

SUBSTRATA VS. UNIVERSALS IN THE FORMATION OF SRI LANKA PORTUGUESE

IAN SMITH

1. INTRODUCTION

Considerable controversy has arisen in recent literature on pidginisation and creolisation over the relative importance of substrate languages and universals to these processes. Hall, though by no means one of the "substratomaniaacs [who] see the influence of linguistic substrata everywhere" (1966:108), does belong to the camp which believes that substratum languages play a major role in the formation of pidgins and creoles. Statemenets (usually well documented) such as the following are numerous in Hall (1966:37): "the influences of substratum languages on phonetics can easily be documented in any aspect of pronunciation"; (1966:60): "the development of aspectual prefixes for verbs in these [French-based] creoles is unquestionably due to carry-over from west African languages".

Language universals have been related to pidginisation by the idea that speakers of a superstratum language in a contact situation simplify their language according to universal principles. This view is well set out in Ferguson (1971:147-8):

the initial source of the grammatical structure of a pidgin is the more or less systematic simplification of the lexical source language which occurs in the foreigner talk register of its speakers, rather than the grammatical structures of the language(s) of the other users of the pidgin. Such a view would not, of course, deny the grammatical influence of the other language(s), but would help to explain some of the otherwise surprising similarities among distant creoles by setting the starting point in a universal simplification process.

Similar views are found in Todd (1974).

It is a well-known fact that similar phenomena are found in unrelated creoles in different parts of the world. For example the following

characteristics have been suggested by Taylor (1971:294) as being typical of creoles:

1. The third person plural pronoun serves as nominal pluraliser.
2. A combination of the markers of past and future expresses the conditional.
3. The word for 'give' also functions as dative preposition 'to' or 'for'.
4. Phrasal 'which thing/person/time/place?' are employed to express 'what?', 'who?', 'when', 'where?'.
- 5a. A prepositional phrase is employed to express the possessive absolute ('mine' 'ours', 'the man's', etc.).
- 5b. A nominal phrase is so employed.
6. The demonstrative pronoun is postposed to its referent ('house this').
7. The definite article is postposed to its referent ('house the').
8. The pronominal determinant is postposed to its referent ('house my').
9. '(my) body' serves to express '(my)self'.
- 10a. The iterative (habitual) function is merged with the completive.
- 10b. The iterative (habitual) function is merged with the progressive.
- 10c. The iterative (habitual) function is merged with the future.
11. na is employed as a general locative: 'at; by; from; in; on; to'.
12. ma is employed as a disjunctive, 'but'.

While the universals model can offer an explanation for such similarities as these, it fails to explain why they are present to a lesser degree if at all in languages such as the French-based creoles of the Indian Ocean, which have only 2, 5a, 7 and 9 according to Taylor (1971: 295) or Tok Pisin, which has only 4, 5a, 8 and 11 (long rather than na) (Graham Scott: pers. comm.)¹.

On the other hand, the substratum theory can often explain particular features of particular pidgins or creoles, such as the morphological distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs and the pronominal system of Tok Pisin. However, it cannot explain similarities which are found in historically unrelated pidgins and creoles.

In two recent papers (1974, 1977), Bickerton claims that substrate influence is the major determinant of pidgin structures, but that for an important class of creoles, viz. those which develop without passing through an 'extended pidgin' stage, other factors are at work. Bickerton advances the thesis that since pidgins in the early stages of their evolution are not adequate to all communication needs, creoles which develop directly from such pidgins must derive some of their syntactic rules from the human "faculté de langage" rather than from input data

as in normal language acquisition. Similarities amongst a number of such 'early creolised' creoles leads Bickerton to the conclusion that there is a 'natural semantax' which can be drawn on by the child acquiring a language whenever the input data are deficient. Bickerton claims for example that all (or nearly all) early-creolised creoles have the features listed below (the following summarised from Bickerton 1977:58-60).

A. Three and only three articles:

- (i) 'definite';
- (ii) 'indefinite';
- (iii) 'generic/non-specific' (this last always zero).

B. A tense/aspect system with the following characteristics:

- (i) a zero marker of 'simple past' for action verbs and 'nonpast' for state verbs;
- (ii) a marker of anterior aspect which indicates past-before-past for action verbs and simple past for state verbs;
- (iii) a marker of irrealis aspect, which indicates 'unreal time' (future, conditional, subjunctive, etc.);
- (iv) a marker of nonpunctual aspect which indicates both durative and habitual aspects;
- (v) all markers are in preverbal position;
- (vi) all markers can combine, but only in the order anterior, irrealis, nonpunctual;
- (vii) anterior + nonpunctual signifies "a durative action or series of non-durative actions taking place either before some other event under discussion, or during a period of time understood to be definitely closed".
- (viii) irrealis + nonpunctual signifies "a nonpunctual action occurring in unreal time", e.g. a future progressive;
- (ix) anterior + irrealis signifies "an unrealised condition in the past";
- (x) anterior + irrealis + nonpunctual signifies "an unrealised condition in the past, of a nonpunctual nature", e.g. *'I would have been looking for something else'*.²

C. Focussing by left-dislocation of the focussed NP.

D. A distinction between attributive and locative-existential constructions.

E. Multiple negation (e.g. nonbadi na go du nating, lit. *'Nobody won't do nothing'*.)

The incidence in Sri Lanka Portuguese (SLP) of the features mentioned in this section will be examined below.

2. EVIDENCE FROM SRI LANKA PORTUGUESE

The Portuguese came to Sri Lanka in 1517 and were ousted by the Dutch in the first half of the next century. By that time there was already a well-established creole community into which the Dutch married. Unfortunately, there is no direct evidence of when Portuguese was creolised in Sri Lanka. Abeyasinghe (1966:188, n.4) mentions that in 1593 there were 350 'Topaz' (i.e. creole) troops serving in the Portuguese forces in the island, a fact which presupposes the existence of a good-sized creole community at least by the mid 1570's. This, together with the well-known Portuguese practice of intermarriage with indigenous people (a practice which received official encouragement), points to an early date for the creolisation of SLP.³

The structure of SLP mirrors that of the island's indigenous languages, Sinhala and Tamil,⁴ in many areas of its grammar. A number of structural similarities, examined more closely in Smith (1979), are summarised below. Characteristics apply to all three languages, except as indicated.

1. Nominal inflection is by case suffixes.
2. Verbs inflect for similar categories in SLP and Tamil.⁵
3. Major constituent order is SOV.
4. Postpositions, rather than prepositions, are found.
5. The adjective invariably precedes the noun.
6. The auxiliary usually follows the verb (SLP has two exceptions).
7. Relative clauses are left-branching and have no relative pronouns.
8. A verb occurs as a past participle when linked to a following, temporally subsequent verb with which it shares a subject.
9. A phrase-final quotative particle is used to mark discourse material which is the object of an overt or implied verb of thinking, naming, speaking, etc.
10. The conditional marker is phrase-final. (SLP also has a less commonly used verbal prefix which marks conditional: see below.)
11. Temporal conjunctions are clause-final.
12. Order in comparative phrases is STANDARD MARKER ADJECTIVE.
(E.g. SLP *əkə dīkə ɪʃɳjɪ* ('that than far') 'farther than that'.)
13. Reduplication indicates duration or distribution.
14. Various particles (reportative, emphatic, conjunctive, tag question marker, topicaliser) occur and are postposed to their arguments.
15. There is a class of verbs (e.g. SLP *suwā* 'sweat', *tēm* 'have', which occur in a [DATIVE NOMINATIVE____] case frame, where the DATIVE nominal corresponds to the English subject.

It should be noted that these features are not found in standard Portuguese and are absent or rare in other Portuguese-based creoles.

Thus a strong case can be made for the influence of substrate languages in the formation of SLP. The rest of this section will examine the evidence for the role of universals. At the start, we can note that SLP is a typical creole in that it has a simple morphology and morphophonemics. Most of the morphology which it does possess (nominal case suffixes and verbal prefixes and suffixes) can be traced back to earlier syntactic combination. More specific 'universals' of creolisation are, however, less well represented in SLP. For example, Taylor's 12 features occur as follows:

1. Absent. The plural suffix *-s* is distinct from the third person plural pronouns *elis* [-HONORIFIC] and *etus* [+HONORIFIC].
2. Absent. For details, see below.
3. Absent. Dative is expressed by a case suffix *-pə*.
4. Partially present. SLP has phrasal *kT ɔrə* ('*what time*') '*when*', but monomorphemic *kT* '*what*', *kēm* '*who*', and *ōndi* '*where*'.
- 5a/b. Absent. Possessive absolute is identical to the genitive case and is indicated by the suffix *-su*: *eli-su* '*his*'.
6. Absent. Demonstratives precede their referents in SLP:
isti kāzə ('*this house*').
7. Absent. Definite nominals are unmarked. The numeral *uŋ(ə)* '*one*' may be used as an indefinite article and usually precedes its referent: *uŋ ālvri* ('*a/one tree*').
8. Absent. The pronominal determinant precedes its referent:
miñə kāzə ('*my house*').
9. Absent.
- 10a/b. Absent.
- 10c. Present: *ēw lo-kumə* '*I eat/I used to eat/I will eat*'. The dialect of Batticaloa also has a separate habitual/descriptive:
ēw ki-(tə-)kumə '*I eat, used to eat, etc.*' However, for two reasons this seems to be an innovation. First it does not occur in any of the other known dialects of SLP, including the closely related Trincomalee dialect. Second, it has likely developed from the expression, *ēw kT tə-kumə...* '*What I am eating...*' on the model of Batticaloa Tamil (the matrix language of the area), in which the two corresponding expressions have identical reduced variants:
nān cāppiT-r-a(-nān) '*I eat, etc.*' *nān cāppiT-r-a(-tu)* ... '*What I am eating ...*'.
11. Absent. The locative case can extend to include '*at*', '*in*', and '*on*'; however, there are also overlapping expressions cover-

ing '*in, inside*' and '*on, on top of, above*', as well as a variety of other locational expressions.⁶

12. Absent.

Clearly SLP has no more of these supposedly typical creole traits than one might expect to find by chance in any language. A similar picture emerges with respect to the features of 'natural semantax' which, if Bickerton's thesis holds true, should be found in SLP, since it is an early-creolised creole. The occurrence of these features in SLP is discussed below.

- A. SLP has only an indefinite article *uŋ(ə)* in contrast with zero, rather than the three article system of natural semantax.
- B. A brief description of the SLP tense/aspect system can be found in the appendix. This is based on the Batticaloa dialect, with which I am most familiar. From that description, it should be obvious that SLP has a system which is quite different from that given by Bickerton for natural semantax. In Smith (1979) the verbal systems of the Batticaloa dialects of SLP and Tamil are compared. Although systematic correspondences between morphologically complex forms in the two systems can be set up on semanto-syntactic grounds, on a purely formal level the systems are not very similar. SLP has many prefixes and few suffixes while Tamil (and Sinhala) use suffixes exclusively. Moreover there is not a simple 1-1 correspondence between the individual morphemes which make up the morphologically complex forms. Furthermore, except for the verbal prefix *ki-* which occurs only in Batticaloa, the dialects of SLP do not differ formally from one another in their verb morpho-syntax. Thus while the semantics of the verbal system of Batticaloa Portuguese has doubtless undergone some secondary (i.e. post-creolisation) convergence with Tamil, the formal side of its morphology by contrast is conservative. With this in mind the following comments can be made. SLP has many more pre-verbal markers than natural semantax and, as might be expected given this situation, the SLP pre-verbal markers combine much less freely than those of natural semantax. Except for optional pleonastic uses of *tə-* and *jā-*, the only possible combinations are of *tə-*, *jā-*, *io-* and *mes-* with *ka-* to form respectively present, past, future/potential and obligative perfectives, and of *kəm(də)-* with *nuku-* or *nā-* to form negative conditionals. There are separate markers for conditional (*kəm(də)-*) and future (*io-*), which are signalled by a single marker in natural semantax. SLP has a separate marker for the result of an unrealised past condition,⁷ which in natural semantax is indicated by a combination of markers.

The zero form of the verb in SLP is imperative, rather than past for action verbs and present for state verbs. Past in SLP is indicated by the marker *ja-*, which is distinct from both the anterior auxiliary *tēm* and the perfective prefix *kā*. The anterior marker *tēm* can in all likelihood be identified with the anterior marker of natural semantax, even though *tēm* always follows the verb: it is quite possible that, being more loosely attached than the prefixes, it has moved to a post-verbal position from a pre-verbal position. (*poy* 'can' seems to be in the process of doing just that; cf. Smith, 1979). However, this similarity and the existence of pre-verbal markers are the only points on which the two systems agree.

- C. Focussing is realised by right dislocation of the focussed NP rather than by left dislocation as in natural semantax.

eli gātu tā-tomā (*he cat PRES-buy*) '*He is buying the cat.*'

eli tā-tomā gātu '*It's the cat that he is buying.*'

- D. SLP conforms to natural semantax in that it does make some distinction between attributive and locative/existential constructions all have an obligatory copula in negative or non-present sentences.

- E. SLP conforms to natural semantax in having multiple negation.

In summary, only two of Bickerton's supposed universals of early-creolised creoles are found in SLP; significantly, they are two features which one would not be surprised to find in any language chosen at random. Bickerton's most specific and therefore most interesting universal, the structure of the tense/aspect system differs from that of SLP in nearly every point.

3. DISCUSSION

In this section I shall discuss why SLP is a counterexample to Bickerton's thesis. Two possibilities need to be considered:

- (a) 'natural semantax' does play a role in the formation of some creoles, but the class of creoles to which it is relevant needs to be defined on a different basis, and
 - (b) 'natural semantax' does not play any role in creole formation.
- I shall discuss these two separately.

If we assume that Bickerton's thesis does hold for some class of creoles, then we need to know why SLP is not a member of that class. One reason might be that the pidgin brought to Sri Lanka by the Portuguese was already an extended pidgin. However, this possibility is precluded by the presence of Dravidian features such as the relative clause and temporal formations in SLP, which must have derived from contact with Sinhala or Tamil. The most likely explanation for such

strong substratum influence in SLP is that SLP was creolised in only a bilingual, or at most, a trilingual situation (Sinhala and/or Tamil, and pidgin Portuguese). In such an environment it is quite likely that children grew up bi- or trilingual. This would have in fact been a necessity for the first generation of Portuguese-fathered children, as outside the home knowledge of the local language(s) would have been essential. These children would thus have models available from Sinhala and/or Tamil for the formation of constructions which the pidgin lacked. Thus if natural semantax does play a role in the formation of any class of creoles, that class must be limited to those creoles which developed from unexpanded pidgins in an environment where it was for some reason not useful or not possible for children to learn another language. While in most cases such a creole will have creolised early, SLP shows that early creolisation is not itself sufficient for membership in this class.

The alternative possibility is of course that 'natural semantax' is a myth and that when a pidgin undergoing creolisation needs augmentation, new structures are created on the model of structures existing in other languages in the environment or are created in some other way. Bickerton's thesis (1977:64) entails the existence in the human

faculté de langage [of] some kind of analog for the instructions, 'If your input language has no nonpunctual aspect marker, employ a locative expression preverbally'; 'if your input language has no system of determiners, distinguish formally between the three existential classes of NP'; etc.

Clearly such a mechanism must be genetically encoded. But in this event, there should be a reason for its existence. Since the vast majority of children learn fully fledged languages rather than pidgins, what could be the advantage, from an evolutionary point of view, of a device which in all but the rarest of cases is overridden? Note that it is not possible to argue that the device is an essential one: children in a creolisation situation have access to a wealth of models from other languages. Bickerton's thesis assumes that they reject all of these in favour of the pidgin. Children in other bi- and multilingual communities have no trouble acquiring two or three (sometimes more) languages simultaneously (South Asia provides abundant examples of such situations). It would be strange indeed for children in an early creolisation environment to restrict their attention to just one of the codes to which they are constantly exposed.

4. CONSLUSIONS

SLP provides evidence that it is possible for substrate languages to play a major role in the formation of early-creolised creoles and that

very specific universals of creolisation do not apply universally. The natural semantax thesis has also been called into question, though the issue cannot be resolved in a paper of such narrow scope. If this thesis does prove to have some validity, the SLP evidence at least shows that the class of creoles to which it applies needs to be redefined.

APPENDIX

Outline of the Verbal System of SLP (Batticaloa Dialect)

Verb Base

The bare verb root is used as an imperative.

istī kumə (*this eat*) 'Eat this.'

Prefixes

tə-, 'present' marks present progressive and immediate future.

ēw tə-kumə (*I PRES-eat*) 'I am eating.'

ēw əmīām kulumbu tə-əndā (*I tomorrow Colombo PRES go*)
'I am going to Colombo tomorrow.'

jā-, 'past'.

ōntə ənōtī nōs vTñu jā-bevə (*yesterday night we arrack PAS-drink*)
'We drank arrack last night.'

lo-, 'potential', marks future and habitual.

nōs oy ənōtī vTñu lo-bevə (*we today night arrack POT-drink*)
'We will drink arrack tonight.'

osTr kədə dTyə vTñu lo-bevə (*he every day arrack POT-drink*)
'He drinks arrack every day/
He used to drink arrack every day/
He will drink arrack every day.'

kā-, 'perfective', occurs in combination with one of the previous markers (though only rarely with tə-), or with mes-.

osTr kumēre jā-kā-kumə (*he food PAS-PFC-eat*)
'He has eaten the food up.'

osTr kumēre lo-kā-kumə (*he food POT-PFC-eat*)
'He will eat the food up.'

ki-, 'descriptive', indicates habitual (overlaps with lo-) and forms a verbal noun; optionally occurs in combination with tē-, with no change in meaning. (This marker is not present in other dialects.)

osTr vTñu ki-(tē-)beve (*he arrack* DESC-PRES-*drink*)
'He drinks/used to drink arrack.'

kədə ʒrə vTñu ki-(tē-)beve bōm nun-tēm (*every hour arrack*
DESC-PRES-*drink good* NEG-*is*)
'Drinking arrack all the time is not good.'

jesə-, 'permissive', occurs only in non-negative sentences in the first person interrogative and in the third person non-interrogative.

ēw jesə-əndā (*I* PER-*go*) 'Can I go?/Should I go?'

eli jesə-əndā (*he* PER-*go*) 'Let him go.'

mes(tē-)/mesə-, 'obligative', also occurs as a first person plural hortative. Some speakers analyse mestē- (< Ptg. mister 'necessary') as mes- plus PRES tē-.

botus mes(tē)-kumə (*you* OBL-*eat*) 'You must eat.'

nōs mes(tē)-əndā (*we* OBL-*go*) 'We must go/Let's go.'

kəm(də)-, 'conditional'. An equivalent and more common formation employs the conditional particle sē (sərə for some speakers) following the verb, which is optionally marked with jā. Blended constructions also occur.

eli kəm(də)-vT (*he* COND-*come*) 'If he comes ...'

equivalent to: eli jā-vi sē, or blended eli kəm(də)-vT sē.

lodTyə(m)-, 'irrealis', marks the result of a past unrealised condition.

ēw lodTyə(m)-vT (*I* IRR-*come*) 'I would have come.'

nuku-, 'negative', marks the past or present non-habitual negative, i.e. it is the negative counterpart of tē- and jā-. It can combine with kəm(də)- and sē.

eli nuku-vT (*he* NEG-*come*) 'He didn't come/isn't coming/hasn't come.'

eli kəm(də)-nuku-vT (*he* COND-NEG-*come*)

'If he doesn't come/isn't coming/hasn't come ...'

equivalent to eli nuku-vT sē.

nā-, 'negative potential', marks habitual and volitive negative (i.e. it is the negative counterpart of lo-, ki-, and kerə): it also occurs with kəm(də)- and se.

eli istōndə nā-vT (*he this:way NEG:POT-come*)

'He won't come/doesn't come/used not to come this way.'

eli istōndə kəm(də)-nā-vT (*he this:way COND-NEG:POT-come*)

'If he won't come/doesn't come this way ...'

equivalent to eli istōndə nā-vT sē.

nāndTya(m), 'negative irrealis' (the negative counterpart of
lodTya(m)-).

eli nāndTya(m)-vT (*he NEG:IRR-come*) *'He wouldn't have come.'*

numis(tə)-, 'negative obligative' (the negative counterpart of
mes(tə)-), marks a negative imperative.

istōndə numis(tə)-vT (*this:way NEG:OBL-come*)

'Don't come this way.'

pə-, 'infinitive'.

slrwTs pə-fəyə fōrsə kərə (*work INF-do strength need*)

'To do work you need strength.'

botus əkT kiləy pə-vT jā-vT (*you here how INF-come PAS-come*)

'How did you come to come here?'

sēm-, 'abessive participle'.

eli sēm-kumə jā-kā-əndā (*he AB:PPL-eat PAS-PFC-go*)

'He went away without eating.'

Suffixes

-tām, 'imperfect participle', like English -ing, marks a verb in a dependent clause as well as a main clause verb in construction with an auxiliary. In the latter case the auxiliary is tēm/tiñə 'is/was'. When tēm is employed in this construction a present progressive results, which overlaps in meaning with tə-VERB. However, VERB-tām tēm places more emphasis on the imperfect status of the action. In the imperative the auxiliary is not present. -tām may also co-occur with kəm(də)-.

eli diñēru pidT-tām tə-əndā (*he money ask-IMP:PPL PRES-go*)

'He's going around asking for money.'

eli kumə-tām tēm/tiñə (*he eat-IMP:PPL is/was*)

'He is/was eating.'

səntā-tām (*sit-IMP:PPL*)

'Sit down.' (Lit. *'be sitting.'*)

-tu, 'perfect participle', is actually a post-clitic whose preferred position is attached to the verb. The verb may also be optionally marked with *jā-*.

eli kumə-tu jā-kā-əndā (he eat-PFC:PPL PAS-PFC-go)
'He ate and went away.' (Lit. 'He went away having eaten.')

Pre-verbal Auxiliaries

kerə, 'intentive', also occurs as a main verb meaning 'want, need'.
ew kulumbu kerə əndā (I Colombo INT go)
'I intend/am going to go to Colombo.'

bōs-pə kT kerə (you-DAT what want/need)
'What do you want/need?'

nikərə, 'negative habitual', optionally co-occurs with *tə-*. It is also used to mark a negative imperative, overlapping in meaning with *numls(tə)-*. Formally *nikərə* is the negative of *kerə*, but its function does not correspond.

eli vTñu nikərə bevə (he arrack NEG:HAB drink)
'He doesn't drink arrack.'

istōndə nikərə vT (this:way NEG:HAB come)
'Don't come this way.'

pōy, 'habilitative'. The negative of *pōy* is irregular: *nupōy*; the negative potential is *nā-pōy* as expected. The latter can also occur post-verbally in an infinitival construction in which the NP corresponding to the positive subject may optionally be either dative or nominative.

eli pōy əndā (he HBL go) 'He can't go.'

eli nā-pōy əndā (he NEG:POT-HBL go)
'He can't/won't be able to go.'

equivalent to: eli(-pə) pə-əndā nā-pōy
(he(-DAT) INF-go NEG:POT-HBL)

Post-verbal Auxiliaries

botā, 'perfective', also occurs as a main verb meaning 'put'. The verb is marked with *jā-*. *botā* overlaps in meaning with *kā-* but seems to be more emphatic.

nōs jā-vendə botā (we PAS-sell PFC) 'We sold it off.'

dā, 'benefactive', occurs as a main verb meaning 'give'. As an auxiliary it may be marked with *tə-*, *jā-*, or *lo-*.

ew botus-pə fəyə lo-dā (I you-DAT do POT-BEN)
'I will do it for you.'

tēm, 'anterior', occurs independently as a copula and existential/locative. In the present it occurs without tē-, and it has an irregular negative nuntēm and past tiñē. As an auxiliary the forms tēm, tiñē and lo-tēm occur. The verb may be marked with negative nuku- or past jā-. VERB tiñē overlaps in meaning with the past perfective jā-kā-VERB. The potential, lo-tēm, as a main verb or as an auxiliary may have the meaning '*is probably*' or '*has probably*' respectively. tiñē has an additional auxiliary function. It follows a verb marked with kəm(də)- to signal an unrealised past condition. This is more frequently expressed by the past anterior (jā/nuku-VERB tiñē) followed by sē.

eli jā-kumə tēm (he PAS-eat ANT) '*He has eaten.*'

eli nuku-əndā tiñē (he NEG-go PAS:ANT) '*He hadn't gone.*'

eli jā-kumə lo-tēm (he PAS-eat POT-ANT)
'*He will have eaten/He has probably eaten.*'

eli nōs-pə kəm(də)-(nuku-)fəlā tiñē nōs lodTɣə(m)-əndā
(he us-DAT COND- (NEG)-tellPAS:ANT we IRR- go)
'*If he had (not) told us, we would have gone-*'

equivalent to: eli nōs-pə jā-fəlā tiñē sē/eli nōs-pə nuku-fəlā
tiñē sē

NOTES

1. The monogenesis theory, which attempts to explain these similarities by positing a single ancestor for all the world's (European language based) creoles (See especially Whinnom, 1965.) will not be discussed here, but faces similar difficulties.
2. It will be useful to distinguish here between an unrealised past condition (e.g., *'If you had told me ...'*) and the (unrealised) result of such a condition (e.g., *... 'I would have gone.'*).
3. A more detailed history of SLP can be found in Smith (1977), Ch.1.
4. Tamil, a Dravidian language, is the mother tongue of the 'Tamil' and the 'Moor' ethnic groups, respectively 20.5% and 6.7% of the population of Sri Lanka. It is spoken in the far north of the island and in a band running down the east coast, as well as here and there in other parts of the country. Sinhala is the mother tongue of the Sinhalese, 70% of the population, and is spoken mainly in the south, west and centre of the island (figures from the 1971 census: no data is available on the number of speakers of SLP). Although Sinhala and Tamil belong to different language families, they have a great many structural similarities due to the partial Dravidianisation of Sinhala.
5. The paper did not deal with Sinhala verb morphology.
6. There is a formal variety of SLP in which the locative *na* and many other Standard Portuguese features are present (Cf. Smith, 1977, for further details, but note that the historical analysis presented there is revised in Smith (1979)). This is the variety found in SLP literature (mainly religious in nature and written mostly in the 19th century)

and in traditional songs. Only a few speakers are able to produce this formal variety, none with any degree of fluency. Moreover, as I have pointed out elsewhere (Smith, 1979), close agreement amongst modern colloquial dialects indicates that the spoken SLP of the 19th century was very similar to modern colloquial SLP and quite different from the formal language of the literature of the period. Thus the historical origin of formal SLP is not clear. In structure, it resembles the written forms of other dialects of Indo-Portuguese. (The lack of an account of any variety of colloquial Indo-Portuguese is unfortunate in that it leaves unanswered the question of whether a similar gap between colloquial and formal varieties existed in continental Indo-Portuguese.) Given that Indo-Portuguese was rarely if ever written prior to the 19th century, it is quite likely that the structure of its written varieties was influenced by the standardising tendencies of the churchmen who introduced writing to the creole communities.

7. The origin of *lodTɥə(m)*- and its negative counterpart *nāndTɥə(m)*- is problematical. They are not further subanalysed here since *nān-* and *-dTɥə(m)* do not occur elsewhere. If it could be established that *-dTɥə(m)* came historically from Ptg. *tinha*, the source of the SLP anterior marker, *tiñə*, then SLP would support Bickerton's B(ix) in that the anterior marker would figure in the marking of the result of a past unrealised condition. However, this would not be particularly surprising, given that the same is true of a great many languages (including Sinhala and Tamil).

SUBSTRATA VS. UNIVERSALS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABEYASINGHE, Tikiri

- 1966 *Portuguese Rule in Ceylon 1594-1612*. Colombo: Lake House.

BICKERTON, Derek

- 1974 'Creolisation, Linguistic Unviversals, Natural Semantax and the Brain'. *Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii* 6/3:125-41.
- 1977 'Pidginization and Creolization: Language Acquisition and Language Universals'. In: Albert Valdman, ed. *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*, 49-69. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

FERGUSON, Charles A.

- 1971 'Absence of Copula and the Notion of Simplicity: a Study of Normal Speech, Baby Talk, Foreigner Talk, and Pidgins'. In: Hymes, ed. 1971:141-150.

HALL, Robert A. Jr

- 1966 *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

HYMES, Dell, ed.

- 1971 *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. London: Cambridge University Press.

SMITH, Ian R.

- 1977 'Sri Lanka Creole Portuguese Phonology'. *Dravlinpex* 10.3.
Also *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 7:
248-406 (1978). Also as book, *Trivandrum: Dravidian
Linguistic Association* 1978.
- 1979 'Convergence in South Asia: a Creole Example'.
Lingua 48:193-222.

TAYLOR, Douglas

- 1971 'Grammatical and Lexical Affinities of Creoles'. In
Hymes, ed. 1971:293-6.

TODD, Loreto

- 1974 *Pidgins and Creoles*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

WHINNOM, Keith

- 1965 'The Origin of the European-based Creoles and Pidgins'.
Orbis 14:509-27.