11th Conference on British and American Studies

11th Conference on British and American Studies

Embracing Multitudes of Meaning

Edited by

Marinela Burada, Oana Tatu and Raluca Sinu

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

11th Conference on British and American Studies:
Embracing Multitudes of Meaning

Edited by Marinela Burada, Oana Tatu and Raluca Sinu

This book first published 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: Exploring Linguistic Diversity: Studies of Language, Rhetoric, and Acquisition

**Chapter II: Making Sense of Meaning: Aspects of Translation,
Rendering, and Definition**

**Chapter III: From Text to Culture: Researching Identity
and Diversity Within and Across Social Communities**

CHAPTER I:

EXPLORING LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY: STUDIES OF LANGUAGE, RHETORIC, AND ACQUISITION

INTRODUCTION

The first chapter brings together investigations of language-related phenomena displaying a variety of conceptual and methodological perspectives. The contributions tackle, on the one hand, the structural and rhetorical particularities of language, and, on the other, first and second language acquisition. As far as the first strand of research is concerned, the articles included here focus on different aspects of the structural (phonetic, grammatical, lexical) and rhetorical organization of English and Romanian, studied either individually or cross-linguistically. The papers in the second strand draw on empirical evidence to study features of child Romanian and of English as a second language.

The chapter opens with a study which falls within the ambit of contact linguistics. **On the Eastern vs. Western Caribbean Creoles Divide** (Andrei A. Avram) takes a critical look at the validity of a number of diagnostic features traditionally used in the literature to draw the isogloss between Eastern and Western Caribbean creoles having English as their superstrate language. Adducing linguistic evidence extracted from Antiguan, Bajan, Grenadian, Kittitian, Tobagonian, Trinidadian, Virgin Islands Creole, and Vincentian, on the one hand, and Jamaican, on the other, the author calls into question the reliability of the phonological, morpho-syntactic, and lexical features previously used by specialists to establish the dividing line between the two groups of English-based creoles. The tenuousness of these diagnostic features is put down to the directionality of approach: as the author argues, the historical and genetic relationships holding within the Caribbean group as a whole cannot be satisfactorily reconstructed simply by taking synchronic data as a starting point, but rather by looking for the earliest attestations of such diagnostic features in the English-lexified creole varieties spoken in this geographical area.

A cross-linguistic investigation is also found in **Obviation and/or Obviative Effects Cross-Linguistically: a Closer Look at English** (Maria Aurelia Cotfas). Obviation and related syntactic phenomena have been particularly interesting to researchers of Romance languages, where infinitive and subjunctive moods are found to compete in embedded clausal complements required by desiderative verbs in the matrix clause. In the GB and minimalist tradition, obviation is commonly held to be the effect of this competition. This explains why English, where the infinitive is the default option in such complement clauses, obviation has received

less attention from linguists. Setting out to fill in this gap, the author starts from a description of obviation illustrated with data from Romanian, Neo-Greek, French, Spanish, Italian, and English and succinctly overviews findings and issues resulting from analyses of Romance languages in general, and Romanian in particular. This evidence allows her to distinguish three categories of languages: those which, just like Romanian and other languages in the same *Schprachbund*, use subjunctives exclusively, whether the subjects in the matrix and embedded clauses are co-referential or not. At the other end of the continuum, she places English, which employs only infinitives irrespective of the subjects' reference. A middle ground is occupied by Romance languages, such as, French, Italian, Spanish, which alternate the subjunctive and the infinitive for disjoint and co-referent subjects, respectively. Although English is typically considered an "infinitive language", oscillation between the two types of mood occurs when the matrix sentence includes the modal idiom "would rather".

Romanian Universal and Epistemic Free Choice Items (Mara Panaitescu) concentrates on the semantics of two free choice items in Romanian, i.e. "orice" and "oarecare". Syntactically, the former can occur in pronoun and determiner function, just like English "any"; the latter functions adjectivally and is found in "un oarecare NP" and "un NP oarecare" patterns comparable to the French "un NP quelconque". Semantically, just like free choice items available in various languages, "orice" and "oarecare" have universal and epistemic value. Languages include multiple, specialized free choice items, lexicalizing distinctions such as person, thing, place, and time (e.g. Greek). These items form a heterogeneous category with only partial correspondence cross-linguistically. The author proceeds by describing the analytical framework and then seeks to determine the extent to which the two Romanian items fit into the pre-established categories. Thus, Romanian "orice" is found to belong to the group of full set free choice items and its semantic contribution is *widening;* "oarecare", on the other hand, falls into the class of subset free choice items and, depending on the context in which it occurs, takes on an *ignorance* or *non-preference* reading.

Cardinal-Noun Constructions Are Partitive Constructions (Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru) makes a case for the morphosyntactic relatedness of numeral constructions and pseudopartitives in Romanian and argues for the genitive marker status of the prepositional item "de" occurring in both types structure. Taking a comparative approach to the cardinal numbers and their syntactic behaviour in a number of languages, the author highlights their universal features by drawing on data from Romance

languages such as Romanian, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Italian and dialectal varieties thereof (Ligurian, Latian, Sardinian, etc.), Slavic, and a non-Indo-European language, i.e. Finnish. There is clear evidence that languages apply a differential syntactic treatment of lower versus higher cardinals. In Romanian, for instance, paucals have clear adjectival status; cardinals 4 to 10 are formally invariable and, despite their specifier status, are analysable as invariable adjectives; the string from 11 to 19 consists of analytic forms, while numerals starting from 20 and higher are nominal heads and take on prepositional (de-N) complementation whose function is similar to that of the genitive of quantification found in Russian.

Another cross-linguistic investigation dealing with morphosyntactic particularities is presented in **On Scrambling and Differential Object Marking with a Focus on German and Romanian** (Alina Tigău). The author argues that, as far as the interpretation of the (indefinite) direct object DP is concerned, clitic doubling (CD) in Romanian is the counterpart of Germanic scrambling. Based on the premise that scrambled indefinite DPs in German are associated with a strong/specific interpretation, it is argued that movement of the indefinite DP to the left (scrambling) does not trigger a specific reading of this DP, interpretation which is obtained, however, when these DPs are *pe*-marked and clitic doubled. The article provides data showing that German scrambling and Romanian CD amount to the same interpretive effects, which comes as a consequence of the position (the edge of the vP phase) occupied by the scrambled Direct Object (DO) in German or the CD-ed DO in Romanian.

At the junction of semantics and pragmatics, **On the Current Use of Romanian Terms Denoting Physical Defects** (Alexandra Stan) gives an account of the results of a questionnaire-based survey aimed at determining the perceptions of Romanian natives of the semantic and pragmatic values of adjectives denoting physical defects, which were then compared with their dictionary definitions. The adjectives are items which more ostensibly reflect the speakers' subjectivity and whose semantic fields are fluid. Using the respondents' intuitions as evidential support, the author finds that, as far as the adjectives denoting physical defects in Romanian are concerned, the difference between language use and usage are minimal.

Within the area of academic literacy and intertextuality, **Mapping Citation Practices in Academic Writing. A Text-Based Approach** (Marinela Burada) delves into aspects of citation behaviour manifest in academic texts composed in Romanian by novice writers operating within different research traditions. The mechanics of citation and the writers' motives to cite form the scope of analysis described in this paper. Although the two aspects are clearly distinct and apparently unrelated,

understanding the formal constraints regulating communication and dissemination of knowledge in different disciplinary communities can shed, it is argued, interesting light on the writers' citing behaviour and, from here, on their reasons to use sources. Taking the specialist literature as a starting point, the author suggests a tripartite categorization of motivation, which she uses to identify the writers' motives for citing behind their texts.

Phonological Features of Multicultural London English (Irina-Ana Drobot) is concerned with aspects such as vowel and consonantal systems and phonological processes in the context of multicultural London English. Defined as a mixture of elements from the languages spoken in the Caribbean, South Asia and West Africa, and Cockney English, the study discusses multicultural London English, the context of its emergence and its users, while pointing out the differences between this new variety of English and Standard English. The emergence of multicultural London English is explained through the impact of globalisation which translates into the influence of the immigrants' languages and cultures on the English language and society.

Argumentation in Newspaper Articles (Gabriela Chefneux) is a rhetorical analysis of argumentative and persuasive techniques employed in newspapers articles. The paper starts with a theoretical preamble which draws a line between between argumentation and persuasion in terms of goals, methods and techniques and considers several persuasion and evaluation strategies. From here, the author goes on to examine a political feature published in *The American Thinker* with a view to identifying its argumentative structure. The analysis reveals that the article is a combination of argumentation (relying on causality) and persuasion techniques (fear, motherhood terms, ad hominem attack, poisoning the well, etc.) deployed in support of the writer's view.

The following four contributions concentrate on first and second language acquisition. Situated at the interface between pragmatics and typical child language acquisition, **The Acquisition of Scalar Implicatures in Child Romanian** (Ioana Stoicescu, Anca Sevcenco, Larisa Avram) reports on an experiment aimed at mapping the emergence of pragmatic competence in children under seven years of age. To this end, the authors set out to test their production of scalar implicatures associated with the use of Romanian quantifying items "unele" and "câteva". In the Romanian context, the acquisition of this particular type of pragmatic inference has so far been investigated only in connection with dyslexia. Including twelve items and consisting of a felicity judgement task, the test was administered to three groups of typically developing children aged

between four and six, as well as to a control adult group. The results obtained showed both intra- and intergroup variation pointing, *inter alia*, at the dependence of the ability to handle scalar implicature on pre-existing semantic competence. Overall, the empirical data collected during this investigation corroborated previous findings recorded in the literature, on other native-language groups: although present, to some extent, among young children, scalar implicature is acquired later in life. As the authors posit, the young children's failure to produce this kind of pragmatic inference may also be put down to their still underdeveloped computational skills, which hampers the complex logical processes underlying scalar implicatures.

In the same area of interest, **Event Conflation in Child Romanian** (Elena Buja) uses empirical evidence to consider motion events described in thirty-seven children's narratives. Starting from the idea that, generally speaking, linguistic encoding of motion events typically presupposes a combination of four basic values, i.e. Figure, Path, Manner, and Ground, the author aims to determine how Romanian language users encode manner and ascending/descending path. Generally speaking, cognitive linguistic research has shown that languages differ in the way they encode these basic values: some may be "satellite-framed", if manner and path are rolled into a verb+particle/morpheme pattern, conflating the idea of motion (verb) and path (particle, or "satellite"); other languages are "verb-framed", rendering path by the verb and encoding manner as a separate, optional constituent. In narratives, such structural discrepancies are reflected in the different perspective and focus observable in accounts of motion events produced in languages from either group, e.g. English descriptions being more dynamic and process-oriented, whilst Romanian accounts appear more goal-oriented and pay more attention to resulting states. The experiment has shown that the Romanian children's ability to use complex, single word motion verbs which merge the values of manner and path is a later development, observable with school-aged children. In the overall process of first language acquisition, it is preceded by a lexical stage, when motion values are mostly expressed by verb-external elements with adverbial value.

Also in the realm of first language acquisition, **Modal Meanings in Early Child English** (Ana-Maria Andreea Gaidargi) draws on longitudinal corpora to study the use and frequency of modal verbs *can*, *will*, *might*, *shall*, *must*, by five monolingual English children. Considering the current views currently held in the literature on the sequence in which the modal meanings – deontic and epistemic – are most typically acquired by children, the author investigates development of linguistic awareness in

very young children over a period of approximately one year. The discussion starts with a brief survey of a number of different first language studies which have supported either the "deontic first" or "the epistemic first" view. In this respect, it is interesting, for example, to see how the acquisition of modal meanings has been linked with the emergence of (meta)cognitive abilities in children: since grasping epistemic meaning relies on deductive processes, it conceivably is a later addition to the child's repertoire. The author's own analysis has shown, however, that modal verbs – with both deontic and epistemic values - occur quite early in children's speech, but not with the same frequency. Although previous experimental data points at a certain gap between the acquisition of these two semantic values, the present study reveals no significant time lag in this respect.

The last article in this chapter, **Unaccusativity in English as a Second Language** (Irina Iancu) examines the way in which Romanian learners of English acquire the unaccusative-unergative distinction in English, with particular focus on resultative constructions and locative inversion sentences, as two of the most important unaccusativity diagnostics. The first part of the article discusses the structure of the unergative and unaccusative verbs, as well as the locative inversion structure in English and Romanian and the Interface Hypothesis, while making some predictions with respect to the acquisition of locative inversion by Romanian L2 learners of English. The author tested the acquisition of these kinds of structures by Romanian learners of L2 English with the help of a grammaticality judgment task whose results are presented and examined in the second part of the article.

ON THE EASTERN VS. WESTERN CARIBBEAN CREOLES DIVIDE

ANDREI A. AVRAM

1. Introduction

Regarding the Eastern vs. Western Caribbean creoles divide, a generally accepted claim is, as put by Holm (1989, 445), that "there is some sociohistorical and linguistic justification for such a division". Holm further states that "the available comparative studies in phonology […] and syntax […] offer grounds for a broad division between the Eastern and Western Caribbean" (1989, 445).

The paper[1] reexamines the validity of some diagnostic features thought to distinguish the Eastern from the Western Caribbean English-lexifier creoles (see e.g. Hancock 1987, Wells 1987, Holm 1989, Aceto 2008a and 2008b, Parkvall and Baker 2012). Also discussed are the conclusions that can be drawn regarding settlement patterns, genetic relationships and centres of diffusion of specific diagnostic features.

Diagnostic features "represent significant phonological, lexical, or grammatical deviations from, or innovations to, varieties of British English – since British English was the major input in the restructuring process" (Baker and Huber 2001, 63). These include world-wide features, i.e. those recorded in at least one Atlantic and one Pacific pidgin or creole, and Atlantic features, which are attested in at least two Atlantic pidgins or creoles (Baker and Huber 2001, 165).The term *Eastern Caribbean features* refers to diagnostic features found only in Eastern Caribbean creoles, whereas the term *Western Caribbean features* designates those occurring only in Western Caribbean creoles.

The Eastern Caribbean creoles include Guyanese, Trinidadian, Tobagonian, Vincentian, Grenadian, Bajan, Antiguan, Kittitian, Virgin Islands Creole, etc. (Holm 1989, 445). Some of these varieties are spoken in the Leewards/Leeward Islands, i.e. in the following territories: Antigua, St Kitts, Nevis, Montserrat, Anguila and Barbuda (Holm 1989, 452). As for the Western Caribbean creoles, these consist of Jamaican, Providencia

Creole, Miskito Coast Creole, Rama Cay Creole, Belizean Ceole, Panama Creole, Limón Creole, etc. (Holm 1989, 466). In the present paper, Jamaican, which is believed to have been the centre of diffusion for Western Caribbean creoles (Holm 1989, 466-467), is taken as the representative of this group.

All examples appear in the orthography or system of transcription used in the sources. The date of the first attestation is also mentioned. When an exact year cannot be established, the system used by Baker and Huber (2001, 164-165) has been adopted: a year preceded by a hyphen reads "in or before", if followed by a hyphen "in or after", and if preceded and followed by a hyphen "in or around". The length of quotations has been kept to a reasonable minimum. Relevant items in quotations are in boldface. All quotations are accompanied by their translation. The following abbreviations are used: Atg = Antiguan; Bjn = Bajan; Gre = Grenadian; Jam = Jamaican; Kit = Kittitian; Tbg = Tobagonian; Tri = Trinidadian; VIC = Virgin Islands Creole; Vin = Vincentian.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 looks at several phonological features. Section 2 focuses on morpho-syntax. Section 3 is concerned with a number of lexical items. The findings and their implications are discussed in section 5.

2. Phonology

2.1 The FACE and GOAT vowels

Holm (1989, 451) writes that "Wells (1987) notes that eight phonological features […] pattern dissimilarly for Barbados and the Leewards, settled during the same period, but similarly for the Leewards and several territories settled later: Jamaica, the Windwards, Trinidad". On the basis of the data presented and analyzed by Wells (1987), Holm (1989, 451) tentatively concludes that "the Leewards were a more important dispersal point of linguistic features than Barbados".

The phonological features discussed by Wells (1987) include the vowels in the lexical sets FACE and GOAT. According to Wells (1987, 64), these "remain generally monophthongal in […] Trinidad […] but in basilectal Jamaican and Leewards speech they have developed into opening diphthongs [ie, up], thus [fies, guot]". Their distribution, according to Wells (1987, 66), is set out in the following table:

Table 1. FACE and GOAT vowels (from Wells 1987: 66)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean			Western Caribbean
	Tri	Bjn	Atg	Jam
FACE vowel [ie]	-	-	+	+
GOAT vowel [uo]	-	-	+	+

Similar generalizations are repeatedly found in the literature. Holm (1989, 445), for instance, writes that "the basilects of Eastern Caribbean varieties such as […] Trinidadian […] have [fe:s] 'face' and [bo:t] boat", while "in most Western Caribbean basilects these sounds are pronounced with on-glides, e.g. [fies] and [buot]". More recently, Aceto (2008a, 293) states that "the off-glides [ei] and [ou] of standard varieties of English are often not found in the Eastern Caribbean where these sounds most often correspond to [e:] and [o:]", whereas "in many Western Caribbean varieties these same sounds correspond to those with on-glides, e.g. /ie/ and /uo/ as in [fies] *face* and [guot] *goat*".

Wells (1987, 64) concludes that "we thus see an innovation adopted in the Leewards and […] in Jamaica, but not usually in Barbados", and that "this may reflect the position of Antigua […] as [one of] the earliest focuses of English(-Creole)-speaking settlement in the Caribbean".

This claim needs to be assessed in light of both diachronic and synchronic evidence. Consider first evidence from earlier stages of several Eastern Caribbean creoles. Thus, /ie/ and /uo/ in FACE and GOAT are not recorded in early Trinidadian (in e.g. Winer 1993, 1995 and 2009). Similarly, /ie/ and /uo/ are not found in records of early Antiguan. Also, according to Smith (1999, 159), "there is no actual evidence in the 18th century Kittitian data on the realization of the reflexes of long mid English vowels as down-gliding diphthongs (/uo/ ~ /ua/, /ie/ ~ /ia/) rather than monophthongs (/o:/, /e:/)". The distribution of the vowels in the lexical sets FACE and GOAT in earlier stages of Caribbean creoles appears to have been as shown in Table 2:

Table 2. FACE and GOAT vowels in early varieties

Feature	Eastern Caribbean				Western Caribbean
	Tri	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
FACE vowel [ie]	-	-	-	-	+
GOAT vowel [uo]	-	-	-	-	+

However, the picture that emerges when examining the current distribution of the vowels at issue is rather different. Firstly, the phonetic realization [uo] of the vowel in GOAT is not reported by Wells (1987), Winer (1993), Smith (1999), Youssef and James (2008) to occur in modern Trinidadian. Consider, however, the following examples:

(1)   a.   kabrit wich iz g**uo**t in brokn French 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 'cabrit which is goat in broken French' 1985, 95)
       b.   go stret h**uo**m 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985, 95)
            'go straight home'
       c.   hiz kl**uo**z mait get wet 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985, 95)
            'his clothes might get wet'
       d.   hi dogd a h**uo**l 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985, 95)
            'he dug a hole'

In modern Antiguan, the phonetic realization of the vowels in FACE and GOAT alternates between [ie] and [ia] and between [uo] and [ua] respectively:

(2)   a.   [kiek] ~ [[kiak] *cake* -2009 (Gallarza Ballester 2011, 95)
       b.   [siel] ~ [sial] *sail* -2009 (Gallarza Ballester 2011, 95)
(3)   [uova] ~ [uava] *over* -2009 (Gallarza Ballester 2011, 95)

Finally, modern Kittitian has /ie/ and /uo/ (Smith 1999, 160). Table 3 presents the current distribution of the vowels in the lexical sets FACE and GOAT in modern varieties of Caribbean creoles:

Table 3. FACE and GOAT vowels in modern varieties (revised)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean				Western Caribbean
	Tri	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
FACE vowel [ie]	-	-	+	+	+
GOAT vowel [uo]	+	-	+	+	+

In conclusion, the [ie] and [uo] phonetic realizations of the vowels in FACE and GOAT, respectively, occur in modern varieties of Eastern Caribbean creoles. Their absence in early Antiguan disconfirms the claim by Wells (1987, 64) that they first emerged in Antigua and were subsequently diffused to other Caribbean creoles. Rather, given that diphthongization of long vowels is a frequently attested phonological process, this may well be the outcome of independent internal developments.

2.2 Velarization of /n/ in coda position

Another feature considered by Wells (1987) is velarization of /n/ in the coda. According to Wells (1987, 64), "it is the Bajans […] in whose speech we most typically find the use of the sequence [Oŋ] […] where other accents have [ɔʊn] or its equivalent: thus [kɔŋt] *count*, [tɔŋ] *town* (homophonous with *tongue*)". Aceto (2008a, 295) also notes that in the Eastern Caribbean creoles "syllable- or word-final alveolar nasals following /ʌ/ are often velarized or become /ŋ/, e.g. /dʌŋ/ *down*, which often creates new homonyms (e.g. in this case with *dung*)", but does not mention individual varieties. According to (Wells 1987), the distribution of velarized /n/ in the Caribbean creoles is as follows:

Table 4. Velarization of /n/ in coda position (from Wells 1987, 66)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean			Western Caribbean
	Tri	Bjn	Atg	Jam
[ŋ] in coda position	-	+	-	+

Wells (1987, 64) concludes that "[velarization of /n/] seems to be unknown in the Leewards [which] makes it look historically like a Bajan innovation", and that "maybe we ought to conclude that the Leeward Islanders used to have this characteristic, but have now lost it".

A few remarks are in order here. Firstly, as mentioned by (Winer 1993, 15), "velarization of nasals occurs after back vowels" both in Trinidadian, contra Wells (1987), and in Tobagonian. As shown below, this is true both of earlier stages and of the modern varieties of Trinidadian – in (4), and Tobagonian – in (5):

(4) a. *pou**ng**-a-libba* 1904 (Winer 1993, 101)
         'pound of liver'

     b. [rɔ**ŋ**] *round* -1993 (Winer 1993, 15)

(5)   *boat ah come du**ng** ah Plymut* 1938 (Winer 1993, 108)
        'the boat comes down to Plymouth'

Secondly, velarization of /n/ in coda position is also attested in several other Eastern Caribbean creoles. Consider the following examples from Grenadian – in (6), Vincentian – in (7), Antiguan – in (8), and Kittitian – in (9):

(6) a. *an sido**ng** rite ro**ng** me* 1904 (Winer 1995, 146)
         'and sit down right around me'
     b. *grou**ng*** 'ground' 2011 (Chase and Chase 2011, 60)
(7) a. *likka pou**ng** plantin* 1904 (Winer 1995, 147)
         'like pounded plantain'
     b. yu waan mi go d**ong** 1950s (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985, 90)
         'do you want me to go down'
(8) a. *in a de gru**ng*** 2010 (Galarza Ballester 2011, 283)
         'in the ground'
     b. *du**ng** de road* 2010 (Galarza Ballester 2011, 112)
         'down the street'
(9)   *du**ng*** 'down' (Baker, in preparation)

It follows, then, that velarization of /n/ in the coda is more widespread than stated by Wells (1987):

Table 5. Velarization of /n/ in coda position (revised)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean							Western Caribbean
	Tri	Tbg	Gre	Vin	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
[ŋ] for [n]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Moreover, velarization of /n/ in coda position is attested in the Leewards (e.g. Antiguan and Kittitian), contra Wells (1987).

3. Morphology and syntax

Isoglosses between the Eastern and the Western Caribbean creoles have also been suggested on the basis of patterns in the distribution of

morpho-syntactic features. Roberts (1988, 88), for instance, states that "linguistic distinctiveness […] between the territories can be illustrated more precisely by using […] selected features […] syntax".

3.1 Progressive *(d)a*, negator *no* and complementizer *say*

According to Roberts (1988, 88), "the negator *no*, the word *say* to introduce a clause after certain verbs, and the continuous particle *a* [which] clearly divide the territories into two":

Table 6. Distribution of *da*, *no* and *say* (adapted from Roberts 1988, 89)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean						Western Caribbean
	Tri	Gre	SVi	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
(d)a (progressive)	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
no (negator)	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
say (complementizer)	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

In fact, contra Roberts (1988), the features at issue were or still are more widespread, as shown by the attestations below from Trinidadian – in (10), Grenadian – in (11), Vincentian – in (12), and Bajan – in (13):

(10)　a.　*my kin **da** hurt me* 1825/1826 (Avram 2012a, 30)
　　　　　'my skin is hurting'
　　　b.　*me **no** care* 1802 (Avram 2012a, 35)
　　　　　'I don't care'
　　　c.　*What you tink **say** me see* 1827 (Avram 2012a, 33)
　　　　　'What do you think I saw'
(11)　a.　*we **da** do in Congo* 1893 (Bell 1893, 30)
　　　　　'we are doing [it] in Congo'
　　　b.　*me **no** want* -1830 (Bayley 1839, 438)
　　　　　'I don't want'
(12)　a.　*my kin [...] **da** hurt me* 1821- (Avram, forthcoming a)
　　　　　'my skin is hurting'
　　　b.　*me **no** know* 1812 (Avram, forthcoming a)
　　　　　'I don't know'
　　　c.　*me heary **say**, me shall eat* 1812 (Avram, forthcoming a)
　　　　　'I heard that I would eat'
(13)　a.　*da* -1825- (Baker 1999, 318)
　　　b.　*no* 1782 (Baker 1999, 320)

The distribution of the features under discussion is set out in Table 7:

Table 7. Distribution of *da*, *no* and *say* (revised)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean						Western Caribbean
	Tri	Gre	Vin	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
(d)a (progressive)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
no (negator)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
say (complementizer)	+	-	+	-	+	+	+

As can be seen, none of these features is diagnostic of the Eastern vs. Western Caribbean divide.

3.2 Post-nominal plural marker *dem*

In his survey of Eastern Caribbean creoles Aceto (2008b, 651) writes that "the post-nominal plural marker [an dɛm] is generally diagnostic of the Anglophone Eastern Caribbean", whereas "post-nominal [dɛm] [is] the form generally associated with Western Caribbean varieties".

Actually, both post-nominal markers are recorded in Trinidadian:

(14) a.   *all de **chilran an dem** axing for you* 1904 (Winer 2009, 21)
        'all the children are asking for you'
    b.   *after you talk with the **spirits-them*** 1972 (Winer 2009, 289)
        'after you talk with the spirits'

The same holds for Tobagonian:

(15) a.   *de **horse an dem** hard fe ketch* 1883 (Winer 2009, 21)
        'the horses are hard to catch'
    b.   *de **people dem** dis side* 1883 (Winer 2009, 289)
        'the people who are on this side'

For Vincentian, Hancock (1987, 305) and Aceto (2008b, 651) list only [an dɛm] as the post-nominal marker, while Baker (1999, 326) explicitly states that *dem* as a postposed pluralizer is not attested in this variety. The

following pair of examples shows, however, that the two post-nominal plural markers coexist in Vincentian:

> (16) a.   *di **pakɪt an dɛm*** 1987 (Hancock 1987, 305)
>   'the pockets'
>   b.   *Chek yo **kaal dem*** 2002 (Avram, forthcoming a)
>   'Check your calls'

There are conflicting opinions in the literature with respect to the occurrence in Antiguan of the post-nominal plural marker *dem*. Reisman (1964, 114) lists [dɛm]/[ɛm] together with [an dɛm] as the post-nominal plural markers. However, in later works, only one form is mentioned: -*andem* in Farquhar (1974, 43) or *an dɛm* in Hancock (1987, 305), but *dem* in Galarza Ballester (2011, 107). In fact, both *an dem* an *dem* are found, occasionally in one and the same sentence:

> (17) a.   *If we no hab nutten fo de **people dem** do […] talk*
>   *dialect with the local   **people an dem***
>   2009 (Avram 2012b)
>   'If we have nothing for the people to do […] talk in
>   dialect with the local people'
>   b.   *the **teacha and dem** inna training a use wan new way*
>   *fu teach* […] *fuh sho de **teacha dem***
>   *how fu introduce arwe twang inna de system* 2010
>   (Avram 2012b)
>   'the teachers in training are using a new way to teach
>   […] to show the teachers how to introduce our dialect
>   into the system'.

Finally, both post-nominal plural markers are recorded in Kittitian (Baker and Huber 2001, 198).

In sum, the post-nominal plural marker *dem* is recorded throughout the history of several Eastern Caribbean varieties:

Table 8. Distribution of the post-nominal plural marker *dem*

Feature	Eastern Caribbean					Western Caribbean
	Tri	Tbg	Vin	Atg	Kit	Jam
dem	+	+	+	+	+	+

Given this pattern of distribution, the post-nominal plural marker *dem* is not illustrative of the distinction between Eastern and Western Caribbean creoles.

3.3 Pronominal forms

According to Aceto (2008b, 652), "it is in the pronominal system that we can see what may be the most transparent and robust split between Eastern and Western Caribbean English-derived varieties".

3.3.1 Him

Aceto (2008b, 652--53) states that "pronouns that seem to be typologically diagnostic of this eastern-western split [include] *(h)im* (as both subject and object pronouns) in western varieties, which are nearly always *(h)i* (as a subject pronoun) […] in Eastern Caribbean varieties".

The occurrence of the form *him* as a subject pronoun, however, is quite well documented in several Eastern Caribbean creoles. Consider, first, Trinidadian. Baker and Winer (1999, 114) dismiss as "most distinctly un-Trinidadian features […] the two Jamaican-style uses of *him* as subject pronoun" in an 1886 source. Reproduced below are the examples at issue:

(18) a. ***him*** *can read de book* 1886 (Baker and Winer 1999, 114)
'he can read the book'
b. ***Him*** *gwine to delibber me* 1886 (Baker and Winer 1999, 114)
'He is going to set me free'

However, *him* as a subject pronoun is recorded in three other 19th century sources:

(19) a. ***him*** *no tink me butt him* 1827 (Avram 2012a, 41)
'he didn't think I would hit him'
b. *me tink **him** dam drunk* 1831 (Avram 2012a, 41)
'I think he is damned drunk'
c. ***him*** *werry tin* 1851 (Avram 2012a, 41)
'it is very thin'

The subject pronoun *him* is also found in Grenadian, contra Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985, 89), who only list *hi*, *hii* and *i*:

(20)   *What make **him** want to married you* 1973 (Avram 2002, 79)
       'Why does he want to marry you'

Note that in (20) *what make* – while etymologically derived from English *what* and *make* – is a question word and means 'why'. Consequently, the form *him* cannot be analyzed as an instance of Exceptional Case Marking. For modern Vincentian, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985, 89), only list *hii* and *i*, but *him* as a subject pronoun is found in early Vincentian:

(21)   **him** *better far* 1821- (Avram, forthcoming a)
       'he is by far better'

Similarly, while modern Antiguan has *hi* or *i* (Galarza Ballester 2011, 111), the subject pronoun *him* is recorded in earlier stages of the language:

(22)   **him** *no 'blong me* -1834 (Avram 2012b)
       'It doesn't belong to me'

Finally, one other Eastern Caribbean variety in which the use of *him* as a subject pronoun is attested is Virgin Islands Creole:

(23)   **him** *look fresh* 1834 (Avram, forthcoming b)
           'it looks fresh'

3.3.2 Wi

According to Aceto (2008b, 653), "*wi* is often the first person plural pronoun (as both subject and object pronouns) in western varieties, and the corresponding form is *aawi* in the Eastern Caribbean".
In fact, *wi* as both a subject pronoun and an object pronoun is attested in a number of Eastern Caribbean creoles. Consider, first, examples from Trinidadian – in (24) and Grenadian – in (25):

(24)   a.   *Ef **we** don sen we chile* 1904 (Winer 2009, 948)
            'If we don't send our children'
       b.   *He leave [...] for **we*** 1849 (Winer 2009, 948)
            'He left [...] for us'
(25)   a.   *Yuh see **we** doing we ting* 2011 (Chase and Chase 2011, 152)
            'You see us doing our thing.'

      b.   *de world belong to **we*** 1966 (Avram 2002, 78)
            'the world belonged to us'

Note the occurrence of the object pronoun *wi* in (25a), contra Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985, 89) who only list the form *os* for Grenadian. According to Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985, 89), Vincentian only has *wi* as subject pronoun and *aawi* as object pronoun. This claim is disconfirmed by the examples in (26a) and (26b):

   (26)   a.   ***all we** go pray for you* 1793 (Avram, forthcoming a)
               'we will pray for you'
         b.   *le **wi** gu* 1950- (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985,
90)
              'let us go'

Next, as illustrated by the examples below, *aawi* and *wi* coexist in Antiguan:

   (27)   a.   *Ah **awe** feeling de heat, for **We** in de line of fire* 2008
               (Avram 2012b)
               'Ah we are feeling the heat, for we are in the line of
               fire'.
         b.   *this matta goin affect mostly **we** de consumer* 2008
               (Avram 2012b)
               'For this matter is going to affect mostly us, the
               consumers'

Note that in (27a) the competing forms *aawi* and *wi* occur in one and the same sentence. Finally, *wi* is documented throughout the history of Virgin Island Creole:

   (28)   a.   ***we** glad for see you* 1834 (Avram, forthcoming b)
               'We are glad to see you'
         b.   *They bring **we** ya from Africa* 1957 (Avram,
               forthcoming b)
               'They brought us here from Africa'

The distribution in early and in modern Caribbean creoles of the forms *him* (as a subject pronoun) and *wi* (as a subject pronoun and as an object pronoun) is set out in Table 9 and Table 10 respectively:

Table 9. Pronominal forms in early varieties

Feature	Eastern Caribbean				Western Caribbean
	Tri	Vin	Atg	VIC	Jam
him (subject)	+	+	+	+	+
wi (subject)	+	+	+	+	+
wi (object)	+	+	+	+	+

Table 10. Pronominal forms in modern varieties

Feature	Eastern Caribbean					Western Caribbean
	Tri	Gre	Vin	Atg	VIC	Jam
him (subject)	-	+	-	-	-	+
wi (subject)	+	+	+	+	+	+
wi (object)	+	+	+	+	+	+

To conclude, early Eastern Caribbean varieties have pronominal forms hitherto considered to be exclusively typical of Western Caribbean creoles. Moreover, some of these forms are also found in modern Eastern Caribbean varieties.

4. Lexicon

4.1 *Bang*, *dokuna*, *funji*, *conkee*, and *lick*

Roberts (1988, 104) writes that Caribbean creoles exhibit a "great variety in […] word choice", which he illustrates with a number of selected lexical items. Reproduced below is the distribution according to Roberts (1988, 102-103) of *bang*, *dokuna*, *funji*, *conkee* and *lick* in six Eastern Caribbean creoles and in Jamaican:

Table 11. Distribution of *bang*, *dokuna*, *funji*, *conkee*, *lick* (from Roberts 1988, 102-103)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean						Western Caribbean
	Tri	Gre	Vin	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
bang "strike"	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
conkee "corn dish"	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
dokuna "starchy food"	-	-	+	-	+	-	+
funji "corn meal"	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
lick "flog"	-	-	-	-	-	-	+

Actually, the lexical items at issue have a much wider distribution, as demonstrated by the following attestations from Trinidadian – in (29), Grenadian – in (30), Vincentian – in (31), Bajan – in (32), Antiguan – in (33), Kittitian – in (34), and Jamaican – in (35):

(29) a.   *conkee* 1974 (Avram 2012a, 31)
        b.   *funge* 1974 (Avram 2012a, 31)
        c.   *she go **lick** her again* 1825/1826 (Avram 2012a, 35)
            'she will flog her again'
(30) a.   *kongky* 2011 (Chase and Chase 2011, 69)
        b.   *me no want for get **lick*** -1830 (Bayley 1830, 438)
            'I don't want to get flogged'
(31) a.   *bang* 2004 (Avram, forthcoming a)
        b.   *conkie* 2008 (Avram, forthcoming a)
        c.   *fungee* 1996 (Avram, forthcoming a)
        d.   *would you no **lick** her well* 1821- (Avram, forthcoming a)
            'wouldn't you give her a severe flogging'
(32) a.   *bang* 1955 (Baker and Huber 2001, 197)
        b.   *kaanki* 1955 (Baker and Huber 2001, 199)
        c.   *funji* -1967 (Baker 1999, 330)
        d.   *lick* 1825 (Baker 1999, 325)
(33) *they **lick** them* -1828- (Avram 2012b)
      'they flog them'

(34) a.   *cankie/kaanki/konkie* 1996 (Alsopp 1996, 167)
      b.   *dokna/dukna* 1956 (Baker and Huber 2001, 198)
      c.   *funji* 1956 (Baker 1999, 330)
      d.   *lick* -1785- (Baker 1999, 330)
(35) *fungee* 1790 (Baker 1999, 330)

In light of these examples, the distribution of the lexical items at issue is follows:

Table 12. Distribution of *bang*, *dokuna*, *funji*, *conkee*, *lick* (revised)

Feature	Eastern Caribbean						Western Caribbean
	Tri	Gre	Vin	Bjn	Atg	Kit	Jam
bang "strike"	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
conkee "corn dish"	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
dokuna "starchy food"	-	-	+	-	+	+	+
funji "corn meal"	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
lick "flog"	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Summing up, *bang* "strike" is only attested in Eastern Caribbean creoles and therefore has diagnostic value. On the other hand, *conkee* "corn dish", *dokuna* "starchy food", *funji* "corn meal" and *lick* "flog", do not distinguish Eastern from Western Caribbean varieties.

4.2 *Duppy* and *jumbee*

According to Holm (1989, 445) "in lexicon, certain words are felt to be typical of one group or the other, e.g. the normal word for the spirit of a dead person is usually *jumby* in the Eastern [Caribbean] group and *duppy* in the Western [Caribbean] group".

While it is true that some Eastern Caribbean creoles, e.g. Antiguan and Kittitian, only have *jumby*, both words are recorded in several Eastern Caribbean varieties. Consider the following attestations from Trinidadian – in (36), Greanadian – in (37), Vincentian – in (38), Bajan – in (39) and Virgin Islands Creole – in (40):