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- 2-year project funded by Velux Foundation (DK)
- Focus on creole languages with Spanish and Portuguese as lexifier languages
- Continuation of previous work
  - Daval-Markussen & Bakker (2011) "A Phylogenetic Networks Approach to the Classification of English-based Atlantic Creoles"
  - Bakker, Daval-Markussen, Plag & Parkvall (2011) "Creoles are typologically distinct from non-creoles"
ENGLISH-BASED CREOLES

(Daval-Markussen & Bakker 2011)

Figure 4. Rooted split network for form and structure combined
CREOLES AS DISTINCT

(Bakker & al. 2011)
AIMS

1. Evaluate previous classifications & models
2. Map the linguistic traits of IRCs: shared features and differences
3. Offer new insights to their relationships and evolution
   - What kind of historical and social processes shaped their evolution to their current form?
   - What do different developments tell us about cognitive constraints in the creation of new languages?
METHODS 1

• Phylogenetic analysis
  – Statistical modeling & probabilities
  – SplitsTree v.4.11.3 (Huson & Bryant 2006)
    o visualizes the most probable evolutionary scenario
    o shows the supposed developmental path based on the observed data (Daval-Markussen 2011: 9)
    o results can be visualized as trees or as networks (lateral influences)

• Suitable for testing hypothesis
DATATYPES

• Database analysis
  – APICS database (Michaelis et al. 2013)

• Data collection
  – Questionnaires: specialists and native speakers
  – Example sentences translated to target language
EARLIER COMPARISONS AND MODELS OF EVOLUTION
SETTING THE SCENE

-Pioneers:
- Schuchardt, Coelho 1881-1886, Barros 1899, Dalgado 1900

-Today, a growing number of studies
- Cardoso, H. & al. 2012: Ibero-Asian creoles
- Hagemeijer, T. & al. Ongoing. The origins and development of creole societies in the Gulf of Guinea
- (Relationships among) Upper Guinea Creoles (Alexandre, Baptista, Kihm, Lang, Rougé, among others)
MODELS OF EVOLUTION

- Atlantic creoles
  - 2 focal points: West-Atlantic vs. Bantu and Kwa substrate
  - Caribbean IC’s and the African connection (Jacobs 2012)
  - UGC: Cape Verde or the continent, Portugal?
  - GGC: Nigerian Delta, São Tomé and later offspring

- Ibero-Asian creoles
  - Intense dynamism, adstrate=substrate
  - Indo-Portuguese: role of Port. Pidgin, African connection
  - Local developments and areal groupings
  - Hypotheses surface, Malacca-Macau/Java (/Philippines)
SO FAR...

- Comparative studies have concentrated on comparing individual languages, features (e.g. Clements 2009, or (sub)groups of languages (Cardoso & al. 2012)
- Evidence of independent developments, universal tendencies, and partial diffusion.
- Problems arising from the close relationship between the lexifiers: many dialectal varieties share features.
- Strong areal clusters defined by sub/adstrate influence and shared history.
Taylor’s Creole features (1971, 294-5)

1. The third person plural pronoun serves as a nominal pluralizer.
2. Past and future markers combined express the conditional.
3. The word for give also functions as dative preposition for or to.
4. Phrasal which/ thing/ person/ time/ place? employed to express what?, who?, when?, where?
5. Prepositional phrase expresses possessive absolute (mine, etc.),
6. A nominal phrase expresses the possessive absolute,
7. Postpositioned demonstrative,
8. Postpositioned definite article,
9. Postpositioned possessive pronominal,
10. (my) body indicates (my) self,
11. Habitual merges with the completive
12. Habitual merges with the progressive
13. Habitual merges with the future
14. Na employed as a general locative preposition,
15. Ma employed as disjunctive but.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saramaccan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Príncipe</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annobón</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angolar</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiá Kristang</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makísta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermiteño</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Clements: Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix Type</th>
<th>CVC</th>
<th>GBK</th>
<th>PRI</th>
<th>ANG</th>
<th>STO</th>
<th>FDA</th>
<th>KOR</th>
<th>DAM</th>
<th>SLP</th>
<th>PKR</th>
<th>CHA</th>
<th>PAP</th>
<th>PAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deverbal -du/-ru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperf/Past (stative verbs) -ba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive -du/-ru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior Passive -da (&lt;-duba)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect -du/-ru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple past -o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund -n(do)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural -s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS BASED ON PREVIOUS WORK

- Selection of Iberian creoles, Portuguese, and Spanish
- Taylor’s features
- Features from Clements’ 2009 “The linguistic legacy of Spanish and Portuguese”
  - Lex. derived suffixes
  - Object marking
+ SPANISH & PORTUGUESE

Chabacano

Gulf of Guinea
CONTACT VARIETIES - GENERAL
PHYLOGENETICS WITH APICS DATA
APICS: ATLAS OF PIDGIN AND CREOLE LANGUAGE STRUCTURES

- comparable synchronic data of 76 languages
  - grammatical and lexical structures: 130 structural features; 18,525 examples
  - broad inclusion of types of languages: mixed languages, pidgins, creoles, both extinct and living varieties

• Strong typological feature set
  - creole language features
  - datasets from experts
  - wide comparative picture
  - no areal cluster feature or superstrate limitations
APICS DATA

• Languages well represented and described
  - current varieties and one historical variety
    o Batavia & Tugu, Maurer’s dataset
  - Lack of information on some Indo-Portuguese
    creoles and Macau Creole Portuguese (Makista)
  - No Afro-Portuguese or Afro-Spanish varieties
  - Intragroup comparisons in UPC, GGC and
    Chabacano

• Information missing: 2.3% of the traits on average
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean, Brava</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean, Santiago</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean, São Vicente</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casamance</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau Kriyol</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korlai</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santome</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamboanga Chabacano</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiá Kristang</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principense</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavite Chabacano</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternate Chabacano</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angolar</td>
<td>98,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka Portuguese</td>
<td>98,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diu</td>
<td>94,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa d'Ambô</td>
<td>92,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>76,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS

• feature values coded manually and numerically
  – in this phase, variation in different trees
  – information on Portuguese and Spanish added

• information into Splitstree, bootstrapping to establish probability values, analysis and comparison of resulting trees

• selection of feature groups and their analysis using the same method
APICS

PHYLOGENETICS OF IBERIAN CREOLES
EEVA SIPPOLA
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Ibero-Asian Creoles

Atlantic Creoles

Cape Verdean

Gulf of Guinea
APICS VARIATION

Fig. 2A. Less frequent

Fig. 2B. Most frequent
• Portuguese and Spanish included
ROOTED

Gulf of Guinea creoles

Cape Verdean

Chabacano

Indo-Portuguese

0.1
Portuguese creoles
PORTUGUESE CREOLES WITH LEXIFIER
CHALLENGES

› Challenges for the comparative study
  – Knowing the sources and the variation in them
  – Superficiality of the typological comparison
  – For ex. TMA-aspects difficult to include based on a multi-feature questionnaire

› How to balance the sample
  – Closely related lexifiers, (African) substrate features
  – Qualitative analysis of the sources and the features
  – Feature selection in APiCS is a convenience selection!

› How to include (free) variation
FEATURE SELECTION BEYOND APICS

› Combination with comparative feature list (Hancock 1987)
  - Balanced between form and structure (some overlapping)
  - 37+ features for ENG/FR/IBE comparison

› Introduction of more fine grained traits
  - permitting the analysis in subgroups

› Historical and sociolinguistic information
  - In phylogenetic analysis and/or later
CONCLUSIONS

- Phylogenetic network analysis with APICS confirms several earlier findings
  - GGCs
  - Today the relationship of the Chabacano varieties to Portuguese creoles in Asia remains unclear
- UPC and their relation to other Atlantic creoles not confirmed by this data (Contra Jacobs 2012)
  - If both superstrates included
  - Limitations and suitability
CONCLUSIONS

- Structural feature comparison (N108), including semantic information, give the best results
  - Also NP features (N 21) produce similar results
  - Significance of order/position features?
  - Other feature subgroups, e.g. phonological and semantic features, do not give results

- However, this is an excellent database that in combination with further material can contribute to a better understanding of the evolution in this group of creoles
2nd workshop?

AFRO-LATIN VARIETIES IN FOCUS
Aarhus Universitet
Fall 2014