ì.*
     man DEF cause-COMPL 3SG.SBJ-cry-COMPL
     'The man made him cry.' (Fante; ibid.)

A third possibility, namely the cooccurrence of the causative verb and the subjunctive complementizer (i.e. *má mà* 'cause SBJV') is not attested in the data from Fante and Asante Twi but I have been told that it exists in some Akan varieties (Osam, p.c.). I will come back to the peculiarity of this distribution in due course, when treating causatives in Ewe.

     Akan therefore offers the same range of possibilities as the AECs, and the African AECs in particular, albeit in the form of dialectal rather than intralectal variation. Another similarity is that Akan subjunctive complementizers introduce the subordinate clauses of a comparable range of strong and weak deontic verbs as the AECs. In (39), the modal verb *pene* 'agree' is followed by a subjunctive clause.

(39) *Kofi pene-e*   *so*   ***mà*** *ɔ-noa-a*   *nam nõ*
     Kofi agree-PST upper.surface SBJV 3SG.SBJ-cook-PST fish DEF
     'Kofi agreed to cook the fish.' (Akan; Osam 1998)

We also find the subjunctive marker in directive main clauses, compare the cohortative in (40) unterhalb with that in Pichi in (8) above. But also note micro-variational specificities: In (40), the predicate is additionally marked for optative mood, while the subjunctive marker now bears a high tone when it introduces a directive main clause (39):[4]

---

[4] The difference in tonal specification between *mà* (low tone) and *má* (high tone) when the element introduces clausal complements and directive main clauses respectively causes Osam (1998) to attribute different function labels to each form. I suggest a monosemous analysis of the form.

(40) ***má***   *yɛ-**n**-kɔ!*

  SBJV 1PL-OPT-go

  'Let's go!' (Akan; ibid.)

We find another parallel with AEC biclausal causative constructions. There is good reason to assume that the Akan subjunctive complementizer is diachronically related to a lexical verb, in this case the Akan verb *má* 'give', shown in (41). Both forms have the same segmental shape, they only differ in their tonal specification: While the complementizer bears a low tone, the lexical verb carries a high tone, compare (37) above. The causative verb is therefore the end-point of a widely attested grammaticalization path for GIVE (von Waldenfels this volume; Heine & Kuteva 2002: 152).

(41) *Kwadwo*   *de*   *sika*   ***má**-a*   *Kofi*

  Kwadwo   take   money   give-PST   Kofi

  'Kwadwo gave money to Kofi ' (Asante Twi)

Apart from the difference between the AECs and Akan in the lexical source of the causative verb and subjunctive complementizer ('make' vs. 'give'), Akan therefore features a similar functional network as the AECs: A lexical verb simultaneously functions as a causative verb, and is diachronically related to the subjunctive complementizer. The latter element, in turn, appears as a clause introducer in a similar range of contexts featuring deontic main verbs.

Ewe (Niger-Congo, Kwa, Gbe), spoken in Ghana and Togo, also shows significant correspondences with the pattern observed for Akan and the AECs. For one thing, the Ewe causative construction also features a causative verb derived from a lexical verb meaning 'give', namely the element *ná*. Secondly, there is good reason to assume that the Ewe modal complementizer *né* is diachronically related to the lexical/causative verb *ná*. Thirdly, the Ewe causative construction is biclausal and the causee is instantiated as the subject of the subordinate clause of effect, as shown in (42). The "raising" pattern is, however, unattested, at least in the Ewe varieties of the Ghanaian interior that I am familiar with, cf. (43):

(42) *mè-**ná***   *wò-vá*   *àfì*

  1SG.SBJ-cause   3SG.SBJ-come   here

  'I made him come here.' (Ewe)

(43) **mè-**nɛ̂**   vá   àfí.*

      1SG.SBJ-cause.3SG.OBJ come here

      'I made him come here.' (Ewe)

The expression of causative in Ewe follows an idiosyncratic pattern, just as it does in Akan above. The use of a modal complementizer in the subordinate clause of effect is not attested. We do, however, find the subjunctive complementizer with deontic main verbs other than the causative verb, as shown in example (44) featuring the main verb *lɔ̃̀* 'like, allow', and in sentence (45), which features a directive (jussive) main clause:

(44) *mè-**lɔ̃̀**   ná   nyɔ́nù   bé   **né**-dzó.*

      1SG.SBJ-allow   DAT   woman   QUOT   SBJV.3SG.SBJ-leave

      'I allowed the woman to leave.' (Ewe)

(45) ***né**   wó-vá!*

      SBJV 3PL-come

      'Let them come!' (Ewe)

The peculiar distribution of the modal complementizer in Akan and Ewe leads me to the conclusion that an OCP constraint is once more at work in these two languages. The cooccurrence restriction of the causative verb and a (near-)homophonous subjunctive complementizer in Ewe and Akan is possibly due to intermediate-stage effects along the grammaticalization path. Evidence for this analysis comes from causative constructions in other languages of the region, in which the causative verb is not formally (near-)identical to the subjunctive complementizer. In these languages, the causative construction has no idiosyncratic marking properties and the subjunctive complementizer appears in subordinate clauses of effect as well as in the subordinate clauses of other deontic main verbs.

      Yoruba (Niger-Congo, Benue-Congo, Yoruboid) is the major adstrate of the South Western variety of Nigerian Pidgin that my informants speak. Yoruba also had a substantial influence on Krio during its formative period (cf. Hancock 1971). In Yoruba, causative constructions are biclausal and the clause of effect is introduced by the subjunctive complementizer *ki* 'SBJV'. With respect to the realization of the causee, Yoruba shows a familiar pattern: The causee is expressed as the subject of a finite subordinate clause, cf. (46):

(46) *mo*   **mú**   **kí**   *ó*   *lò*   *oògùn*   *náà.*
    1SG.SBJ cause   SBJV 3SG.SBJ use   medicine   DEF
    'I made her drink the medicine.' (Yoruba)

In Yoruba, the subjunctive complementizer introduces the subordinate clauses of the entire range of deontic-modality inducing main verbs already identified for the West African AECs, e.g. in permissives involving the use of the verb *gbà* 'get, accept', as in (47):

(47) *mo*   *gbà*   **kí**   *ó*   *lọ*   *sí*   *Ìbàdàn.*
    1SG.SBJ accept   SBJV 3SG.SBJ go   LOC   Ibadan
    'I allowed her to go to Ibadan.' (Yoruba)

The subjunctive complementizer is also found with indirect imperatives, as in (48). The modal complementizer is also present in purpose clauses, compare (49). Note the presence of the quotative-modal complementizer sequence in (48), a characteristic that we have already seen in the West African AECs (see (6) as well as in Ewe (see (44) above:

(48) *mo*   *sọ*   *fún*   *un*   **pé**   **kí**   *ó*   *wá.*
    1SG.SBJ say   GIVE 3SG.OBJ QUOT SBJV 3SG.SBJ come
    'I told her to come.' (Yoruba)

(49) *ó*   *lọ*   *sí*   *Ìbàdàn*   **kí**   *ó*   *lè*   *gbà*   *itọ́jú*
    3SG.SBJ go   LOC   Ibadan   SBJV 3SG.SBJ be.able get   care
    'She went to Ibadan in order to (be able to) get a treatment.' (Yoruba)

Susu (Mande, Western), a major language of Guinea, also features subjunctive marking in the clausal complements of deontic main verbs. This language does not, however, make use of a subjunctive complementizer. Instead, (affirmative) subjunctive mood is expressed via the preverbal particle *kha* 'SBJV', as shown in the causative in (50):

(50) *n*   *a*   *nyè-ma*   *i*   **kha**   *siga.*
    1SG   3SG   make-IPFV 2SG   SBJV   leave
    'I will make you leave.' (Susu)

I should mention for the sake of completeness that contrary to the other Niger-Congo languages featured so far, Susu also has a derivational causative formed by means of bound morphology, as shown by the use of the prefix *ra-* in (51). The causative prefix is however not fully productive and renders unpredictable meanings with many verbs other than *siga* 'leave' in (51):

(51) *m   bara a   **ra**-siga*
     1SG PRF 3SG CAUS-leave
     'I made her leave.' (Susu)

The Susu subjunctive does not fit in in formal terms into the pattern observed so far, since it is instantiated in a preverbal particle rather than a complementizer. However, it falls very neatly into the pattern in terms of its functional range. The distribution of the particle *kha* 'SBJV' parallels that of the maximal system of Pichi and Yoruba with their neat form-function isomorphism. Beyond its use in clauses of effect as in (50) above, the subjunctive is also found in directives (including cohortatives), in the complements of strong and weak deontic verbs, and in purpose clauses. Example (52) should suffice for illustration. Here the subjunctive particle appears in the complement of the permissive main verb *lu* 'let (go)':

(52) *m   bara **a**   lu   **a**   **kha** siga.*
     1SG PRF 3SG let   3SG SBJV leave
     'I let/allowed him to leave.' (Susu)

There is good reason to assume that the subjunctive marker *kha* is the result of a grammaticalization process from complementizer to verbal particle. We still find a homophonous *kha* as a general complementizer with a diverse range of complement-taking verbs including utterance and cognition verbs. Example (53) shows the optional cooccurrence of the complementizer and the subjunctive particle in a complement clause of *wama* 'want'. A scenario is therefore imaginable in which a modal complementizer *kha* migrated into the predicate. Its subsequent use as a verbal particle then allowed the source form to take on a more general complementizer function, while preverbal *kha* retained its modal function.[5]

---

[5] A grammaticalization scenario from clausal to phrasal modal element has also been documented for the irrealis marker *bai* in the Pacific English-lexicon Creole language Tok Pisin (Papua New Guinea) (see Romaine 1995).

(53) *n   wama   (kha)   a   kha   siga.*
    1SG   want   COMP   3SG   SBJV   go
    'I want him to leave.' (Susu)

So far I have only provided evidence for causative formation within the subjunctive complex in languages of the Niger-Congo phylum, even if some of the examples given stem from languages that are only very distant relatives (e.g. Susu and Ewe). But we also find biclausal causative constructions plus subjunctive mood in the subordinate clause of effect in West African languages outside of the Niger-Congo phylum. In Hausa (Afro-Asiatic, Chadic, West), analytic causative constructions involve the use of subjunctive mood in the clause of effect. A central strategy of causative formation involves coding of the causee as the subject of the clause of effect, which is marked for subjunctive mood, as in (54):

(54) *nā   sâ   yâ   shiryà   àbinci.*
    1SG.PFV   cause   3SG.M.SBJV   prepare   food
    'I made him prepare (some) food.' (Hausa; Jaggar 2001: 553)

In the absence of a systematic areal survey, I can only speculate that a larger sample might reveal that more, genealogically diverse, West African languages employ biclausal structures as a primary strategy of causative formation, even if we should encounter considerable individual variation in tense-mood-aspect marking and argument realization patterns.

In summary, we have identified two large patterns of analytic causative formation in West Africa, both in formal and semantic terms. In one pattern, we find a neat form-function mapping of subjunctive marking in subordinate clauses along a continuum of (main verb) deontic force (e.g. Yoruba and Susu). Here, the causative verb behaves like any other deontic main verb and accordingly, induces the use of the subjunctive complementizer in the subordinate clause of effect. In most of the languages that feature such unitary systems, the subjunctive mood is instantiated in a modal complementizer. The other pattern is characterized by a defective distribution of subjunctive marking in subordinate clauses. We find the same kind of deontic force continuum as in the first pattern, instantiated in the use of subjunctive marking with the usual range of strong and weak deontic verbs, as well as in directive main clauses and purpose clauses. However, the causative construction sheers out of line, and we find two types of idiosyncratic structures with respect to the expression of the effect event. One involves a "raising" structure (e.g. Akan), the other involves a biclausal

structure in which the subjunctive complementizer is absent (e.g. Ewe). These two broad patterns, including the further sub-differentiation of the second pattern were also identified in the AECs in section 3.

5. Language contact and AEC causatives

We have seen that AEC causative formation involves diverse strategies found in the adstrates/substrates as well as in English. These strategies can be situated along a continuum with "European" and "African" strategies at the opposing ends. I now argue that three interdependent language-contact related factors may be seen as responsible for the observed differences in patterns of AEC causative formation: (1) the amount of contact that an AEC has (had) with English; (2) the amount of contact that an AEC has (had) with West African adstrates; (3) the degree of paradigmatic levelling and grammaticalization of subjunctive use in causative constructions (which may be reinforced by contact). These factors combine to produce a specific scenario for each AEC, and may provide explanations for the trajectory of causative formation in each language.

The following table provides an overview of relevant features of causative formation in the African and Caribbean AECs treated in this paper. The last row contains information on the contact scenario for each language, and implicitly offers a hypothesis on the relevance of language contact in the differentiation of causative formation strategies in the AECs. When a language is in contact with English or other relevant languages this is indicated via the plus sign and the language name, absence of contact via the minus sign; a higher degree of attested contact is indicated by two plus signs:

Table 1. Comparison of causative formation in the AECs

Feature/Language	Pichi	Krio	NigP*	GhaP	Tob	Sran	Trin
SBJV COMP	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Biclausal CAUS -SBJV		X	X	X	X	X	?
Biclausal CAUS +SBJV	X	X	X				
"Raising"		X	X	X	X		X
Scenario	-Engl +adstrates levelling	+Engl +adstrate	+Engl +adstrates	+Engl +adstrates	+Engl	- Engl	++Engl

*NigP: Nigerian Pidgin, GhaP: Ghanaian Pidgin, Tob: Tobagonian, Sran: Sranan, Trin: Trinidadian, Engl: English

The Table above shows that all AECs except Trinidadian feature subjunctive complementizers. This is expected, since this feature was shown to be thoroughly "African" and Trinidadian is the most anglicized AEC through extensive contact with English. The other AECs that have subjunctive complementizers are either in contact with African adstrate languages (from Pichi to Ghanaian Pidgin), have been relatively insulated from contact with English (Tobagonian) or have been insulated altogether from contact with English (Sranan).

All AECs also feature biclausal causatives, if we accept that in Trinidadian causative constructions, the preference for a case-neutral personal pronoun in the expression of the causee is sufficiently indicative of "biclausality". Again, since biclausal causatives have been shown to be an "African" rather than a "European" (i.e. English) feature, the divergence of Trinidadian is not surprising.

Paradoxically, complementizer-less biclausal causatives might also be seen to result from contact with English (or another European superstrate), This is because the *absence* of a modal complementizer makes these structures slightly less "African" in their typological make-up. Biclausal CAUS −SBJV structures might therefore well be the result of convergence of African adstrate/superstrate languages and English influences in the AECs. The fact that Pichi is the only AEC that *exclusively* makes use of biclausal CAUS +SBJV structures is a good argument for such a convergence scenario. This is because biclausal causative structures that additionally feature subjunctive complementizers move us furthest towards the "African" pole of causative formation, since neither "biclausality" nor modal complementizers are attested in English (nor Spanish and Dutch) causatives. This is why we find biclausal CAUS +SBJV structures only in the African AECs. Ghanaian Pidgin has been shown to diverge from the pattern, possibly due to an OCP constraint also found in Akan, Ewe and other Ghanaian languages (where we also find CAUS −SBJV structures).

But adstrate/substrate influence may also have been responsible for the opposite result in Nigerian Pidgin and Krio. Yoruba, a major adstrate of Nigerian Pidgin and a major historical substrate of Krio has a neat, unitary subjunctive complex that includes causative formation. It is well possible that the rise of CAUS +SBJV structures in these two languages has been driven by extensive contact with Yoruba, and the etymological relationship and formal similarity between causative verb and subjunctive complementizer has been obfuscated or has become irrelevant in Krio. Being a direct offshoot of Krio, the presence of CAUS +SBJV structures in Pichi might have the same cause. At the same time, Table 1 shows that Pichi is also the only AEC to have *nothing but* the CAUS +SBJV pattern of causative formation. I

attribute this characteristic to two circumstances that follow from the very different course that Pichi has taken in comparison to its West African sister languages.

Firstly, isolation, i.e. the absence of contact with English led to the lack of reinforcement of other strategies more compatible with English, principally "raising". Secondly the complex interaction of factors such as koineization involving other AECs (but not with English), language shift to Pichi from Bubi and other Bantu languages, as well as extensive contact with Spanish have led to paradigmatic levelling and innovation in many parts of the linguistic system (cf. e.g. Yakpo 2009b). These factors have contributed to extending the subjunctive complex to all deontic main verbs and eliminating idiosyncratic patterns of causative formation.

The final observations with respect to Table 1 concern "raising". Its distribution across the languages in Table 1 strongly suggests that its presence is a consequence of continued contact with English after the creolization phase. This is so because Sranan and Pichi, the two AECs without "raising", are the only languages that have not had direct contact with English for centuries. Among the languages that employ "raising", we can also identify gradations in the centrality of this strategy. It seems to be a default pattern for Tobagonian and Trinidadian. This is so because these two languages have been in continuous contact with English for a long time, albeit with differing intensity. At the same time "raising" is only one of three patterns for the African AECs Nigerian Pidgin and Krio. Pichi does not feature "raising" at all, for reasons already given above. For speakers of Ghanaian Pidgin, "raising" is merely one of two available patterns. But for this AEC, we have also established that the (Akan) substrate makes use of "raising" as well. Hence "raising" in Ghanaian Pidgin might also be the consequence of convergence between Akan adstrate and the English superstrate strategies of causative formation.

All in all, we can therefore establish that the amount of contact with English and with African adstrates is a good predictor of patterns to be found in each individual AEC. Amongst the African AECs, an additional factor that co-determines the presence of particular patterns of causative formation are the specific patterns found in the adstrate languages. This is particularly so when the influence of a specific adstrate has been or is disproportionately strong, as is the case with Yoruba for Nigerian Pidgin, and possibly Krio, as well as with Akan for Ghanaian Pidgin.

6. Conclusion

Causative formation in the Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles is typologically diverse. It includes "African" and "European" strategies. A pattern that involves fully biclausal structures and the use of a subjunctive complementizer has been shown to be the most "African" one while "raising" was identified to be the most "European" pattern. Nevertheless, one circumstance points towards the enduring pervasiveness of "African" features in the AECs. It is the use of a reflex of 'make' not only as a causative verb, as in English, but also as a subjunctive complementizer in the clausal complements of deontic main verbs apart from the causative verb, in directive main clauses and in purpose clauses. This is a feature shared by all the AECs covered, save the most anglicized one (Trinidadian Creole). This feature may in fact be seen to constitute an areal trait that provides further evidence for the genealogical continuities and deep linguistic affinities between the Caribbean AECs, the African AECs and the languages of West Africa.

Abbreviations: CAUS = causative (construction); COMP = complementizer; COMPL = completive aspect; COP = locative-existential copula; COREL = corelative pronoun; DAT = dative; DEF = definite marker; DIST = distal demonstrative; F = feminine gender; INDF = indefinite article; INDP = independent/object personal pronoun; INF = infinitive; IPFV = imperfective aspect; LOC = locative preposition; M = masculine gender; MOD = modal element; NAME = personal name; NEG = negator; OBJ = object; OCP = Obligatory Contour Principle; OPT = optative mood; PL = plural; PLACE = place name; POSS = possessive; POT = potential mood; PRF = perfect marker; PROX = proximate demonstrative; PRS = present tense; PST = past tense; Q = question particle; QUOT = quotative marker; REFL = reflexive pronoun; REL = relative pronoun; SG = singular; SBJ = subject; SBJV = subjunctive mood.

7. References

Aboh, Enoch Oladé. 2006. Complementation in Saramaccan and Gungbe: the case of c-type modal particles. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 24(1). 1–55.

Alleyne, Mervyn C. 1980. *Comparative Afro-American: an historical-comparative study of English-based Afro-American dialects of the New World*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Ameka, Felix K. 2006. Ewe serial verb constructions and their grammatical context. In Aleksandra Y Aikhenvald & Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb constructions: a cross-linguistic typology*, 124–143. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ansaldo, Umberto, Stephen Matthews & Lisa Lim (eds.). 2007. *Deconstructing Creole*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bickerton, Derek. 1975. *Dynamics of a creole system*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1983. *Kreolsprachen, Substrate und Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.

Brauner, Siegmund. 2000. Die Mande-Sprachen: Gliederung, Strukturen. In P Zima (ed.), *Areal and genetic factors in language classification and description: Africa south of the Sahara*, vol. 47, 4–29. (LINCOM Studies in African Linguistics). München: LINCOM Europa.

Bybee, Joan & Suzanne Fleischman. 1995. Modality in grammar and discourse: an introductory essay. *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 1–14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. 3*, 309–348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dillard, John L. 1972. *Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States*. New York: Random House.

Faraclas, Nicholas. 1996. *Nigerian Pidgin*. London: Routledge.

Finney, Malcolm Awadajin. 2011. Krio (Sierra Leone Creole). In Bernd Kortmann & Kerstin Lunkenheimer (eds.), *Electronic world atlas of varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Givón, Talmy. 1995. *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. The Macro-Sudan belt: towards identifying a linguistic area in northern sub-Saharan Africa. In Bernd Heine & Derek Nurse (eds.), *A linguistic geography of Africa*, 151–185. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, Ken. 1991. Misumalpan Verb Sequencing Constructions. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Serial verbs: grammatical, comparative and cognitive approaches*, 1–35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hancock, Ian. 1969. A provisional comparison of the English-based Atlantic creoles. *African Language Review* 8. 7–72.

Hancock, Ian F. 1971. A study of the sources and development in the lexicon of Sierra Leone Krio. PhD dissertation, University of London.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Huber, Magnus. 1999. *Ghanaian Pidgin English in Its West African Context: A Sociohistorical and Structural Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Huber, Magnus. 2012. Ghanaian Pidgin. In Susanne Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.), *The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures (APiCS)*. Oxford University Press.

Ihemere, Kelechukwu Uchechukwu. 2006. A basic description and analytic treatment of noun clauses in Nigerian Pidgin. *Nordic journal of African studies* 15(3). 296–313.

Jaggar, Philip J. 2001. *Hausa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

James, Winford & Valerie Youssef. 2002. *The languages of Tobago*. St. Augustine: School of Education, University of the West Indies.

Kastenholz, Raimund. 2006. On distributed predicative syntax in Western Mande. In Bernard Caron & Petr Zima (eds.), *Sprachbund in the West African Sahel*, 185–204. Louvain: Ed. Peeters.

Leben, William. 1973. *Suprasegmental phonology*. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Migge, Bettina. 2003. *Creole formation as language contact: The case of the Surinamese Creoles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2008. *Language Evolution: Contact, Competition and Change*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osam, Emmanuel Kweku. 1998. Complementation in Akan. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 19(1). 21–43.

Osam, Emmanuel Kweku. 2003. An introduction to the verbal and multi-verbal system of Akan. In D Beermann & L Hellan (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop on multi-verb constructions*. Trondheim: University of Trondheim.

Palmer, Frank Robert. 1990. *Modality and the English modals*. London: Longman.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. The grammaticalization of irrealis in Tok Pisin. In Joan Bybee & Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 389–428. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Singler, John Victor. 1990. The impact of decreolization upon T-M-A: tenselessness, mood and aspect in Kru Pidgin English. In John Victor Singler (ed.), *Pidgin and creole tense-mood-aspect systems*, 203–230. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Song, Jae Jung. 1996. *Causatives and causation: a universal-typological perspective*. London: Longman.

Song, Jae Jung. 2001. *Toward a typology of causative constructions*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Vossen, Rainer & Sonja Ermisch. 2006. Du contact au changement de langue: l'isolement singulier du bisa (mandé-est). In Bernard Caron & Petr Zima (eds.), *Sprachbund in the West African Sahel*, 57–66. Louvain: Ed. Peeters.

Whinnom, Keith. 1971. Linguistic hybridization and the special case of pidgins and creoles. In Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yakpo, Kofi. 2009a. A grammar of Pichi. PhD dissertation, Radboud University Nijmegen.

Yakpo, Kofi. 2009b. Complexity revisited: Pichi (Equatorial Guinea) and Spanish in contact. In Nicholas G. Faraclas & Thomas Klein (eds.), *Simplicity and complexity in creoles and pidgins*, 183–215. London: Battlebridge.

Zima, Petr. 2000. Hausa: a genetically related branch of dialects within Chadic cum cluster of post-creole areal varieties? In P Zima (ed.), *Areal and genetic factors in language classification and description: Africa south of the Sahara*, vol. 47, 146–162. (Studies in African Linguistics). München: Lincom Europa., pp. 146-162.