

# The perfect in English-lexifier pidgins and creoles: A comparative study

Stephanie Hackert, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich

This study investigates the expression of perfect meanings in thirty English-lexifier pidgins and creoles or related varieties, such as African American Vernacular English or Singlish. The data were elicited with the help of sixteen sentences and a short text from Dahl's (1985:198-206) typological tense-aspect questionnaire. The perfective, as the perfect's 'anti-prototype' (Dahl 2014:273), is also considered. The possession of a grammaticalized perfect category is particularly frequent in West Africa, where it is likely to constitute a case of substrate influence; moreover, the gram is considerably less frequent in English-lexifier pidgins and creoles than in non-creole languages, which may be related to recent grammaticalization processes.

Keywords: English-lexifier pidgins and creoles, typology, perfect of result, experiential, persistent situation, recent past, perfective, substrate influence, creole exceptionalism, grammaticalization

## 1 Introduction

As noted by Lindstedt (2000:365-366), even though the perfect is common in the languages of the world, 'there have not been many attempts to explore its nature as a cross-linguistic category'. Usually, perfects are treated as language-specific grammatical categories, and 'it is often not even asked whether the 'Perfects' of languages A and B are really manifestations of the same typological feature at all, or

only happen to share the same name for obscure historical reasons'. Despite the frequent occurrence of the perfect crosslinguistically, it is clear that there are significant differences between instantiations of this category type between languages and also between different varieties of one and the same language (cf. Dahl 2014:271).

If the perfect is understudied in typology, even less is known about it from a creolist perspective. This may at least in part be owed to the fact that it does not fit into the tripartite tense-mood-aspect (TMA) system outlined for putatively 'typical' creoles by Bickerton (1981:58), which features an 'anterior' tense, an 'irrealis' mood, and a 'non-punctual' aspect. Bickerton's analysis of the linguistic features of creoles has been immensely influential. For a long time, work was carried out which attempted to match the grammatical structures found in a particular variety with those claimed to characterize 'typical' creoles (cf. Winford 2012:429). Potentially, any category not fitting this tripartite structure might have been overlooked. Alternatively, the perfect might be rare in creoles; in fact, in a number of varieties, there is no single form that serves to mark all of the meanings or uses that are generally attributed to the category crosslinguistically (e.g. Hackert 2004:103-107 for Bahamian Creole). A few studies (e.g. Schreier 2002; Bao 2005; Winford & Migge 2007) have looked at individual categories that may be described as subtypes of the perfect, such as completive or resultative, in individual varieties. Unfortunately, their findings cannot be generalized, as neither the categories they investigate nor those categories' definitions or designations are comparable.

The present study employs a typological approach in order to investigate the expression of perfect meanings in thirty English-lexifier pidgins and creoles (P&Cs) and other high-contact vernaculars. It also looks at the question of which of these languages possess a grammaticalized perfect category and whether, if taken together as a group,<sup>1</sup> they behave differently than other languages in terms of this feature.

---

<sup>1</sup> Of course, lumping all of these languages together simplifies matters and ignores the differences that exist between pidgins, creoles, and other high-contact

Another question addressed is what subdivisions of English-lexifier P&Cs emerge on the basis of perfect constructions and whether these subdivisions have any geographical and/or sociohistorical correlates. The study thus aims to contribute not only to our understanding of the tense and aspect systems of P&Cs, which have always constituted a focal research area in creole studies, but also to our knowledge about the perfect and related categories crosslinguistically. Finally, it touches on creole exceptionalism, i.e. the assumption that creoles, on account of their unusual sociohistorical background, should be considered special languages, different from languages that did not emerge out of situations of extreme language contact.

The present study is structured as follows: Section 2 gives background information on the perfect as a crosslinguistic category. Section 3 introduces the data base. Section 4 turns to the different meanings and uses of the perfect and the forms employed to express them in English-lexifier P&Cs. Section 5 considers the perfective as a related category, before Section 6 summarizes the results obtained and places them in context. Section 7 presents concluding remarks.

## **2 The perfect as a crosslinguistic category**

The present paper approaches the perfect as a crosslinguistic grammatical category that is characterized by a particular set of ‘readings’ and asks what forms express these readings in thirty different English-lexifier contact languages and whether any of these languages actually possesses a grammaticalized perfect. I follow the approach toward the perfect – and tense and aspect in general – current in much of the typological literature. This approach views TMA categories not as members of a hierarchically ordered system but as immediate constituents of a system of ‘grams’ on

---

vernaculars. I follow Michaelis et al. (2013a, b, c) in treating the varieties covered here as a single group when comparing them with non-creole languages. In the interest of brevity, I will occasionally refer to them as ‘English-lexifier P&Cs’ only.

a par.<sup>2</sup> Crosslinguistically similar grams constitute ‘gram types’; they are ‘identifiable by their semantic foci and associated with typical means of expression’ (Dahl 1985:52). These semantic foci, which are reflected in prototypical uses, not only make the (traditional but often frustrating or even futile) search for a verbal category’s unitary meaning, or *Gesamtbedeutung*, superfluous but also permit the crosslinguistic comparison of tense-aspect grams. If a language consistently expresses a set of tense-aspect functions by means of a particular grammatical form, it has grammaticalized them. Clearly, temporal or aspectual meanings may also be expressed by way of adverbial expressions like *yesterday*, *usually*, or *since 1969*, but if a language has grammaticalized them, the respective marker is often obligatory and therefore used even when the information it provides is redundant, in contrast to adverbials, which are often employed only when they are discursively relevant (cf. Dahl & Velupillai 2013).

The term *grammaticalization* has yet another meaning, which is diachronic. It may also refer to the process of language change by which grammatical markers develop. A strong correlation has been found between the degree of grammaticalization that a particular category has reached and its formal expression. Thus, perfects, being younger, less grammaticalized categories, are often expressed periphrastically, in keeping with their resultative or completive sources (cf. Lindstedt 2000:368), while older, more grammaticalized past tenses tend to be inflectional. Also, certain tense-aspect categories have been found to be more or less frequent and more or less stable than others. The perfect is frequent crosslinguistically (cf. Dahl 2014:271) but is also likely to disappear. This disappearance often does not actually involve the loss of the original perfect-expressing form, but its reanalysis into another tense-aspect category, such as perfective or general past (cf. Dahl & Velupillai 2013).

The point of departure for many analyses of the perfect is the observation that the English present perfect evidences a limited number of distinct but obviously related

---

<sup>2</sup> This makes irrelevant the question of whether the perfect should be considered a tense or an aspect.

meanings or uses. The number quoted varies between two and five (cf. Werner 2014:72); commonly, the following four perfect readings are listed (Dahl 1985:132-133):

- (1) the perfect of result (sometimes also called ‘stative perfect’), e.g. *You have ruined my dress*;
- (2) the experiential (or ‘existential’) perfect, e.g. *I’ve seen this movie before*;
- (3) the perfect of persistent situation, e.g. *I have lived here since 1969*;
- (4) the ‘hot news’ perfect (or perfect of recent past), e.g. *The king has just abdicated*.

In standard English, a single construction, i.e. HAVE V-*en*, is used in all four functions. Even though this situation, i.e. all four perfect readings being marked by means of the same grammatical form, is not uncommon crosslinguistically – and, in fact, the English perfect is often considered a fairly prototypical exemplar of the category – there is variation in the ways in which perfect meanings are associated with tense-aspect categories, both crosslinguistically and among varieties of English. As for the former, in Vedic Sanskrit, for example, ‘the resultative and recent past readings are marked by the Aorist, and the universal, existential, and stative present readings are marked by the Perfect’ (Kiparsky 2002:114). Werner (2014) presents a comprehensive survey of the perfect in varieties of English, which shows that non-standard forms of the language often possess a range of different constructions. A case in point is Irish English, which features not just the famous ‘*after-perfect*’, whose core meaning is recency, but also the BE-perfect, the medial-object perfect, the use of the simple present or past with perfect meaning, as well as HAVE V-*en* (cf. Kirk 2017:243). Still, the fact that all of these readings are so frequently marked by means of a single category in the languages of the world invites the question of what unites them semantically.

Arguably the most widely favored answer to this question is based on the notion of ‘current relevance’.<sup>3</sup> Comrie, in his classic definition (1976:52), simply states that ‘the perfect indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation’. The central semantic component of the perfect in this sense, thus, is constituted by the link between a past event and the present time sphere. This, of course, leaves unanswered the question of what exactly this link is like, leading to ‘the impression that everyone knows that the perfect implies ‘current relevance’ but nobody knows what that is supposed to mean’ (Dahl & Hedin 2000:391). A lot of the criticism leveled against the notion centers around this vagueness (cf. Werner 2014:63-65).

As already indicated, interest in the perfect crosslinguistically has often involved the question of grammaticalization. Bybee & Dahl (1989:67-68) name four typical sources for perfects: (1) copula + past participle of a lexical verb; (2) possessive construction, e.g. ‘have’ + past participle of a lexical verb; (3) lexical verb + particle meaning ‘already’; and (4) constructions involving verbs meaning ‘finish’, ‘throw away’, or ‘come from’. The last of these two types originally have completive meaning; the first two resultative. A grammaticalization path of the type resultative > perfect > perfective or past has been observed for many (areally and genetically) unrelated languages (cf. Bybee et al. 1994:55-81). It has long been noted that the process is characterized by a loosening and eventual loss of the current-relevance constraint in its final stage, i.e. in the development from perfect to perfective or past (1994:86), but Dahl & Hedin (2000:399) argue that it also marks its initial phase, i.e. the transition from resultative to perfect.

It is important to note that, even though perfects typically have resultative uses and may derive from resultatives via grammaticalization, perfects and resultatives constitute separate gram types. Resultatives are similar to passives in that the patient occurs in subject position, but differ from the latter in that they take intransitive

---

<sup>3</sup> Alternative accounts invoke either anteriority, the notion of ‘extended-now’, or the focus on a result state. Detailed outlines of these accounts are beyond the scope of this paper; an overview may be found in Werner (2014:59-79).

verbs, as in *He is gone* (Bybee et al. 1994:54). A number of criteria have been adduced to make the distinction between resultative and perfect. Semantically, while ‘resultatives focus on the state which is the result of a previous event, perfects focus on the event itself’ (Bybee & Dahl 1989:70). Formally, as just noted, resultatives are restricted to telic verbs, and only resultatives but not perfects combine with adverbs of unlimited duration. Thus, in English, it is possible to say *He is still gone* (resultative) but not \**He has still gone* (perfect of result) (Lindstedt 2000:367).

Perfects are also not equivalent to completives. Completives signal that something is done ‘thoroughly and to completion’ (Bybee et al. 1994:54). In its emphasis on completion, the category resembles the perfective, and, in fact, it is often seen as a subcategory of the latter. English does not have a completive aspect but employs constructions involving *to finish V-ing*, but sometimes completives in other languages are translated by means of the perfect (Velupillai 2012:213).

The resultative and experiential readings are often considered the two central readings of the perfect. As de Wit (2017:34) observes,

there is an important difference between resultative and experiential perfects, on the one hand, and the continuative perfect, on the other hand. [...] the former two profile a (resultant or subsequent) state that is different from the prior event that has given rise to this state. The continuative perfect [i.e. perfect of persistent situation], on the other hand, involves a single dynamic situation that started out in the past and lasts up to the present.

The hot news perfect, finally, is often not even considered a subcategory of the perfect at all but either subsumed under its experiential or resultative readings or classified as a type of perfective. This distinction into central and peripheral readings underlies the definition of the perfect as a crosslinguistic category employed in a number of typological studies. Thus, Dahl & Velupillai (2013) count as perfects ‘only constructions or forms that have both resultative and experiential readings’; they describe the perfect of persistent situation and the hot news perfect as ‘further uses’.

However, grammatical categories may be identified not only by the uses in which they regularly occur but also by those with which they tend not to be associated. Such uses can be seen as instantiating what Dahl (2014:273) calls an ‘anti-prototype’, i.e. a category ‘that lacks all the properties of the prototype’. As noted by Dahl (1985:138), perfects are not generally used in narration, and non-occurrence in this context was in fact employed as an operational criterion in the identification of perfect grams in both the EUROTYP project (Lindstedt 2000:366) as well as by Dahl & Velupillai (2013). The bulk of any narrative consists of what since Labov & Waletzky (1967:32) has been referred to as ‘complicating action’ clauses, i.e. clauses which present the past events relayed in the narrative individually and in iconic order and thus drive the narrative forward. Complicating action clauses are perfective in aspect, i.e. each event is presented as a bounded whole, with its initial and final endpoints (Smith 1997:66). The perfective may thus be seen as the perfect’s anti-prototype.

In the comparative analysis of the perfect in P&Cs and non-creole languages presented in Section 6 below, I follow this operationalization of the category. Nevertheless, I would like to stress once more that the expression of perfect meanings is not tied to the existence of a grammaticalized perfect category. Obviously, irrespective of whether a language has a perfect gram of the type just defined, the semantic distinctions underlying the various uses that perfects are put to in the languages that possess them may well be relevant in perfect-less languages, and speakers of these languages will find means to realize them verbally. However, these means will not consist in a single formal expression.

Based on the preceding outline, the research questions to be answered in the following are:

- 1 What is the range of forms covering the semantic space of the perfect in English-lexifier P&Cs?
- 2 Which English-lexifier P&Cs possess a grammaticalized perfect? Do patterns of perfect marking support the idea that P&Cs constitute a distinct type of language opposed to languages that did not emerge out of intense contact?



- 3 Do marking patterns distinguish groups of P&Cs? Do these linguistically determined groups have geographical and/or sociohistorical correlates?

### 3 Data and method

The data base of the present study includes thirty languages. With the exception of a few languages, such as Chinese Pidgin English, for which I did not manage to obtain data, my sample comprises all of the English-lexifier P&Cs covered in standard reference works. I also included some varieties that are not usually considered pidgins or creoles ‘proper’ but often compared to creoles. Tristan da Cunha English and Bermudian English, for example, have been described as ‘creoloid’ (Schreier 2010:463) and ‘decreolized’ (Trudgill & Hannah 2008:115), respectively, and/or have been discussed in conjunction with creoles (e.g. Michaelis et al. 2013a, b, c; Kortmann & Lunkenheimer 2012, 2013). Like P&Cs, all of them have a history of intense language contact, as reflected in their classification as ‘high-contact L1’, and they have been found to closely resemble P&Cs in other comparative studies (e.g. Schneider 2012:887). Table 1 lists all of the languages covered in the present study and groups them by geographical region and type. The classification into variety types follows Kortmann & Lunkenheimer (2012, 2013).

VARIETY	GEOGRAPHICAL REGION	VARIETY TYPE
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	West Africa	expanded pidgin
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	West Africa	expanded pidgin
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	West Africa	expanded pidgin
<b>Krio</b>	West Africa	creole
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	West Africa	high-contact L1
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	West Africa	expanded pidgin
<b>Pichi</b>	West Africa	creole

<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	South Atlantic	high-contact L1
<b>Bermudian English</b>	North Atlantic	high-contact L1
<b>African American Vernacular English (AAVE)</b>	North America	high-contact L1
<b>Gullah</b>	North America	creole
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	Western Caribbean	mesolectal creole
<b>Jamaican</b>	Western Caribbean	conservative creole
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	Western Caribbean	conservative creole
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	Western Caribbean	conservative creole
<b>Bajan</b>	Eastern Caribbean	mesolectal creole
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	Eastern Caribbean	mesolectal creole
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	Eastern Caribbean	conservative creole
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	Eastern Caribbean	conservative creole
<b>Sranan</b>	Suriname	radical creole
<b>Saamaka</b>	Suriname	radical creole
<b>Pamaka<sup>4</sup></b>	Suriname	radical creole
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	Pacific	creole
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	Pacific	expanded pidgin
<b>Bislama</b>	Pacific	creole
<b>Norfolk</b>	Pacific	expanded pidgin
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	Australia	creole
<b>Kriol</b>	Australia	creole
<b>Butler English</b>	South Asia	pidgin
<b>Singlish</b>	Southeast Asia	high-contact L1

---

<sup>4</sup> There is variation in naming and spelling for some of the Surinamese maroon groups and their languages. The spellings <Saamaka> and <Pamaka> resemble most closely the pronunciations used by the speakers themselves; cf. Migge & Léglise (2013:77). Pamaka is a variety of Nengee, or Eastern Maroon Creole (Migge 2013:39).

Table 1: Varieties by geographical region and type

Typological work relies on large amounts of comparable data. For P&Cs this used to be a problem, as the first such data became available only with Holm & Patrick's *Comparative Creole Syntax* (2007). In the past few years two other sources have been published, i.e. the *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures* (APiCS; Michaelis et al. 2013a, b, c) and the *Mouton World Atlas of Variation in English* (WAVE; Kortmann & Lunkenheimer 2012, 2013). Unfortunately, however, as a grammatical category,<sup>5</sup> the perfect is covered in neither work. It is true that studies of the tense-aspect systems of individual creoles or groups of them, such as Edwards (1991), Winford (1993), Migge (2003), Velupillai (2003, 2011), Hackert (2004), Durrleman (2007), Durrleman-Tame (2008), or van de Vate (2011), contain extremely valuable information on creole perfect categories. Unfortunately, however, such studies are few in number and center on Caribbean English-lexifier creoles. Also, with few exceptions (e.g. Hackert 2004:103-107; van de Vate 2011:42-49), their approach has generally been form-based and focused on particular perfect subtypes, such as completive *done*.

Comparable data on the perfect in a large number of P&Cs, covering both the Atlantic and the Pacific region and all of the perfect meanings outlined in Section 2, were thus still lacking at the outset of this study and had to be elicited. This was done with the help of a questionnaire based on Dahl's typological tense-aspect questionnaire (1985:198-206), which, in its original form, consists of 156 sentences and eight short texts to be translated from English into the language under investigation. All sentences are placed in a specific context, which is enclosed in brackets. Verbs are given in the infinitive and capitalized in the text so as to minimize influence from English in the translation. For the questionnaire compiled for this project, fifteen sentences and a single text were chosen. This was done so as to not

---

<sup>5</sup> WAVE contains data on the medial object perfect (feature 97) and the *after*-perfect (feature 98). These features do not occur in P&Cs, though.

place too much of a burden on the consultants. All sixteen items elicited what has been described by Dahl as ‘prototypical’ uses of the perfect (1985:131-132) or the perfective (1985:78).

The number of completed questionnaires per variety ranges from one (e.g. Pichi, Tristan da Cunha English, Norfolk) to four (Ghanaian Pidgin English), five (Bahamian Creole, Bajan, Sranan, Singlish), or six (Jamaican). Elicitation procedures varied. In some cases, consultants were linguistically untrained native speakers who were interviewed face-to-face and whose translations were recorded and later transcribed. In other cases, speakers filled in electronic or paper copies of the questionnaire in the absence of an interviewer. Many of these speakers had been approached at universities and were thus students and/or academic staff but, apart from exceptional cases, not linguists or students of linguistics. A number of questionnaires, finally, were filled in by colleagues of the author’s, who translated the questionnaire sentences themselves, based on their own knowledge as (native) speakers of and/or experts on particular varieties.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> I am very grateful to the following colleagues and friends for providing me with data, either as speakers of one of the varieties covered here or by making data from other speakers available: Samuel Atechi, Sarah Baker, Saidu Bangura, Angela Bartens, Kim Dismont-Robinson, Nicole Eberle, Genevieve Escure, Alexandra Esimaje, Malcolm Awadajin Finney, David Forbes, Natalie Fraser, Jan Goh, Vinije Haabo, Salome Harris, Alim Hosein, Magnus Huber, Presley Ifukor, Angelina Joshua, Matthias Klumm, Karen Lavarello-Schreier, Glenda Leung, Miriam Meyerhoff, Bettina Migge, David Mitchell, Salikoko Mufwene, Peter Patrick, Paula Prescod, Daniel Schreier, Anne Schröder, Chanti Seymour, Jeff Siegel, John Singler, Viveka Velupillai, Donald Winford, and Kofi Yakpo. Without them, this study would have been impossible. Thank you also to Alexander Laube and Catherine Laliberté for help in data extraction and processing and the anonymous *JPCL* reviewers for their critical feedback. The usual disclaimer applies.

Tables 2 to 7 below display the results from the questionnaire survey. In these tables, question marks indicate that I did not obtain data for a particular context; slashes separate alternative constructions; and brackets indicate optional elements. Sentence numbers are those originally used by Dahl (1985:198-206). While I use a single spelling for each variety in the result columns in Tables 2 to 7, following *APiCS* and/or *WAVE* wherever possible, for the examples, I retain the spellings originally used by the consultants.

Obviously, what typological studies gain in breadth is sometimes lost in depth. Thus, it is clear that the data presented here will never fully reflect the linguistic behavior of all speakers of the varieties covered, given that some of these varieties are represented by a single speaker only. For other varieties, a substantial amount of variation does surface, but apart from the fact that frequency-based information was not available, a lot of this variation centers on (upper) mesolectal forms, as many consultants were educated speakers who had been approached at schools, on campus, and the like. Finally, in some cases, consultants may have misunderstood particular sentences or interpreted them in a different way than intended. In order to remedy the situation, I will, where appropriate, make reference to the existing literature.

#### **4 Uses of the perfect in English-lexifier P&Cs**

This section turns to the constructions employed to mark perfect meanings or uses in English-lexifier P&Cs. As indicated above, four types of perfect are usually distinguished: the perfect of result; the experiential perfect; the perfect of persistent situation; and the perfect of recent past. All of them describe ‘events that took place before the temporal reference point but which have an effect on or are in some way still relevant at that point’ (Dahl & Velupillai 2013). The following sections look at the four types of perfect in turn.

#### 4.1 The perfect of result

Table 2 shows the forms elicited for two sentences that Dahl (1985:132, 200-201) describes as typical examples of the perfect of result. Whereas (54) elicited many ‘done’- or ‘finish’-derived forms, in (69), bare verb forms predominate. In this sentence, variants of *done* or *finish* occur primarily in the West African varieties. In Vernacular Liberian English, *feni V-ing* (or, in the basilect, *feni V*; Singler p.c.) alternates with variably *na*-marked verbs. *Feni* obviously derives from *finish*. *Na* ‘represents a phonological evolution from dOn [emphasis in the original]’ (Singler 1984:193); it also occurs in Liberian Settler English. Speakers of Tristan da Cunha English also use *done* in both contexts. In this variety, *done* predominantly has auxiliary support (Schreier 2002:159); the auxiliary is BE; and *done* co-occurs with both marked and unmarked main verbs: *She’s done took the lock off* vs. *I’s done buy the coke* (2002:160). Bare verbs in both contexts occur in Gullah, Trinidad English Creole, Guyanese Creole, Bislama, and Butler English. In Bajan, two out of five consultants used variable *had*-marking in sentence (69).

	<p><b>(54) [A: It seems that your brother never finishes books.]</b>  <b>(That is not quite true.)</b>  <b>He READ this book</b>  <b>(=all of it)</b></p>	<p><b>Example(s)</b></p>	<p><b>(69) [Q: Why is it so cold in the room? The window is open but the person who asks does not know. The person who opened the window answers:] I OPEN the window</b></p>	<p><b>Example(s)</b></p>
--	---	--------------------------	--	--------------------------

<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	V (... finiʃ)	Naa, e read this one finish. / E mow this book.	V	I gbele /open the window.
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	don V / V ... finish	Him don read dis book. / Him read dis book finish.	V	Why e cold for this room? Na me open the window.
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	don V (... finish)	I don rid dis buk. / I dong read dis book finish.	don V	I dong open windo.
<b>Krio</b>	(don) V / V don	I (don) rid dis buk. / Ee read dis book ya done – all di page dem.	(bin don) V	A (bin don) opin di winda.
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	done V / V-ed	He done rid / red that one.	(na) V	I na open the window. / I open the window.
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	feni V-ing / na V	He feni ridin that one. / He na rid that one.	feni V-ing / (na) V	I feni opening the window. / I na open the window. / I open the window.
<b>Pichi</b>	don finis V	Nɔ̀tò so, è don finis rid di buk.	don V	À don opin windà, nà in mek.
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	is done V(-ed)	He's done read this book.	is done V(-ed)	I's done open the w[indow].
<b>Bermudian English</b>	V-ed	No, he read de whole theeng.	V-ed	Cuz I opened de window.
<b>AAVE</b>	V-ed	Nah, that ain't true, e read this book.	V-ed	I opened the window.

<b>Gullah</b>	V	He read dis book (done).	V	Uh open da window.
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	done V	He done read all of this book.	V	I open the window.
<b>Jamaican</b>	(done) V	Him done read this book. / Him read dis book.	V	Mi open di window.
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	(don) V	I don rid dis buk ya. / I rid dis buk tru.	V	A opn da windo.
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	don V	Ihn don riid disya buk.	V	Mi uopn di window.
<b>Bajan</b>	V	He read dis one.	(had) V	I had open de window, das why. / I open de winda.
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V	He read the whole book.	V	Because ah open de window.
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V	'E read out dis whole book.	V	I open de window.
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	(duhn) V	He done read da one dey. / I riid dis wan.	V	A opn di windo.
<b>Sranan</b>	V (... kaba)	A leisi a buku disi (te a kaba).	V	Bikasi mi opo a fensre.
<b>Saamaka</b>	kaba u V	A kaba u lesi di buku aki.	V	Mi yabi di fense.
<b>Pamaka</b>	kaba V	A kaba leysi a buku.	V	Mi opo a fense.
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	wen V	He wen pau / rid dis buk.	wen V	Ai wen open da windo.
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	V pinis	He ritim dispela buk pinis.	(bin) V	Mi bin opim windo. / Mi opim windua



				(olsem na rum i kol).
<b>Bislama</b>	V	No, hem i ridim buk ia (evriwan / wantaem).	V	Mi openem wan windo.
<b>Norf'k</b>	? <sup>7</sup>	Dar nor true, he usea read orl ar book.	V	I open ar window.
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	bi pinis V	Em be pinis read gor end.	bi V	I be open e the window.
<b>Kriol</b>	V	I nomo tru, imin rid this buk.	bin V	Ai bin oupuni thet windou
<b>Butler English</b>	V	He read this book	V	I open the window.
<b>Singlish</b>	(got) V finish / (got) finish V-ing / (already) V(-ed)	He got read finish this one. / He read finish this. / He got finish reading this one. / He finish reading this book. / He already read those books.	V(-ed) (mah / la / lor)	I open the window. / Because I opened the window. / Because I open the window mah. / Because I opened the window la. / Because I open the window lor.

Table 2: The perfect of result in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

The resultative perfect quite neatly separates the Caribbean creoles. Whereas in the Western varieties (Bahamian Creole, Jamaican, Belizean Creole, and San Andrés Creole) *don(e)* is used in sentence (54) (but not in 69), the marker does not occur at

<sup>7</sup> *Usea* marks past habitual aspect in Norf'k (Nash, p.c.), which is not what sentence (54) aimed to elicit.

all in the Eastern Caribbean, with the exception of Vincentian Creole, where it is optional in (54). The same contrast may be observed in the Surinamese creoles, where *kaba* is used in (54) but not in (69). Still, Winford & Plag (2013:18) clearly describe *kaba* as expressing the perfect of result. *Kaba* derives from Portuguese *acabar* ‘finish, complete, stop’. Whereas it appears to occur mainly in post-verbal position in Pamaka (Migge 2013:43, but cf. Table 2), in Saamaka, the construction *kaba u V* was given by the consultant, *u* being a form of the complementizer *fu* (< *for*; cf. Aboh et al. 2013:34). Speakers of Tok Pisin and the two Australian creoles use preverbal *bi(n)* in sentence (69), in contrast to (54), where *(bi) pinis* is found in Tok Pisin and Torres Strait Creole. In Singlish, finally, *finish*, either with or without *got* or *already* and with or without progressive inflection, is an option in (54) but not in (69). In this context, the Chinese-derived sentence-final particles *mah*, *la*, or *lor* occur. According to one consultant, *lor* (just like *mah*; Leimgruber 2009:57), ‘express[es] that what has been said is relatively obvious’, while *la* is an ‘extremely common’ particle with assertive meaning (2009:54).

So what is the difference between sentences (54) and (69)? What explains speakers’ preference of ‘done’- or ‘finish’-derived forms in the former but their comparative avoidance of such forms in the latter? In order to answer this question, it is helpful to take a closer look at resultative perfects in more general terms. They signal that ‘a present state exists as the result of a previous action’ (Bybee et al. 1994:69) and thus combine two meaning components: a result state and an event leading up to that state. In (54) the completion of the event is explicitly marked, whereas in (69) it is not. Where does this difference come from? In terms of Vendler’s (1957) lexical aspectual classification, the verb situations occurring in (54) and (69) are both accomplishments. They are [+dynamic], [+durative], and [+telic], i.e. they ‘have a change of state which constitutes the outcome, or goal, of the event. When the goal is reached, a change of state occurs and the event is complete’ (Smith 1997:19). Not all accomplishments have the same internal temporal structure, though. The two verb situations in (54) and (69), in fact, differ in their degree of telicity, or, as Rappaport Hovav (2008:33) puts it, ‘verbs like *read*, even on their telic reading [e.g. when associated with a definite, singular object noun phrase such as *the book*; Smith

1997:4], are not associated with a result state'. One of the tests to show this employs the adverbial *for X time*. Whereas verb situations which lexicalize a result state

have, in addition to a reading in which the time adverbial modifies the amount of time the action denoted by the verb was taking place, a reading in which it modifies the amount of time the result state has held. Sentences with verbs which do not lexicalize a result state do not have this interpretation (2008:33-4).

Thus, *I read the book for two minutes* does not allow a result state reading (\*'The book remained read for two minutes'), whereas *I opened the door for two minutes* does ('The door remained open for two minutes'). In sum, *read the book* and *open the door* may both belong to Vendler's (1957) accomplishment class, but they constitute different subtypes of accomplishments possessing different degrees of telicity. This has grammatical consequences: apparently, in most English-lexifier P&Cs, if the resultative perfect is to be expressed, verb situations such as *read the book*, which do not lexicalize a result state, necessitate explicit marking of the completion of the event, which is achieved by means of 'done'- or 'finish'-derived forms, whereas situations such as *open the door*, which lexicalize a result state, do not and therefore permit bare verb constructions. A different pattern is found in the African P&Cs, the majority of which consistently mark the resultative perfect, no matter whether the result state is lexicalized or not.<sup>8</sup>

#### 4.2 *The experiential perfect*

The experiential perfect 'indicates that a given situation has held at least once during some time in the past leading up to the present' (Comrie 1976:58). In English-lexifier P&Cs, this perfect type mostly shows bare verb forms. 'Done'- or 'finish'-derived

---

<sup>8</sup> Working within a generativist framework, Durrleman (2007: 154-155) also observes a telicity effect on the overt realization of the completive aspect marker *don* in Jamaican. In her analysis, telic verb situations – and only telics – license the occurrence of a zero completive.

forms are found in African varieties, Tristan da Cunha English, Sranan, and Tok Pisin and Bislama. In Belizean Creole we find *me*, which Escure (2013:95) describes as an ‘anterior past’ marker; in Kriol, past-tense *bin* (Schultze-Berndt et al. 2013:246) is used. Singlish speakers vary between V *already* constructions, (*got*) V *before* and *have* V-*en*. This is remarkable, as Bao (2005) describes *ever* as the experiential aspect marker of Singapore English, tracing it back to substrate influence in the form of Chinese postverbal *guo* (2005:244). *Already*, by contrast, which is modeled on verb- or sentence-final *le*, has completive, inchoative, or inceptive meaning (2005:242). With statives, the two markers are clearly distinguished: ‘*already* asserts the existence, and *ever* the end, of a given state at the time of reference, or at the present time’ (2005:244), but even with dynamic verb situations, *ever* appears to imply a contrast with the present, as Bao’s translation of *I ever been out with her before* ‘I have been out with her before (but not anymore)’ (2005:244) shows. Apparently, sentence (42) did not evoke this sense of ‘not anymore’ to the Singlish consultants but rather the beginning of the state of knowing the brother brought about by the meeting, which would explain the use of *already* rather than *ever*.

	(42) [Q:] You MEET my brother (at any time in your life until now)?	Example(s)
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	V	You crosk my bro before (now)?
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	don V	You don meet my brother before?
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	(bin) don V	You bi dong mitop ma broad bifo / Yu don ever see ma broda?

<b>Krio</b>	((bin) dɔn) V	Yu (dɔn ɛva) mit mi brɔda? / You bin done meet mi broda?
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	V-ed / (ha) <sup>9</sup> V-en / na V	You met my brother before? / You hav met my brother before? / You na meet my brother before?
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	V-ed	You met my brother before?
<b>Pichi</b>	dɔn V	Yù dɔn mit mì brɔdà?
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	is done V(-ed)	Is you done meet my brother?
<b>Bermudian English</b>	V-ed	You evah met my bruhvah?
<b>AAVE</b>	V-ed	Yeah, I met him.
<b>Gullah</b>	V	You meet me / muh bubbah?
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	V(-ed)	You ever meet him? / You ever met my brother before?
<b>Jamaican</b>	V	Yuh eva meet mi bredda yet?
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	me V	Yu me miyt may breda?
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	V	Yu miit mi brada?
<b>Bajan</b>	V	You evuh meet my brudda?

<sup>9</sup> According to Singler (p.c.), when used as an auxiliary, *have* tends to lose its final consonant.

<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V	You ever meet my brother?
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V	You eva meet me brudda?
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	V	Yo eva miit mi bruhda?
<b>Sranan</b>	(ben) V / V kaba	Yu ben miti mi brada wan leisi liba? / Yu miti mi brada ini wan ten ini yu libi? / Yu nanga mi brada miti kaba wan leisi?
<b>Saamaka</b>	V	I miti mi baaa kaa u?
<b>Pamaka</b>	V	I miti (anga) / si mi baala (ete)?
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	V	Yu eva mit mai brada?
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	V pinis / bin V	Ju mitim brata bilong me pinis or nogat? / Yu bin bungim brata bilong mi?
<b>Bislama</b>	V ... finis	Yu mitim brata blong mi finis?
<b>Norf'k</b>	V	You meet myse brother some time in yuus life till now?
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	V	You sabe my bala?
<b>Kriol</b>	bin V	Yu bin mitim main braja?
<b>Butler English</b>	V	You meet my brother.
<b>Singlish</b>	V (already) / have V-en / got V (before)	You meet my brother already? / Have you met my brother? / You

		(got) meet my brother before?
--	--	----------------------------------

Table 3: The experiential perfect in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

#### 4.3 *The perfect of persistent situation*

As Comrie (1976:60) notes, English is unusual in employing the Present Perfect in sentences such as ‘*we’ve lived here for ten years. I’ve shopped there for years, I’ve been waiting for hours*’, i.e. in sentences which ‘describe a situation that started in the past but continues (persists) into the present. [...] Many other languages use the present tense here’. This should not come as a surprise, as the perfect of persistent situation does not just assert the present existence of a state resulting from some previous event but the actual continuation of a situation up to the moment of speech. As such it may be described as a ‘derived’ stative, i.e. a stative resulting from a ‘situation type shift’ altering the aspectual value of a verb constellation (Smith 1997:48). Such shifts may be achieved by various devices, among them grammatical aspects, such as imperfective or habitual, or adverbials (1997:52). Thus, in English, whereas *I have attended mass in this church* receives an experiential reading, the addition of an adverbial of duration, as in *I have attended mass in this church for ten years*, or of the Progressive, which presents situations as unbounded (Smith 1997:85), as in *I’ve been attending mass in this church*, turns the sentence into a perfect of persistent situation.

Sentence (148), which, according to Dahl (1985:132), represents a typical perfect of persistent situation, contains a dynamic verb situation (‘cough’). Accordingly, we see many progressive or imperfective markers in Table 4.<sup>10</sup> Progressive *-in(g)* occurs in

---

<sup>10</sup> If a perfect of persistent situation involves a stative verb situation, unmarked verbs appear to be common. For Saamaka, for example, van de Vate (2011:48) gives two examples (*Mi sábi Senni sénsi dí tú dúsu yáa* ‘I have known Senni since the year

the mesolectal Caribbean creoles, in AAVE, in the Atlantic and Liberian varieties, and in Singlish. It may be used without any auxiliary support, as in Trinidad English Creole and Guyanese Creole, or in combination with *been* only, as in Bahamian Creole, AAVE, the Liberian varieties, and Norfolk. The Bermudian consultant's rendering of sentence (148) was *His bin coughin for an owah*; it seems likely that the apparently possessive pronoun actually stands for the subject form followed by a contracted auxiliary. An auxiliary is present in Tristan da Cunha English, too, but, as indicated above in conjunction with resultative *is done V(-ed)*, the variety shows extensive auxiliary leveling to *is* or *'s*, not just in the sense that the BE paradigm is reduced to *is* and *was* (Schreier 2010:254-255) but also in the sense that auxiliary HAVE occurs very rarely if at all (2002:156-159). In other words, the underlying form of Tristan da Cunha English *He's been coughing for a hour* is, in all likelihood, *He is been coughing for a hour* rather than *He has been coughing for a hour*. Singlish once more shows an array of forms ranging all the way from the unmarked verb to standard English *has been coughing*.

---

2000' and *Dí yáa lóngi mi líbi a fóto kaa* 'I have lived in Paramaribo for three years already').



	(148) [Of a coughing child:] For how long has your son been coughing?] He COUGH for an hour	Example(s)
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	((stat) dè) V	He start dey cough like one hour dis. / E dey cough for one hour. / E cough for one hour.
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	dɔn dè V	He don de cough for one hour.
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	bin V	I bi cough for one hour.
<b>Krio</b>	(bin / dɔn di) V	I (bin) kɔf fɔ wan awa. / Ee done di cough now for wan awa.
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	been V-ing	He been coughing for one hour.
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	been V-ing	He been coughing for one good hour.
<b>Pichi</b>	dɔn dè V	È dɔn dè kɔf fɔ wan awà.
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	's been V-ing	He's been coughing for a hour.
<b>Bermudian English</b>	('s) been V-ing	His bin coughin for an owah.
<b>AAVE</b>	(dɔn) been V-ing	He done been coughin for a hour. / He been coughin for a hour.
<b>Gullah</b>	V	He cough for one hour.
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	been V-ing	He been coughing a hour.
<b>Jamaican</b>	(did a) V	Him dida cough fi one hour. / Im kaff-kaff (fi) wan huol owa.
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	de V	Da wan owa I de kaf.
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	de V	Ihn de kof fi wan haua.

<b>Bajan</b>	V / did V-ing	He cough fah an hour. / He did coughing fuh bout an hour.
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V-in	He coughing for an hour now.
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V-ing	Is waan hour 'e coughin'.
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	bin a V	He bin a cough lang time fo bout one hour.
<b>Sranan</b>	e V kaba	A e kosokoso wan yuru kba.
<b>Saamaka</b>	ta V	Wan yuu langa kaa a ta mbei katau.
<b>Pamaka</b>	e V kaba	A wan hii yuu langa di a e kosokoso kaba.
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	V	Wan awa hi kof.
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	(wokim long) V	Em wokim long kus long wanpela awa olgeta. / Em i kus i go long wanpela awa.
<b>Bislama</b>	V ... finis	Hem i kof wan haua finis.
<b>Norf<sup>o</sup>k</b>	V / bin V-en <sup>11</sup>	He cough for one hour. / He been coughen one hour.
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	V	Em e cough now por one hour.
<b>Kriol</b>	V	Imin kofkof lilwail.
<b>Butler English</b>	V	He cough for an hour.
<b>Singlish</b>	V (already) / has been V-ing (already) / was V-ing	He cough one hour. / He cough for an hour already. / He has been coughing for an hour. / He has been coughing for an hour already. / He was coughing since one hour ago.

<sup>11</sup> In Norf<sup>o</sup>k, *-en* is the progressive suffix and not, as in standard English, the past participle ending (Mühlhäusler 2013:236).

Table 4: The perfect of persistent situation in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

Table 4 displays other notable patterns. In Africa outside of Liberia, we find the preverbal imperfective marker *de* in combination with *bin* or *don*, except in Ghanaian Pidgin, where it occurs on its own or preceded by *stat* ‘start’.<sup>12</sup> According to Table 4, Cameroon Pidgin English appears to constitute another exception to the *bin de* or *don de* pattern, but sentence (148) was translated by a single Cameroonian consultant only, and Schröder (2013:189) explicitly states that the perfect of persistent situation is ‘expressed by a combination of *bin* and *di*’ in the variety. A similar pattern, i.e. the use of a preverbal imperfective marker, with or without a ‘done’- or ‘finish’-derived form or a past marker, is found in the Surinamese creoles and the conservative Caribbean creoles apart from Guyanese Creole, which patterns with the mesolectal varieties in using inflectional *-ing*.<sup>13</sup> In Australia and the Pacific, imperfective or progressive markers are rare, except for Tok Pisin, where we find optional *wok long*, which has been described as a preverbal progressive construction by Smith & Siegel (2013:219). (Postverbal) *finis* is employed only in Bislama. Butler English once more

---

<sup>12</sup> Huber (1999:225) describes *stat dè V* constructions as instantiating ingressive aspect. He notes that the parallel construction, *bigin dè V*, is semantically identical and structurally and phonetically close to (Ghanaian) English *begin to V* sequences. The latter may thus be reinforcing *bigin dè V* and, in analogy, *stat dè V*, which was used by two of the four Ghanaian consultants. According to Smith (1997:34), such constructions are not unusual: ‘States can also be presented indirectly, through a change of state (inchoative). Inchoatives often allow the inference that the resultant state continues, unless there is information to the contrary’.

<sup>13</sup> The consultant for Guyanese Creole expressly indicated that he had filled in the questionnaire in a mesolectal to acrolectal variety. The use of the progressive inflection rather than a preverbal imperfective particle thus does not come as a surprise.

uses a bare verb. Verb reduplication, finally, also plays a role. It occurs in Jamaican, Vincentian Creole, Sranan, Pamaka, and Kriol and, at least in some cases, seems to have iterative function; in fact, one Jamaican consultant expressly indicated that ‘*kaff-kaff* seems to mean repeated action for me’.<sup>14</sup>

#### 4.4 *The perfect of recent past*

The perfect of recent past, or ‘hot news’ perfect, denotes situations whose relevance to the present is ‘simply one of temporal closeness’ (Comrie 1976:60). In English-lexifier P&Cs, the type of perfect shows mostly bare verb forms, with the exception of the African P&Cs, where variants of *done* or *finish* predominate. These markers also optionally occur in Belizean Creole and Tok Pisin. In Kriol, Bermudian English, and Tristan da Cunha English, we find constructions familiar from resultative and experiential contexts, i.e. *bin V*, *V-ed*, and *is done V(-ed)*, respectively. Singlish once more shows a wide range of forms, including the Chinese particle *liao*, which, according to Leimgruber (p.c.) means ‘already’. In five varieties,

---

<sup>14</sup> In Jamaican, Vincentian, and Sranan, a reduplicated form of ‘cough’ also occurs in sentence (95) ([Q: What your brother's reaction BE when you gave him the medicine (yesterday)?] He COUGH for an hour), but not in (91) ([Q: What your brother's reaction BE when you gave him the medicine (yesterday)?] He COUGH once) (Dahl 1985:202). In Pamaka, the verb is *kosokoso* ‘cough’ in all three contexts; in Kriol, only the perfect of persistent situation (148) takes a reduplicated verb. As one anonymous reviewer pointed out, however, iconic verb reduplication is not as common in the Surinamese creoles as sentences (95) and (148) appear to suggest. S/he noted that sentence (148) could have also been rendered as *A e koso wan yuru kba*, which would make the interpretation of *kosokoso* as a form of iconic reduplication questionable. The occurrence of *kosokoso* as the Pamaka translation of ‘COUGH once’ (91) substantiates this assertion.

i.e. AAVE, Jamaican, Bajan, Torres Strait Creole, and Singlish, alternative (zero) copula structures occurred.

	(133) [The speaker has just seen the king arrive (no one had expected this event)] (Have you heard the news?) The king ARRIVE	Example(s)
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	V	The king drop / arrive.
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	dɔn V	The king don come.
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	don V	De king dong kom.
<b>Krio</b>	((bin) (dɔn)) V	Di chif (bin / dɔn/ bin dɔn) kam / rich.
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	na / done V / ha V-en	The king done / na / ha come o.
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	na V / ha V-en / feni V-ing	The king na / ha come o. / The king feni coming o.
<b>Pichi</b>	dɔn V	Chif dɔn kan.
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	is done V(-ed)	The king's done arrive.
<b>Bermudian English</b>	V-ed	Enh ehn, the king reached.
<b>AAVE</b>	?	The king here.
<b>Gullah</b>	?	?
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	V	The king reach.
<b>Jamaican</b>	V	The king reach. / Di king arrive. / De king de yah.
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	(don) V	Di king (don) kum.

<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	V	Di king rich.
<b>Bajan</b>	V	You know, de king arrive! / You hear? De king hey!
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V	De king reach.
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V	De king come.
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	V	Aayo na hear, i king come.
<b>Sranan</b>	V	Na kownu kon / doro.
<b>Saamaka</b>	V	Di konu dou.
<b>Pamaka</b>	V	A kownu doo.
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	V	Da king kam.
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	V (pinis)	King i kam ya. / King i kamap pinis.
<b>Bislama</b>	V	King i kamtru.
<b>Norf'k</b>	V	You hear em news? Ar king come.
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	?	Ay upla, e gud King ya.
<b>Kriol</b>	bin V	Thet king bin gerrin.
<b>Butler English</b>	V	The king arrive.
<b>Singlish</b>	V already / liao / has V-en	The king arrive already! / The king arrive liao! / The king has arrived. / The king is here!

Table 5: The perfect of recent past in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

## 5 The perfective in English-lexifier P&Cs

As outlined in Section 2, the perfect may also be defined negatively, i.e. as the ‘anti-prototype’ (Dahl 2014:273) of the perfective. Table 6 displays the questionnaire results for three sentences which, according to Dahl (1985:78), represent

‘prototypical’ occurrences of the perfective. In all three sentences, the boundedness of the event in question is explicitly indicated: there is a prepositional phrase indicating duration in sentence (99), a finite clause indicating a past point of time in (101), and an adverb of past time position in (142). Clearly, bare verb forms dominate the table. Past inflection occurs in the Atlantic and the Liberian varieties, in AAVE, and in Singlish.<sup>15</sup> Sentences (99) and (101) show the variable use of AAVE ‘preterite *had*’, which may be used ‘in narrative contexts to mark an event that occurred in the past’ (Green 2002:243). The use of Cameroon Pidgin English *bin*, Hawai’i Creole *wen*, and Torres Strait Creole *bi* also deserves mention, because preverbal perfective markers are not particularly frequent in creole languages. Typically, perfectives remain unmarked (Maurer 2013:200-203). In Cameroon Pidgin English, the bare verb is actually an option, but *bin* as a past-tense or perfective marker seems to be gaining ground, possibly as a result of English influence (Schröder 2013:188).

---

<sup>15</sup> The rate of past inflection in Singlish is very high overall (ca. 80%), and unmarked perfectives are restricted to use by an individual speaker.

	(99) [Q: How long did it take for your brother to finish the letter?] He WRITE the letter in an hour	Example(s)	(101) [Last year, the boy's father sent him a sum of money] When the boy GET the money, he BUY a present for the girl	Example(s)	(142) [Q: Do you know my brother?] (Yes,) I MEET him at the market yesterday	Example(s)
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	V	E rep / write the letter in one hour.	V	As the boy get the money, e buy some gift give de girl.	V	Yeah, ah meet for de market yestee.
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	V	Him write the letter in one hour.	V	When they give am the money, him buy gift for de girl.	V	I meet am for market yesterday.
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	bin V	I bin rait di leta fo wan hawa.	bin V	Time wez de boy bi get de money, i bi buy something for de girl.	bin V	A bi mitop ji for market.



<b>Krio</b>	V	I rayt di leta na wan awa.	V	We di bobo gɛ(t) di mɔni, I bay wan present fɔ di gyal.	(bin) V	A (bin) mit am na makit yestade.
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	V-ed / done V(-ed)	He wrote the letter in one hour. / He done write / wrote the letter in one hour.	(1) V(-ed) / ha V-ed (2) V-ed / na V	When he get the money, he bought one present. / When he got the money / When he ha received the money, he na buy one present.	V-ed / na V / done V(-ed)	I met him. / I done / na meet him.
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	V-ed / feni V-ing	He wrote the letter in one hour. / He feni writing the letter in one hour.	(feni) V(-ing)	When he feni getting the money, he go buy (one) present. / When he get the money, he feni buying (one) present.	V-ed / feni V-ing / na V	I met him. / I feni meeting him. / I na meet him.
<b>Pichi</b>	dɔn finis V	È no rich wan awà sef se è dɔn finis rayt dan carta.	V	Lɛk haw di boy get dan mɔni, nà in è bay di gyal regalo.	dɔn V	À dɔn mit àn nà makit yestàde.
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	was done V	He was done write the l[etter].	V-ed	When the boy got the money, he went buy ...	V(-ed)	I met him.

<b>Bermudian English</b>	V-ed	He wrote dat theeng in an owah.	V-ed	When dat bie got de money, he bought a present for de garl.	V-ed	Yah, I met him at de market yastaday.
<b>AAVE</b>	(had) V-ed	He had wrote it in like a hour. / He wrote it in a hour.	(had) V-ed	When the boy (had) got the money, he (had) bought a present for the girl.	(dən) V-ed	I (done) met him yesterday.
<b>Gullah</b>	V	It take um one hour fuh write da letter.	(1) V-ed (2) V	When da boy get / got da money, he buy da girl a present.	V	I meet um at da market yesiday.
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	V	He take a hour to write the letter.	(1) (did) V (2) V	Last year, when he (did) get the money, he (gone and) buy one present for he girlfriend.	(did) V	Yesterday, yeah, I (did) meet him in the market yesterday.
<b>Jamaican</b>	V	Im tek wan owa rait di leta.	V	Wen di moni riich / Wen di bwai get di moni im bai prezint fi di gyal.	V	Yeh, wi miit op ina maakit yeside.

<b>Belizean Creole</b>	me de V	Da leta I me de rayt wan full owa.	(1) me V (2) V	Afta da bway me git di moni i bay wan presen fu di gyal.	V	A miyt im da makit yestade.
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	V	Ihn rait di leta iina wan haua.	V	Wen di bwai get di moni, ihn bai di gyal wan prizent.	V	Mi bok op wid im at di maakit yeside.
<b>Bajan</b>	V	He write the letter in an hour.	V	When de boy get de money, he buy a present for de girl.	V	Yea, I meet he at de market yesterday self.
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V	Is a hour he take to write the letter.	V	When the boy get the money, he buy a present for the girl.	V	I meet him in the market yesterday.
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V	He tek waan hour fuh write de letta.	V	W'en de bai get de money, 'e buy wan present fuh de girl.	V	(Yeah,) me meet 'e at de market.
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	V	I tek a owa fo rait i leta.	V	Wen I bwai ge i moni I bai wan gif fo I gyel.	V	Mi miit uhm a maakit yestade.
<b>Sranan</b>	V	A skrifi a brifi ini wan yuru.	(ben) V	Di a boi ben kişi a moni a bai wan kado gi a pikin. / Di a boi	(ben) V	Ai mi ben miti en na winkri esde. / Ay, mi

				kisi a moni, a bai wan kado gi a pikin.		miti en na woyowoyo esde.
<b>Saamaka</b>	V	A sikifi di biifi a wan yuu dendu.	V	Di di womimii fendi di moni, hen a bai wan kado da di muyeemii.	V	Ai, mi miti hen a woyowoyo eside.
<b>Pamaka</b>	V	A sikiifi a biifi a ini wan yuu.	V	Di a boy feni a moni, a bay wan kado gi a meyse.	V	Eye, eside mi miti anga I baala a wowoyo.
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	wen V	Hi wen rait da leta in wan awa.	wen V / (1) (hæd) V (2) wen V	Wen da boi wen get da, ani, hi wen bai wan prezent fo da girl. / Wen da boi (had) get da mani, hi wen bai wan gif fo da girl.	wen V	Ai wen mit om aet da maket yestade.
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	(bin) V	Em i bin raitim pas long wanpela awa. / Em raitim insait long wanpla awa.	V	Taim boi kisim moni, em baim present long meri.	V	Mi lukim em long market aste.

<b>Bislama</b>	V	Hem i raetem leta blong hem long wan haua.	V	Taem mane i kasem boe ia, boe i pem wan presen blong gel ia.	V	Yes, mitufala i mit long maket yestedei.
<b>Norf'k</b>	V	He write ar letter. Tek hem one hour.	V	When ar boy get em spoondoolicks, he buy one present for ar girl	V	Yes, I meet him in ar market yestedi.
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	bi V	E be teke one hour por bala por write e the letter.	bi V	Bala, be gede money em be gor buy present for oman blo em.	bi V	I sabe em, I be look em look der where da market yesterday.
<b>Kriol</b>	V	Imin raidim that lerra in en auwa.	(1) bin V (2) V	Wen thet boi bin gaji thet mani, imin baiya presen ba thet gel.	bin V	(Yuwai,) ai bin midi im la makit yestadei.
<b>Butler English</b>	V	He write the letter in an hour.	V	When the boy get the money he buy a present for the girl.	V	I meet him at the market yesterday.

<b>Singlish</b>	V(-ed) / finish(-ed) V-ing	He write the letter in one hour. / He wrote the letter in one hour. / He finish writing it in one hour. / He finished writing in one hour.	(1) V-ed / after V-ing (2) V(-ed)	When the boy got the money, he buy a present for the girl. / When he got the money, he bought present for her. / After getting the money, he bought a present for the girl.	V(-ed)	I meet / met him at the market yesterday.
-----------------	----------------------------------	--	---	---	--------	--

Table 6: The perfective in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

In Pichi, the situation is slightly more complex in that sentence (99) features a combination of the completive ‘aspectual auxiliary’ *finis* (Yakpo 2009:202) and *dɔn*. According to Yakpo (2009:206), the completive ‘indicates the crossing of the terminal boundary of a situation [...]’. This is particularly so when *finis* cooccurs with the perfect marker *dɔn*. The occurrence of a perfect in sentence (99), however, should not come as too much of a surprise, because in terms of semantic roles, this sentence contains an element that may be labeled ‘RESULT’, i.e. a ‘[p]articipant in an event that comes into existence through the event [...] and] indicates a terminal point’ for it: the letter (LIRICS Consortium n.d.). *Done* is also used in this sentence in Tristan da Cunha English; in sentence (142) it optionally occurs in AAVE. The same sentence also seems to have been interpreted by the Pichi consultant more in a resultative sense than as a mere perfective, but sentence (101) shows a bare perfective verb.

This is interesting, because this sentence actually contains a sequence of events ([Last year, the boy's father sent him a sum of money] When the boy GET the money, he BUY a present for the girl). It could thus be described as a minimal narrative, and with the exception of the Cameroon Pidgin English, Hawai'i Creole, and Torres Strait Creole perfective markers *bin*, *wɛn*, and *bi*, variable past inflection in the Liberian and Atlantic varieties and in Singlish, we actually see hardly anything but bare verbs in this sentence – or more specifically, in the second of the two sequenced verbs. The first verb is often (variably) marked for anteriority. In this context, we find not only the past or perfective markers already familiar, but also an inflected verb in Gullah and Hawai'i Creole *hæd*, which is described by Velupillai (2011:129) as an aspectual marker that focuses ‘specifically on a limit that has already been attained’. The marker is frequent in spoken language and apparently occurs most often on the island of Kaua'i; it has been traced to Portuguese substrate influence (Siegel 2000). The Liberian varieties are unique in permitting ‘done’- or ‘finish’-derived forms in sentence (101) and in doing so not only on the first of the two sequenced forms but on both. As Singler (p.c.) notes, however,

in the Bickerton TMA system, the anterior form is used to signal the disruption of temporal sequencing, but in the VLE [i.e. Vernacular Liberian English] basilect *feni* signals the preservation of it. That is, when basilectal speakers use the AUX, they only do so when the clause that contains it fits into the sequencing at hand, i.e. CLAUSE A – *feni* CLAUSE B – CLAUSE C [or] CLAUSE A – *feni* CLAUSE A – CLAUSE B, where the order of the

clauses corresponds to the order in which events occurred or the middle clause is a repetition of the first clause with *feni* added.

Table 7 displays the marking patterns found in a more fully developed narrative (Dahl 1985:205). The constructions listed translate sentences (182) to (185), i.e. the complicating action clauses of the narrative. In such a sequence of events, which is explicitly embedded in a set of orientation clauses ([Once upon a time there was a man. This is what happened to him one day.] (181) He WALK in the forest), even the past or perfective markers that occurred in Table 6 disappear or become variable. What is left is a host of bare (or variably inflected) verbs and (optional) *feni* V-*ing* in the Liberian varieties. Not displayed in Table 7, because the consultant did not use it, is the Pichi ‘narrative perfective marker *kan*’, which is ‘specialized for use in the foregrounded sections of narrative discourse’ (Yakpo 2013:199). In Nigerian Pidgin, *come* occurred in a similar function, expressing ‘[+ past] tense’ in combination with ‘[e]mphasis, narration’ (Faraclas 2013:181).

		<b>Example(s)</b>
	[Once upon a time there was a man. This is what happened to him one day.] (181) He WALK in the forest. <b>(182) Suddenly he STEP on a snake. (183) It BITE him in the leg. (184) He TAKE a stone and THROW at the snake. (185) It DIE.</b>	
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	V	Wey e step some snake bi in top. De snake bite in leg. Wey e take stone throw de snake. De snake die.
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	V	Na so him come match one snake. The snake bite am for leg. Him take /



		carry one stone come throw / hit the snake. E (come) die.
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	V	I wan see i mash snake. De snake bi bite ji for foot. I take stone truwey for de snake. De sneik dai.
<b>Krio</b>	V	Bifo yu mɛmba, I mas snek. Di snek bet am na in lɛg. I tek ston en ston di snek. Di snek day.
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	V(-ed) / feni V-ing	[He] step [on a snake]. [It] bite [him]. [He] took [a stone], threw / feni throwing [a stone]. [It] die / died / done die(d).
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	V(-ed) / feni V-ing	[He] step [on a snake]. [It] bite [him]. [He] took [a stone], threw / feni throwing [a stone]. [It] die.
<b>Pichi</b>	V	De repente è mas wan snek. Snek bet àn nà fut. È tek ston e nak dì snek wet àn. Dì snek day.
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	V(-ed)	Suddenly he step on a s[nake]. It bite him in the leg. He took a stone and throw it at the [snake]. It's dead.
<b>Bermudian English</b>	V-ed	All of a sudden, he stepped on a snake. The theeng bit him in de leg. So my boy took a stone an beaned him wif it. The snake died.
<b>AAVE</b>	(had) V-ed	Suddenly he (had) stepped on a snake. It bit him in the leg. He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.

<b>Gullah</b>	V(-ed)	He step upon a snake. It bit um in da leg. He take a stone and trow at da snake. It die.
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	V	One day, he step on a snake. It bite him in the leg. He take a stone and throw it at the snake and the snake dead.
<b>Jamaican</b>	(did) V	Den him did step pon a snake. It did bite him leg. Him did tek one stone and trow on di snake and it did dead. / The snake bite him pon him leg and him tek the stone and fling pan the snake and kill the snake. / Im step pan siniek. Siniek bait im fut. (Den) im tek rakstuon lik di siniek, til di siniek ded.
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	V	N sodn I tred pan snyek. We bayt fu-im fut. Den I tek wan ston tro it da snyek. Den di snek day.
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	V	Sodenly ihn step pan wan serpent. Di serpent bait ihn iina di fut. Ihn tek wan stuon an truo ih pan di sniek. Di sniek ded.
<b>Bajan</b>	V	All of a sudden he step on a snake. It bite he in de leg. He then tek a stone and throw it at de snake and it dead.
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V	Just so, he step on a snake. It bite him in he leg. He take a stone and pelt the snake and it dead.
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V	Suddenly, ‘e step pon wan snake. De snake bite ‘e pon he leg. He tek wan

		stone and t'row it pon de snake. De snake dead.
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	V	Wen you hei di shout i mash wan sneik. An i sneik bait uhm pan i fot. I tek wan stoon an i tro uhm afta I sneik an i sneik ded.
<b>Sranan</b>	V	A trapa wan sneki. A beti en na en futu. A teki wan ston dan a trowe en na en tapu. A dede.
<b>Saamaka</b>	V	Te wanpisi hen a makisa wan sindeki. A nyamee neen futu. A tei wan sitonumii hen a vinde naki hen kii.
<b>Pamaka</b>	V	Wan boo, wan boo, a taanpu wan sineki. A nyam en na en futu. A boy teki wan siton fingi en naki a sineki. Neen a sineki dede.
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	(wen) V	Aen den hi (wen) step on wan snek. Aen den da ting wen bait om in da leg. Aen den hi tek wan ston aen wen tro um aet da snek. Da ting wen make / dai.
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	V	Em krungutim sinek. Em kaikaim em long lek. Em kisim stone na tromoi long sinek. Em dai.
<b>Bislama</b>	V	Hem i purumbut long wan snek. Snek ia i kakae hem long leg. Hem i karem wan ston, hem i troem ston ia long snek. Snek i ded wantaem.
<b>Norf'k</b>	V	He step orn one snake. Et bite hem orn ar leg. He tek one stoen an throw et gen at snake. Snake se deadun.

<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	(bi) V	Em be standup untup snake. The snake be bite em where leg. Em pickump stone and lego, kill e the snake.
<b>Kriol</b>	(bin) V	Bambai sneik. Bin bairri im la leg. Imin gaji stoun en tjaki la thet sneik. Imin dai na.
<b>Butler English</b>	V	Suddenly he step on a snake. It bite him in the leg. He take a stone and throw at the snake. It die.
<b>Singlish</b>	V(-ed)	He step on a snake. It bite him in the leg and he take a stone and throw at the snake. / Then he stepped on a snake. It bit him in the leg. He took a stone and throw it at the snake. It died.

Table 7: Verb marking in narrative complicating action clauses in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

Throughout most of the Caribbean, sentence (185) elicited not the verb *die(d)* but *dead*, which at first sight appears to function as a predicative adjective in a zero copula construction. However, in the majority of Caribbean English-lexifier creoles, *dead* is actually one of an entire class of ‘Physical Property items’ (Winford 1993:186), which show verb-like behavior in regularly co-occurring with TMA marking, as seen in the Bahamian and Bajan examples. Outside of the Caribbean, *dead* occurs only in Tristan da Cunha English, Bislama, and Norfolk. Whereas the Bislama sentence *Snek i ded wantaem* resembles the Caribbean Physical Property item construction, both Tristan da Cunha English and Norfolk show overt copulas.

## 6 Discussion

By way of discussion, this section returns to the research questions that have guided the present study.

- 1 What is the range of forms covering the semantic space of the perfect in English-lexifier P&Cs?

The forms employed depend on the type of perfect meaning to be expressed. For the perfect of result, ‘done’- or ‘finish’-derived forms occur frequently. The experiential perfect often shows zero marking, whereas for the perfect of persistent situation imperfective or progressive markers (with or without past-reference particles or auxiliaries) predominate. The perfect of recent past again shows bare verbs. The perfective, finally, is most generally expressed by means of unmarked verbs, too, even though a few P&Cs show preverbal particles in this context. That said, two points deserve further discussion.

First, whereas standard English possesses a single perfect marker, this is not the case in any of the languages covered here. In terms of the expression of perfect meanings, English-lexifier P&Cs are thus clearly demarcated from their lexifier. Obviously, it would be wrong to assume that standard English was the dominant variety in the formation of English-lexifier P&Cs around the world. It is true that in former trade colonies such as Singapore, English was introduced primarily through education and only later spread via face-to-face contacts; accordingly, many standard patterns of use have been preserved in contemporary local varieties of the language (cf. Schneider 2007:101). In the plantation colonies of the Caribbean, by contrast, it was typically non-standard vernaculars which were imported by the British settlers from the seventeenth century onward and adopted by the slave population in untutored second-language acquisition under influence from various West African native languages. More standard-like forms of English became significant in the local linguistic ecologies only in the nineteenth century, when public systems of education were instituted in the region, and thus after the formation of the new community vernaculars. These sociohistorical facts do not, of course, invalidate synchronic typological comparisons of different varieties of English – standard and non-standard – with each other.

Second, across varieties, bare verbs frequently mark perfectives as well as experiential perfects and recent past situations. This should not come as a surprise, though. The semantic link between

the perfective on the one hand and experientials and recent pasts on the other is close, in the sense that all three categories denote bounded past situations, with the additional meaning component of ‘current relevance’ in the case of the latter two. As is well-known, perfects often develop into other past-reference categories, i.e. perfectives or past tenses (Bybee et al. 1994:81-7). As outlined in Section 2, the process involves meaning generalization and ‘may at least partly be interpreted in terms of a gradual relaxation of the requirements on current relevance’ (Dahl & Hedin 2000:391). At least for some languages, ‘hot news uses [have been documented to] arise later than other perfect functions, as the perfect construction gradually loses its connection to the present’ (Schwenter 1994:995). Recent past uses may therefore constitute an important link between the perfect and the perfective in grammaticalization, but a path of evolution from perfect to perfective via experientiality has also been suggested (Lindstedt 2000:372). That said, zero marking of perfective verb situations is not uncommon crosslinguistically; of the 31 languages listed by Bybee et al. (1994:84) as possessing a perfective, seven employ unmarked verbs to express this category. As the present study has found, it is not just perfectives that may be zero-marked, but experientials and recent past situations, too. In sum, the three categories are related not just semantically, but formally and diachronically as well, and this relatedness very clearly shows in English-lexifier P&Cs.

- 2 Which English-lexifier P&Cs possess a grammaticalized perfect? Do patterns of perfect marking support the idea that P&Cs constitute a distinct type of language opposed to languages that did not emerge out of intense contact?

To answer the question of which English-lexifier P&Cs possess a grammaticalized perfect category, we need to bring together the relevant contexts. This is done in Table 8. To recapitulate, only ‘forms that have both resultative and experiential readings are regarded as perfects [...]. On the other hand, to count as a perfect, a construction or form must not be [...] regularly used in narratives’ (Dahl & Velupillai 2013). The perfect of result is represented by sentence (54), which emerged as the more ‘prototypical’ of the two resultative contexts discussed in Section 4.1; the experiential perfect is seen in sentence (42), which is the only one of its kind in my data. The narrative contexts chosen for display are those occurring in the connected text, with the exception of (185), as discussed in Section 5. As seen in Table 8, according to the data presented above, seven English-lexifier P&Cs fulfill the criteria just laid out and may thus be considered to possess

a perfect gram: Nigerian Pidgin, Cameroon Pidgin English, Krio, Pichi, Tristan da Cunha English, Sranan, and Tok Pisin.

	(54) [A: It seems that your brother never finishes books.] (That is not quite true.) He READ this book (=all of it)	(42) [Q:] You MEET my brother (at any time in your life until now)?	[Once upon a time there was a man. This is what happened to him one day.] (181) He WALK in the forest. (182) Suddenly he STEP on a snake. (183) It BITE him in the leg. (184) He TAKE a stone and THROW at the snake. (185) It DIE.
<b>Ghanaian Pidgin English</b>	V (...fini)	V	V
<b>Nigerian Pidgin</b>	dɔn V / V ... finish	dɔn V	V
<b>Cameroon Pidgin English</b>	don V (... finish)	(bin) don V	V
<b>Krio</b>	(dɔn) V / V dɔn	((bin) dɔn) V	V
<b>Liberian Settler English</b>	done V / V-ed	V-ed / (ha) V-en / na V	V(-ed) / feni V-ing
<b>Vernacular Liberian English</b>	feni V-ing / na V	V(-ed)	V(-ed) / feni V-ing
<b>Pichi</b>	dɔn finis V	dɔn V	V
<b>Tristan da Cunha English</b>	is done V(-ed)	is done V(-ed)	V(-ed)
<b>Bermudian English</b>	V-ed	V-ed	V-ed
<b>AAVE</b>	V-ed	?	(had) V-ed
<b>Gullah</b>	V	V	V(-ed)
<b>Bahamian Creole</b>	done V	V(-ed)	V

<b>Jamaican</b>	(done) V	V	(did) V
<b>Belizean Creole</b>	(don) V	me V	V
<b>San Andrés Creole</b>	don V	V	V
<b>Bajan</b>	V	V	V
<b>Trinidad English Creole</b>	V	V	V
<b>Guyanese Creole</b>	V	V	V
<b>Vincentian Creole</b>	(duhn) V	V	V
<b>Sranan</b>	V (kaba)	(ben) V / V kaba	V
<b>Saamaka</b>	kaba u V	V	V
<b>Pamaka</b>	kaba V	V	V
<b>Hawai'i Creole</b>	wen V	V	(wen) V
<b>Tok Pisin</b>	V pinis	V pinis / bin V	V
<b>Bislama</b>	V	V ... finis	V
<b>Norf'k</b>	?	V	V
<b>Torres Strait Creole</b>	bi pinis V	V	(bi) V
<b>Kriol</b>	V	bin V	(bin) V
<b>Butler English</b>	V	V	V
<b>Singlish</b>	(got) V finish / (got) finish V-ing / (already) V(-ed)	V (already) / have V-en	V(-ed)

Table 8: The perfect in English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties

Another variety, i.e. AAVE, is shaded lightly; it illustrates the limits of typological surveys, whose accuracy always depends on the reliability of the sources consulted. AAVE is represented in Table 8 as a perfect-less language. This may not actually be true. For AAVE, a sizeable body of literature (e.g. Dayton 1996; Edwards 1991, 2001; Green 1993, 2002; Labov 1998) suggests that ‘preverbal *dən* is a marker of perfect aspect that semantically is almost identical to the Standard English Present perfect auxiliary *have*’ (Edwards 2001:425). The discrepancy between this description and what Table 8 indicates may be explained by means of the process of data



collection. A single AAVE-speaking consultant, who, in addition, was highly educated, agreed to participate in the survey; his use of the variety may simply not have represented the kind of vernacular speech that has been at the heart of the AAVE enterprise. In fact, according to Dayton (1996:500), AAVE *dən* would have to be considered a prototypical perfect marker, which possesses ‘two distinct categories of use, the experiential perfect and the perfect of result’. What complicates this straightforward conclusion is that the form is also often described under the heading of ‘completive’. Edwards (2001:416), for example, maintains that, particularly with ‘punctual main verbs such as *killed, labeled, put, graduated, lost*’ or with perceptual verbs, *dən* ‘carries a completive meaning, in the sense of ‘completed’ as proposed by Comrie (1976:18)’. Green (1993:149) also ‘emphasize[s] the completion of the eventuality’ with *dən* constructions. As noted in Section 2, however, ‘completion’ – or boundedness – is not actually the defining criterion of completives. Completives imply that something is done ‘thoroughly and to completion’ (Bybee et al. 1994:54), i.e. intensively. And indeed, such a meaning appears to surface in AAVE examples such as ‘if Pop’d catch us, he say, ‘Boy – you *done* done it now’.’ This intensive meaning may then shade into one of ‘moral indignation’, as in ‘So he went to where she was ... and got the nerve to lie to me ... talking ‘bout he *done* went to work’. Such uses constitute ‘contextually pragmatic interpretations’ (Labov 1998:125-6) or ‘secondary foci’ arising through the ‘conventionalization of implicatures’ in the Gricean sense (Dahl 1985:10-11), which, however, do not detract from the primary readings of the AAVE *dən*-perfect, which appear to be resultative and experiential.

There are a few other cases where there is disagreement between what Table 8 indicates and what the literature suggests. First, there is Guyanese Creole. Again, a single, highly educated consultant participated; he, in fact, indicated himself that he had filled in the questionnaire in a meso- to acrolectal variety. It is not surprising that his language use should differ from that described by Edwards (1991:244), who maintains that Guyanese Creole ‘preverbal *don* encodes a perfect meaning’. Still, Edwards’ analysis is not easily reconciled with the typological approach followed here, as the examples provided, for their lack of context, do not permit the reliable identification of resultative and experiential meanings. His proposed translations of the marker as ‘already’ in stative and ‘be or have finished’ in dynamic contexts also do not straightforwardly align with these meanings (1991:241-2). Other analyses, in fact, describe Guyanese Creole *don* merely as a completive, whose ‘typical function’ in extended discourse is ‘to signal the

observance of temporal order' (Winford 1993:51), with resultativity constituting one of its secondary foci (1993:50), or even as a 'contrastive completive', in opposition to the 'non-contrastive completive aspect', which comes in the form of the unmarked verb (Devonish & Thompson 2013:55). The examples given by Bickerton (1975:40) also foreground *don*'s discourse-structuring function while permitting resultative readings (1975:41); what they do not suggest is an experiential sense. From all of this, it appears as if Guyanese Creole *don* fulfilled only one of the requirements for classification as a perfect marker employed here, and I will not assume that the variety has a grammaticalized perfect in the following, despite contrasting claims in the literature.

Similarly, Bao (2005:239) labels *already* a 'perfective' marker – again, a case of terminological confusion; what is meant is 'perfect'. I still do not count Singlish among the perfect-possessing languages. In my own data, which is based on the utterances of five consultants altogether, there is substantial variation in the expression of perfect meanings; this variation is clearly visible in Table 8. Also, according to Bao (2005:239), Singlish actually possesses two 'perfective' forms, with *already* functioning as a completive and *ever* as an experiential marker. All of this suggests that there is no single construction in the variety that would serve to express the two central meanings of the perfect crosslinguistically and that Singlish therefore does not (yet) possess a grammaticalized perfect.<sup>16</sup> Winford & Migge (2007:78), finally, describe *kaba* as a completive marker for all of the Surinamese creoles, instead of just Sranan, as seen in Table 8. They suggest

---

<sup>16</sup> As noted by Vander Kloek & Matthewson (2015:172), elements meaning 'already' are, in fact, easily (mis)categorized as perfects. Both 'are acceptable in many of the same environments, since both refer to an event prior to the utterance time without relying on a specific past reference time'; therefore, they can both express resultative, experiential, as well as recent past readings. Drawing on the example of Jawanese *wis*, which has been variously described as equivalent to *already*, a perfect, perfective, or even past tense, they propose a set of diagnostics by means of which 'already' elements can be distinguished from true perfects. These include compatibility with adverbials indicating a specific past-time interval, an 'earliness' implication, an inchoative interpretation with statives, the 'extended-now' interpretation, and truth-conditional equivalency in interactions with negation (2015:173). My data do not permit for the testing of Singlish *already* against these diagnostics, but this would certainly be a worthwhile endeavor.

that '[t]he category we have labeled 'Completive' might just as well be labeled 'Perfect', but the readings and examples they provide cover only the perfect of result and the perfect of persistent situation and thus only one of the central readings of the perfect. The opposite case – a language that has been classified as perfect-less in the literature (Bybee et al. 1994:64-65) but showing a single form in the two required contexts but not in narratives in Table 8 – is constituted by Tok Pisin.

How does the pattern displayed in Table 8 compare to what we find in other languages? In other words, are English-lexifier P&Cs more or less likely than non-creoles to possess a perfect gram, or is there no difference? Of the 222 languages analyzed for this feature in the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (WALS; Haspelmath et al. 2005), 108, i.e. 49%, are listed as having a grammaticalized perfect (Dahl & Velupillai 2013).<sup>17</sup> Among the languages sampled here, this ratio is only 27% (8/30). This finding at first sight appears to support the idea that P&Cs are special languages, distinct not just in terms of their sociohistorical background but also structurally.

Tempting as it may seem, such a comparison is problematic in both theoretical and methodological terms. The first problem concerns the size and composition of the two types of language sample underlying all comparisons of P&Cs with non-creole languages. P&C samples are necessarily small by typological standards, but their most serious drawback is their composition. Typological samples are usually controlled for genealogy and area, even though an Indo-European bias has been noted for a number of WALS samples, too (cf. Maddieson 2013). In terms of genetic affiliation, the vast majority of P&Cs have European languages as their lexifiers. Furthermore, most P&Cs are spoken in the Caribbean (and to a lesser extent West Africa), which means that there is also an areal imbalance, which in turn severely restricts the representation of substrate languages, too, not just in terms of number, but also typologically, with languages from the Macro-Sudan belt (i.e. Niger Congo excluding Bantu, Atlantic, and Ijoid) clearly dominant (cf. Michaelis 2014). 'Another problematic factor in any creole sample is [...] diffusion'.

---

<sup>17</sup> The WALS sample includes three creoles, i.e. Hawai'i Creole, Tok Pisin, and Kriol. If we remove the creole languages from the WALS sample to avoid overlap, even though absolute frequencies (108/219) change slightly, the proportional representation of perfect-possessing languages remains the same (49%).

Particularly in the Caribbean, settlement history ‘point[s] to the possibility of features spreading from one variety to another’ (Velupillai 2015:288). What this means is that the genetic imbalance of any P&C sample owed to common lexifier and substrate languages is compounded by sample-internal historical relatedness and contact effects. All of these problems are aggravated in the sample displayed in Table 8, as it is even more restricted in terms of lexifier language (exclusively English), areal representation (disproportionately Caribbean and West African), and historical relatedness between varieties than ‘normal’ creole samples. To summarize, the comparison of my own sample of languages with Dahl & Velupillai’s *WALS* sample (2013) permits the conclusion that English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties appear less likely to possess a grammaticalized perfect than the world’s languages in general. What it does not permit, however, is to draw conclusions as to the typological nature of creole vs. non-creole languages.

Nevertheless, creoles are special in terms of their sociohistorical background, and it is precisely this background which explains at least a part of the structural makeup and similarities of these languages. Creoles are community vernaculars that ‘arose due to situations of intense contact’ (Velupillai 2015:43). It is now clear that their creation involved not primarily child first-language acquisition of an impoverished pidgin under the influence of an innate, universal bioprogram but primarily adult second-language learning in untutored situations, with restricted access to native speakers of the target language but under continued and sometimes reinforced influence from the first languages (cf. Siegel 2008a:192-193). The most important mechanism underlying the building-up of creole grammatical systems appears to have been grammaticalization, both internal and contact-induced. Whereas internal grammaticalization refers to the creation of new grammatical constructions from lexical material (cf. Section 2), in contact-induced grammaticalization, ‘superstrate lexical items or morphemes assumed the syntactic and other properties of substrate functional categories’ (Winford 2012:440). Internal grammaticalization appears to be a universal diachronic process, often following the same paths in the development of particular crosslinguistic categories. The notion of contact-induced grammaticalization goes back to Heine & Kuteva (2003), but creolists had already described the phenomena involved variously as instances of substrate influence, transfer, or relexification, among others (cf. Siegel 2008a:196-199).

According to Winford (2012:441-444), the development of completive and resultative categories in English-lexifier P&Cs such as Sranan, Nigerian Pidgin, Melanesian Pidgin, and Hawai’i

Creole constitutes a prime example of contact-induced grammaticalization. In a detailed analysis, Winford & Migge (2007:83-85) demonstrate that *kaba* in the Surinamese creoles is closely modeled on the completive category in Gbe languages, not just in terms of its syntactic distribution (verb-finally) but also in terms of the origins of the form in a serial verb meaning 'finish'. The fact that *kaba* occurs with both stative and non-stative verb situations, whereas the Gbe completive marker is restricted to the latter, is explained by way of subsequent internal grammaticalization.

Obviously, contact-induced grammaticalization involves not only substrate influence but also superstrate contributions, and, in fact, van den Berg & Aboh (2013) point to a problem in the Gbe-Surinamese 'finish' > completive analysis. They show that not all Gbe languages actually possess a serial 'finish' construction and ask to what extent these languages can then be held responsible for the development of *kaba* as a completive marker. Noting that English also possesses a construction involving the verb *finish* and expressing completive meaning (*finish V-ing*), they suggest that 'a combination of the English and Gbe constructions (rather than just Gbe patterns) could have contributed to the emergence of the Sranan Tongo pattern' (2013:150).

The contribution of the English input to the grammaticalization of creole perfect categories has been acknowledged before. As Kortmann points out, even though the development of a dynamic verb meaning 'make, perform an action' into a tense-aspect marker is typologically rare (2004:246-247), the use of *do* as a progressive, habitual, or perfect marker is widespread in non-standard varieties of English and English-lexifier P&Cs (2004:248-249). Perfect uses of *do* are 'clearly innovations of New World varieties, with the Atlantic pidgins and creoles forming the largest and most coherent group' (2004:252). Important input apparently came from fixed expressions of the kind *We're done*, *It's done*, or *I'm done with it*, which are attested in varieties of Early Modern English and earlier dialects of Scottish English. It seems very likely that such expressions conspired with West African 'already'- or 'finish'-perfects (cf. below) to lead to the fact that, '[i]n Atlantic pidgins and creoles, [...] *do* as a Perfect marker [...] exhibits the highest degree of grammaticalization of all relevant tense and aspect categories' (2004:252). Creoles may be young languages which have not had the time to develop the amount of grammatical 'ornament' or 'overspecification' (cf. McWhorter 2002:219) found in older languages, but then perfects are also often younger grammatical categories, which, like their resultative or completive sources, tend to be expressed periphrastically (cf. Section 2). Despite their unusual sociohistorical

background, thus, creoles develop TMA categories in normal ways, and the categories found as well as their formal expressions are not unusual, either.

- 3 Do marking patterns distinguish groups of P&Cs? Do these linguistically determined groups have geographical and/or sociohistorical correlates?

Yes, they do. Perhaps most strikingly, the possession of a grammaticalized perfect category may be described as a predominantly African phenomenon. Of the eight perfects found in the present study, four are located in West Africa; in fact, with the exception of Ghanaian Pidgin English and the Liberian varieties, all of the African P&Cs sampled here possess a perfect gram, which, moreover, inevitably comes in the form of variants of *done* or *finish*. These markers are also employed to express perfect meanings in Ghanaian Pidgin English, Liberian Settler English, and Vernacular Liberian English; their distribution simply does not fulfill the criteria employed in the present study to identify grammaticalized perfect categories.

The clustering of perfect grams in West Africa and the preponderance of variants of *done* or *finish* are likely owed to substrate influence. As a look at *WALS Online* shows (<http://wals.info/feature/68A#2/25.9/133.5>), grammaticalized perfects do not just occur fairly frequently in the region, but they also often originate from words meaning 'already' or 'finish', in contrast to what we find in the European languages, where perfects derived from possessive constructions predominate. Thus, with the exception of Ewe, perfects occur in all of the coastal West African languages sampled for *WALS*, including those spoken in areas in which English-lexifier P&Cs are used today (i.e. Temne in Sierra Leone, Mano and Grebo in Liberia, Akan and Tem in Ghana, and Yoruba, Isekiri and Engenni in Nigeria). A number of languages used further inland (e.g. Kanuri and Margi) also possess perfects.

In the Caribbean, we also find 'done'- or 'finish'-derived forms to express perfect meanings, but with the exception of Sranan, no Caribbean English-lexifier creole possesses a grammaticalized perfect. The three Surinamese creoles are clearly set off from the other varieties by their use of *kaba*, which, as indicated in Section 4.1, derives from Portuguese *acabar* 'finish, complete, stop' and does not occur elsewhere in the region. Moreover, in contrast to *done*, *kaba* (also) occurs

post-verbally (cf. Winford & Plag 2013:18 on Sranan; Migge 2013:43 on Nengee).<sup>18</sup> The division between Western and Eastern Caribbean creoles is clearly visible in resultative contexts, where sentence (54) showed the variable occurrence of *don(e)* in the West but not in the East. The distinction between conservative and mesolectal creoles also emerges: as discussed in Section 4.3, with the exception of Guyanese Creole, which, however, is represented here in its meso- to acrolectal form, the former employ a preverbal particle with the perfect of persistent situation; the latter use inflectional *-ing*. Belizean Creole occupies a special position within the group of conservative Caribbean creoles in that it alone possesses a preverbal past marker, *me*, which functions in perfective contexts.

The differences found in the expression of perfect meanings between African P&Cs and the Caribbean creoles as well as among the latter nicely align with Yakpo's model of stratal language contact in Atlantic English-lexifier creoles, which takes into account not just the role of substrate influence in the formation of contact vernaculars but also 'post-formative areal contact and convergence' in the multilingual societies of West Africa (2017:51), where the continued presence of 'African adstrates will reinforce and expand existing African substrate features', whereas in the Caribbean 'the absence of contact with African adstrates will lead to a weakening of substrate features'. Thus, while existing West African perfect categories may have played a similar role in the emergence of both African and Caribbean English-lexifier P&Cs, they would have been reinforced or expanded only in the former, whereas in the latter, they would have come under increasing formal, semantic, or syntactic influence from varieties of English, whose direction and strength would have depended on the particular sociolinguistic ecologies in place in the different territories.

Two varieties that stand apart in the present sample are Tristan da Cunha English and Bermudian English. As noted in Section 3, these two varieties are not creoles but have been described as creole-related, which is why they were included in the present investigation. Tristan da Cunha

---

<sup>18</sup> Even though it did not appear in this position in the data sampled for the present study, Jamaican *done* may also be used post-verbally, but, as noted by Durrelman-Tame (2008:53-54), this use of the marker is more frequent among older than among younger speakers and may eventually die out altogether. Guyanese Creole also possesses pre- and post-verbal *don* (cf. Bickerton 1975:40-41; Edwards 1991:246).

English clearly possesses a grammaticalized perfect, i.e. *is done* V(-ed), which is strikingly different from all other *done*-constructions displayed in Tables 2 to 7 by its consistent auxiliary support as well as by its semantic value: with the exception of the perfect of persistent situation, *is done* V(-ed) obligatorily occurs in all perfect contexts and thus appears as the most fully grammaticalized of the perfects represented here, strongly resembling the English Present Perfect in terms of its semantic range. The robust occurrence of *is done* V(-ed) in the variety is explained by Schreier 2002:169) through multiple causation: ‘the emerging koine adopted perfective [i.e. perfect] *be* from the British donor dialects and the aspect marker *done* from a St. Helenian [creole] input. [...] the two forms merged when new norms developed’. Bermudian English, by contrast, makes no difference at all between perfect and perfective verb situations, employing (variable) past inflection in all contexts (cf. Eberle & Schreier 2013:295).

To turn to Asia and the Pacific, Butler English represents another exception among the varieties represented here. Being ‘the English of poorly educated service workers’, it ‘has a few pidgin-like structural characteristics, but in general its instability and the fact that it is mostly used in dealing with English-speaking customers, employers, and so on make it more like an interlanguage or a prepidgin’ (Smith 2008:255). Not surprisingly, Butler English does not feature any overt marking in the contexts analyzed above. Both perfect and perfective verb situations are rendered by means of bare verbs, which is actually entirely in line with what is common such varieties (cf. Siegel 2010:824). Norf’k, too, employs almost exclusively bare verbs. Yet again, we are dealing with a variety which has been described as an ‘unfocused language’, which has ‘relatively few agreed social norms, either with regard to its use or to its lexicon and grammar’, and which is not always ‘transmitted in full to the children’ (Mühlhäusler 2013:232-233).

In Singapore, the use of English at home has been increasing persistently in the past couple of decades, which, in turn, has given rise to a ‘highly complex’ sociolinguistic situation involving ‘a range of local language forms, spanning from an informal, basilectal variety to formal uses’, with the choice of variety depending on ‘sophisticated assessments of domain, situational parameters, and one’s interlocutor’s age, status, and background’ (Schneider 2007:157-158). Most recently, ‘[t]he gap between the more acrolectal Standard Singapore English and the more mesolectal-basilectal Singlish appears to be diminishing’, and ‘systematic mixing of acrolectal and mesolectal/basilectal varieties is documented’ (Lim & Ansaldo 2013). This ‘mixing’ is



clearly visible in the data presented here, which showed forms ranging all the way from standard English constructions over bare verbs to Chinese particles for many contexts.

Tok Pisin and Bislama are '[s]ister dialects' of Melanesian Pidgin (Smith & Siegel 2013:214), and this relatedness clearly shows in my data, too. In contrast to the West African and Caribbean varieties, where forms of *done* predominate, Tok Pisin and Bislama employ *pinis* or *finis* to express perfect meanings. Both occur in post-verbal position only (cf. Smith & Siegel 2013:218-219; Meyerhoff 2013:226), again in contrast to what we find in West Africa and the Caribbean, where preverbal markers are most frequent. Once more, however, a look at substrate sources is instructive. The primary substrate language of Tok Pisin was Tolai; those for Bislama were Nguna and Tangoa (Siegel 2008b:182). In a comparison of Tok Pisin with Tolai, Mosel (1980:124) notes that in the latter 'completed action is often expressed by the intransitive verb *par* or its transitive counterpart *vapar* 'to do (s.th.) completely' following an intransitive or transitive verb respectively. Their use is similar to that of *pinis* in Tok Pisin'. There is also preverbal *tar*, which Mosel (1980:124) classifies as a resultative marker. For Nguna, Schütz (1969:27-28) describes the use of a preverbal 'perfective' marker, *poo*, which he glosses by means of 'comp' but which clearly has resultative and experiential functions. It seems, thus, that the presence of resultative or completive markers in the most important substrate languages, together with English input presumably containing *finish* V-*ing* expressions (cf. above), contributed to the use of V *pinis* or V *finis* to express perfect meanings in Tok Pisin and Bislama.

The two Australian creoles, finally, are closely related to Tok Pisin and Bislama, with all four varieties ultimately tracing back to a pidgin which developed in the wake of the establishment of a British convict settlement at Sidney Cove, Port Jackson, in 1788. Like Tok Pisin, Torres Strait Creole shows *pinis* as a marker of the resultative perfect; unlike the two Melanesian Pidgin varieties, however, both Australian creoles feature variable *bi(n)* as a perfective marker. In sum, the data presented here clearly reveal areal and/or genetic patterns among English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties, with those patterns largely confirming previous groupings, such as those into Western vs. Eastern Caribbean or Atlantic vs. Pacific creoles.

## 7 Conclusion

This paper has followed a typological approach in order to shed light on the expression of perfect meanings across English-lexifier P&Cs and related varieties. In Standard English, a single construction, i.e. HAVE V-*en*, is used; most English-lexifier P&Cs – like other non-standard varieties of the language – depart sharply from this pattern and employ different forms for different perfect meanings. ‘Done’- or ‘finish’-derived constructions are frequent, particularly in West Africa and in resultative contexts, but bare verbs also occur, especially in the Caribbean and for experientials and recent pasts.

One of the research questions that the questionnaire survey was originally intended to answer is which English-lexifier P&Cs possess a grammaticalized perfect category and whether, if taken together as a group, such high-contact languages behave differently than other languages in terms of this feature. While only about a quarter of the languages sampled here may be said to have a perfect gram – compared to roughly half of the languages surveyed for this feature in *WALS* – the genetic and areal bias inherent in creole samples in general, which is compounded in samples of English-lexifier P&Cs, prohibits conclusions as to the typological nature of creoles vs. non-creole languages.

Still, creoles are special on account of their sociohistorical background, and this background actually appears to be responsible for a large part of the structural makeup and similarities of these languages. Grammaticalization, both internal and contact-induced, was instrumental in the building-up of creole TMA systems, with perfect categories occurring early on, as predicted by typological studies of the perfect in the world’s languages. Contact effects, both during and after creole formation, help explain the areal distribution of perfect constructions found in this study, which shows a rather clear demarcation of world regions in alignment with traditional classifications into Atlantic vs. Pacific, African vs. Caribbean, Western vs. Eastern Caribbean, etc. Rather than for creole exceptionalism, thus, the typological study of creole TMA categories appears to lend support for the assumption that creoles are ‘normal’ languages that are built on common processes of language change and contact and the creation of grammar.

## 8 References

- Aboh, Enoch O., Norval S.H. Smith & Tonjes Veenstra. 2013. Saramaccan. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole Languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 27-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bao, Zhiming. 2005. The aspectual system of Singapore English and the systemic substratist explanation. *Journal of Linguistics* 41. 237-267.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1975. *Dynamics of a creole system*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Berg, Margot C. van den & Enoch O. Aboh. 2013. Done already? A comparison of completive markers in the Gbe languages and Sranan Tongo. *Lingua* 12. 150-172.
- Bybee, Joan & Östen Dahl. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13. 51-103.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dahl, Östen (ed.). 2000. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen. 2014. The perfect map: Investigating the crosslinguistic distribution of TAME categories in a parallel corpus. In Benedikt Szmrecsanyi & Bernhard Wälchli (eds.). *Aggregating dialectology, typology, and register analysis. Linguistic variation in text and speech*, 268-289. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen & Eva Hedin. 2000. Current relevance and event reference. In Östen Dahl (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 385-401. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen & Viveka Velupillai. 2013. The perfect. In Matthew Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/68> (November 11, 2017).

- Dayton, Elizabeth. 1996. *Grammatical categories of the verb in African American Vernacular English*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Devonish, Hubert & Dahlia Thompson. 2013. Creolese. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 49-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Wit, Astrid. 2017. *The present perfective paradox across languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). 2013. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info> (November 12, 2017).
- Durreleman, Stephanie. 2007. Completive aspect in Jamaican Creole: The complete story? *GG@G (Generative Grammar in Geneva)* 5. 143-157.
- Durreleman-Tame, Stephanie. 2008. *The syntax of Jamaican Creole. A cartographic perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Eberle, Nicole & Daniel Schreier. 2013. African Bermudian English and the Caribbean connection. *English World-Wide* 34. 279-304.
- Edwards, Walter F. 1991. A comparative description of Guyanese Creole and Black English preverbal aspect marker *don*. In Walter F. Edwards & Donald Winford (eds.). *Verb phrase patterns in English and creole*, 240-255. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Edwards, Walter F. 2001 Aspectual *dən* in African American Vernacular English in Detroit. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5. 413-427.
- Escure, Geneviève. 2013. Belizean Creole. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 92-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faraclas, Nicholas. 2013. Nigerian Pidgin. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 176-184. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, Lisa J. 1993. *Topics in African American English: The verb system analysis*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Green, Lisa J. 2002. *African American English. A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hackert, Stephanie. 2004. *Urban Bahamian Creole: System and variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.). 2005. *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2003. On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27. 529-572.
- Holm, John & Peter L. Patrick. 2007. *Comparative creole syntax. Parallel outlines of 18 creole grammars*. London: Battlebridge.
- Huber, Magnus. 1999. *Ghanaian Pidgin English in its West African context. A sociohistorical and structural analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kiparsky, Paul 2002. Event structure and the perfect. In David I. Beaver, Luis D. Casillas Martínez, Brady Z. Clark & Stefan Kaufmann (eds.). *The construction of meaning*, 113-136. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Kirk, John M. 2017. The present perfect in Irish English. *World Englishes* 36. 239-253.
- Kortmann, Bernd. 2004. *Do* as a tense and aspect marker in varieties of English. In Bernd Kortmann (ed.). *Dialectology meets typology: Dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective*, 245-275. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Bernd & Kerstin Lunkenheimer (eds.). 2012. *The Mouton world atlas of variation in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Bernd & Kerstin Lunkenheimer (eds.). 2013. *The electronic world atlas of varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.  
<http://ewave-atlas.org> (August 23, 2015).
- Labov, William. 1998. Coexistent systems in African-American Vernacular English. In Salikoko S. Mufwene, John R. Rickford, Guy Bailey & John Baugh (eds.). *African-American English: Structure, history and use*, 110-153. New York: Routledge.
- Labov, William & Joshua Waletzky. 1967. 'Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience'. In June Helm (ed.). *Essays on the verbal and visual arts: Proceedings of the 1966 annual spring meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Leimgruber, Jakob R.E. 2009. *Modelling variation in Singapore English*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oxford.

- Lim, Lisa & Umberto Ansaldo. 2013. Singlish structure dataset. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The atlas of pidgin and creole language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://apics-online.info/contributions/21> (January 11, 2016).
- Lindstedt, Jouko. 2000. The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential. In Östen Dahl (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 365-383. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- LIRICS (Linguistic InFRastructure for Interoperable ResourCes and Systems) Consortium. N.d. Semantic roles: Definitions, explanations, examples. [https://semantic-annotation.uvt.nl/LIRICS\\_semroles.htm#guidelines](https://semantic-annotation.uvt.nl/LIRICS_semroles.htm#guidelines) (August 27, 2017).
- Maddieson, Ian. 2013. Tone. In Matthew Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/13> (November 12, 2017).
- Maurer, Philippe. 2013. Present reference of stative verbs and past perfective reference of dynamic verbs. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The atlas of pidgin and creole language structures*, 200-203. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McWhorter, John H. 2002. What happened to English? *Diachronica* 19. 217-272.
- Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2013. Bislama. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 223-231. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Michaelis, Susanne Maria. 2014. Sampling in contact linguistics: What is a typical creole feature? Paper presented at ‘Time and space in linguistics: Interdisciplinary computational approaches and cross-creole comparisons’, Aarhus.
- Michaelis, Susanne Maria, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). 2013a. *The atlas of pidgin and creole language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Michaelis, Susanne Maria, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). 2013b. *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Michaelis, Susanne Maria, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). 2013c. *The atlas of pidgin and creole language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://apics-online.info> (August 15, 2015).

- Migge, Bettina. 2003. *Creole formation as language contact. The case of the Suriname creoles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Migge, Bettina. 2013. Nengee. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 39-48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Migge, Bettina & Isabelle Léglise. 2013. *Exploring language in a multilingual context: Variation, interaction and ideology in language documentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 1980. *Tolai and Tok Pisin: The influence of the substratum on the development of New Guinea Pidgin*. Pacific Linguistics B-73. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 2013. Norf'k. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 232-240. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 2008. Lexicalized meaning and the internal temporal structure of events. In Rothstein, Susan (ed.). *Theoretical and crosslinguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect*, 13-42. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schneider, Agnes. 2012. Typological profile: Pidgins and creoles. In Bernd Kortmann & Kerstin Lunkenheimer (eds.). 2012. *The Mouton world atlas of variation in English*, 874-904. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schreier, Daniel. 2002. Dynamic mixing or archaic retention? The ambiguous case of 'completive *done*' in Tristan da Cunha English. *Diachronica* 19. 135-176.
- Schreier, Daniel. 2010. The consequences of migration and colonialism II: Overseas varieties. In Peter Auer & Jürgen Erich Schmidt (eds.). *Language and space: Theories and methods. An international handbook of linguistic variation* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 30.1), 451-467. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Schröder, Anne. 2013. Cameroon Pidgin English. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 185-193. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Schultze-Berndt, Eva, Felicity Meakins & Denise Angelo. 2013. Kriol. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 241-250. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schütz, Albert J. 1969. *Nguna grammar*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications 5. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Schwenter, Scott A. 1994. Hot news and the grammaticalization of the perfect. *Linguistics* 32. 995-1028.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2000. Substrate influence in Hawai'i Creole English. *Language in Society* 29. 197-236.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2008a. Pidgins/creoles and second language acquisition. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John Victor Singler (eds.). *The handbook of pidgin and creole studies*, 189-218. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2008b. *The emergence of pidgin and creole languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2010. Contact languages of the Pacific. In Raymond Hickey (ed.). *The handbook of language contact*, 814-836. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Singler, John Victor. 1984. *Variation in tense-aspect-modality in Liberian English*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1997. *The parameter of aspect*. 2nd ed. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Smith, Geoff P. & Jeff Siegel. 2013. Tok Pisin. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 214-222. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Ian. 2008. Pidgins, creoles, and Bazaar Hindi. In Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru & S.N. Sridhar (eds.). *Language in South Asia*, 253-268. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter & Jean Hannah. 2008. *International English. A guide to the varieties of standard English*. 5th ed. Hodder Education.
- Vander Klok, Jozina & Lisa Matthewson. 2015. Distinguishing *already* from perfect aspect: A case study of Javanese *wis*. *Oceanic Linguistics* 54. 172-205.
- Vate, Marleen Susanne van der. 2011. *Tense, aspect and modality in a radical creole. The case of Saamáka*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.



- Vendler, Zeno. 1957. Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review* 66. 143-160.
- Velupillai, Viveka. 2003. *Hawai'i Creole English: A typological analysis of the tense-mood-aspect system*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Velupillai, Viveka. 2011. The 'had VERB' construction in Hawai'i Creole English. *GAGL* 53. 119-138.
- Velupillai, Viveka. 2012. *An introduction to linguistic typology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Velupillai, Viveka. 2015. *Pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Werner, Valentin. 2014. *The present perfect in World Englishes: Charting unity and diversity*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press.
- Winford, Donald. 1993. *Predication in Caribbean English creoles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Winford, Donald. 2012. Creole languages. In Robert I. Binnick (ed.). *The Oxford handbook of tense and aspect*, 428-457. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winford, Donald & Bettina Migge. 2007. Substrate influence on the emergence of the TMA systems of the Surinamese creoles. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 22. 73-99.
- Winford, Donald & Ingo Plag. 2013. Sranan. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 15-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yakpo, Kofi. 2009. *A grammar of Pichi*. Berlin/Accra: Isimu Media.
- Yakpo, Kofi. 2013. Pichi. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Vol. I: English-based and Dutch-based languages, 194-205. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yakpo, Kofi. 2017. Towards a model of language contact and change in the English-lexifier creoles of Africa and the Caribbean. *English World-Wide* 38. 50-76.

Stephanie Hackert  
 Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich  
 Schellingstr. 3  
 80799 Munich, Germany  
 st.hackert@lmu.de