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ABSTRACT

SOME NON-STANDARD FEATURES OF BAHAMIAN DIALECT SYNTAX

By

Alison Watt Shilling

This dissertation investigates three areas of non-Standard syntax in the Bahamian Dialect.

Chapter I provides orientation and a discussion of the literature. It gives historical and social background showing the relationship the Bahamas has with the US and the Caribbean. Since the analysis is based on tape recorded data, details are given of the techniques employed in data collection.

In Chapter II copula sentences in BD are discussed. Tables are provided showing the forms of the verb in such sentences and their frequency of occurrence. Individual speaker variation in the presence or absence of non-past positive copula is compared with equivalent Black English data in Labov 1969. It is concluded that Bahamian Dialect variation cannot be accounted for by phonological rule as can the Black English variation. Copula omission is governed by the following syntactic environment; discussion of these environments leads to the conclusion that there is an underlying copula only before a noun-phrase complement. Discussion of other environments where a surface copula is found shows that these can be accounted for without postulating an underlying copula. It is shown that variation in the BD copula can be accounted for if BD is considered to have developed from an earlier stage where copula categories were similar to those in present-day Guyanese Creole basilect.
In Chapter III the factors determining the forms of the
verbal negator are discussed. Frequencies of forms found in different
environments at different points on the BD continuum are given and it
is shown that the form selected reflects non-Standard distinctions in
the BD basilect. This corresponds to the situation in the Guyanese
Creole mesolect.

In Chapter III a detailed analysis of negative concord in
Bahamian dialect is compared to data given for Black English by Labov
1972. Rules are proposed for negative concord in BD and BE which
declare these varieties independently from SE rather than by the addition
of rules to the end of a grammar required for SE, as proposed by Labov
1972.

In Chapter IV the lack of dummy-subject rule in the BD basilect
and the gradual appearance of this rule for different environments in
the mesolect are discussed. Pronoun copying of a noun-phrase subject
is also analyzed and attempts to correlate its occurrence with features
of the copied noun-phrase show that this copying is optional with the
complexity of the noun-phrase and its contrast with a preceding noun-
phrase favoring the copying. Similar pronoun copying and also the
fronting of a non-subject has been called topicalization. Both these
transformations make a noun-phrase more prominent in the sentence;
such a noun-phrase in the BD data seems to have certain
characteristics of the sentence topic insofar as these have been es-

tablished.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
General Remarks

1.1. This study presents an analysis of certain syntactic features of the Black Bahamian Dialect. I have concentrated on three areas only, in order to provide a detailed analysis of the data. I hope to show with frequency counts and examples the close similarity between the non-Standard features I discuss and these same features in other Afro-American varieties of English, in particular US Black English and Guyanese Creole.

1.2. Although my emphasis is not on diachronic development I have included some historical background to justify making these comparisons. The origins of Black Bahamians as slaves mainly from the US but also from Africa, and their existence in small communities near the US mainland but somewhat isolated from it, parallel that of Gullah. These two varieties constitute a link between the US as a whole where, in spite of some large plantations, most Blacks lived in daily contact with the White majority, and the Caribbean where the isolation of the Black majority was much greater.

The close trading links with the States throughout Bahamian history contrasts with the slight and indirect contacts with Guyana. Nevertheless Black Bahamian Dialect can be seen to be perhaps closer to Guyanese Creole than to Black English; the original circumstances which gave rise to Afro-American varieties would seem to have greater influence on their development than later contacts between the peoples in the Americas.

I analyze data from White Bahamian speech mainly for comparison and contrast with Black speech. I have provided considerable
detail for White speech however, since a full understanding of Black varieties and their development depends upon a knowledge of varieties with which they are in contact. It is of interest also to see the influence which Black speech has had upon the White. White Bahamian shows an interesting ambivalence in avoiding overt Black markers such as does or mussy while adopting habitual be which masks itself more readily as Standard English.

1.3. I have chosen for detailed analysis the copula, negation, and omitted and double subjects. The copula has been studied in detail in other Afro-American varieties; my analysis reveals the extent to which an understanding of de-creolizing Black varieties depends on a knowledge of more basilectal forms. Negative concord is a more general non-Standard English phenomenon, although the greater pervasiveness of this in Afro-American speech probably indicates reinforcement from Creole here also. The final area I selected is somewhat different in kind from the first two, in that very little analysis has been performed of subjects and topics in non-Standard English. This analysis is more preliminary in nature than those of the preceding two areas; more data is needed from Bahamian speech and from related varieties to determine the relationship of the various features discussed in Chapter IV and their function in discourse.

1.4. The analyses of the copula and of negation reveal the great similarity which Black Bahamian Dialect has to US Black English on the one hand and Caribbean varieties on the other. Many other features of BBD also show this, one fairly straightforward example being the complementizer /se/ (usually written 'say'). In US Black English as a whole this exists only in the expression "He tell me say..." (Dillard
1972). In Gullah, however, as in BBD, this form exists in a wider range of environments including not only the equivalent of the US Black English expression but also the complementizer for any indirect statement:

(1) He tell me say he suppose to stay off. (BM46R)
(2) I remember say I done left light on. (BF75R)
(3) I know say the bill only $4.00. (BF32R)

In Jamaican Creole, besides the above uses, /se/ is found introducing comparisons and extrapoosed subject clauses, besides being complementizer after psychic state verbs (Bailey 1966):

(4) fieba se jaaj naa kom. = It seems as if George is not coming. (p.112)
(5) dem ron laka se dem set daag afta dem. = They ran as though dogs had been set after them. (p.137)
(6) mi fraitn se im gi mi non atall. = I am surprised that he gave me any at all. (p.112)
(7) im dis faam se im sik. = He just pretended to be sick. (p.120)

This non-Standard element is thus more restricted in its use in BBD than in Jamaican Creole, but less so than in US Black English. Its persistence in mainland speech in the superficially most Standard context - written as 'say' after the verb tell - is analogous to the behavior of non-Standard elements in a socio-geographic continuum and provides evidence for the Creole origins of such features in US Black English.

Related Literature

2.1. As the entries in Reinecke et al. (1976) show, there has been no analysis published of the variety of language spoken in the Bahamas, merely a few collected texts and discussion of the folk-lore. This is not surprising, since the islands are small and the population
insignificant besides the numbers in the Caribbean, and it is only recently that the Creoles spoken in Jamaica, Guyana and elsewhere have themselves come under serious scientific scrutiny.

The reasons for this neglect are also obvious; although more different from Standard English than most English varieties, these Creoles have an almost entirely English lexicon, and thus would not excite the attention of searchers for new languages to describe. Furthermore the low social status of the speakers casts its shadow over these language varieties, still stigmatized by most laymen as merely the Incorrect English of ignorant people.

2.2. Such a stigma probably had a more pronounced effect upon research into US Black English than that of Caribbean Creoles, since the island territories take pride in their distinctive speech as part of their national heritage, whereas US Black English is spoken by a geographically scattered minority.

However, even in the case of Caribbean Creole Studies there has been felt a need to justify research in terms of its usefulness in solving urgent educational problems (see, for example, the introduction to Bailey 1966). While it is true that research into the Creoles is important for this purpose, such an apologia would be considered inappropriate before similar works on the standard language. The majority of literature on US Black English also seems to be slanted towards the teaching profession; again, while this is of great importance, it does mean that many of the papers even by well-known socio-linguists such as Stewart (1964, 1967) and Labov (1964, 1969a) are focused on educational
Issues rather than linguistic ones.

Linguists wishing to undertake research on Black English enter an area of politics, polemic and prejudice which still makes the objective collection and analysis of facts difficult. The speakers of the most distinctive forms of Black English are young, lower-class and Black. Black adults, while vitally concerned to have the educational gap closed, are naturally skeptical of judgments offered by White middle-class linguists (or even by their Black, Standard-English-speaking colleagues).

Authors such as Dillard (1972) have rightly ridiculed writers like Francis (1958) for discussing the importance to US speech of Films and Swedes and not that of Blacks. However, Linguistic Atlas lexicographers and those who, like Francis, based their writings on Atlas research, were concerned with geographical differences in lexicon; the few items of African phonological as well as semantic parentage such as toto or okra have spread into general use. Differences in the lexicon of Black and White speakers, at least in southern US communities, consist mainly in subtle differences of usage of English-derived items such as the Black use of signifying for a type of verbal jousting or suck teeth for a Black mannerism. Atlas questionnaires designed to elicit labels for farm equipment, for example, missed such subleties, as well as the more basic differences in Black use of items such as be done or bin as grammatical markers.

Authors such as McDavid (1950) addressed Black-White differences directly; McDavid for example, gave distribution maps of he do in Black and White US speech and also in southern England to show that this form is not limited to Blacks and in any case could have
originated in the UK. By the same token, habitual be can be traced to Irish and done to Scots; the appearance of these forms in Black speech and not in that of Whites who are the descendants of the British Immigrants is attributed by McDavid to the preservation of archaisms in the most underprivileged section of the community. McDavid's (1950) view, accepted by many, was that only Gullah could not be explained in this way:

It has long been known that Gullah, the dialect spoken by Negroes along the South Carolina and Georgia coast is sharply different not only from all varieties of standard English but also from the folk dialects of the US and Canada. (p.323)

It is easy to see this attitude, as does Dillard (1972), as one which seeks to deny any Black contribution to US linguistic heritage but, as Steward points out in a perceptive article (1964), one can seek to minimize differences with the laudable aim of emphasizing that Black potential is the same as White, given equal opportunity. The recent emphasis on the deep structural differences between Black English and SE (see for example Dillard 1970, 1972 or Loflin 1967, 1969) can lead all too easily to the conclusion by the linguistically naive reader that Black English is therefore inherently deficient. After all, the argument goes, their language is English, but their language causes them to fail scholastically, therefore their language is an inferior form of English. This view has been reinforced by writers such as Bernstein (1964) who, working with class differences rather than racial ones, postulates that lower-class children learn mainly a 'restricted code' of language ill-suited for school learning.

The efforts of such as Dillard and Loflin to show the
syntactic differences between BE and SE have thus not always been welcomed by Black leaders. Dillard's suggestion that BE be used in schools lays such well-intentioned attempts to give dignity to Black speech open to charges such as those of Sledd (1969) of Whites attempting a linguistic apartheid where Blacks are held back from participation in the mainstream SE culture.

2.3. Against such a background writings on Black English have tended to quote little and debate much. Detailed research-based studies have come from New York (Labov, 1968, 1969, 1972), Detroit (Shuy et al. 1967) and Los Angeles (Legum et al. 1971) rather than from the southern communities whence Black speakers emigrated. I shall be relying quite heavily on the Labov studies mentioned in my comparison of Bahamian Dialect with Black English. The other studies do not show any striking geographical differences from Labov's New York BE.

Gullah, even if not as fundamentally different from other Black US varieties as the passage from McDavid quoted above states, remains of great interest for the understanding of the continuum of Black speech within the US and its links with Caribbean varieties. There have been two substantive works on Gullah: Turner (1949) emphasized the African elements of syntax, phonology and lexis in Gullah; this was of great value, although unfortunately this contributed to the impression that this variety was in fact an isolated type completely unrelated to Black English. In syntax, Turner gives too few details for me to make useful comparisons in the present study. Cunningham is perhaps too complete to be of much use. She has the
laudable aim of describing all features of the grammar:

...it is my intention to present a syntactic analysis of a tongue known to be Creole rather than an analysis of only that which is Creole in that tongue. (p.3)

However, because Gullah is "rapidly being modified, by its speakers, in the direction of Standard English" her stated aim results in her describing many features which are also found in SE\textsuperscript{2}. This results in the uniquely Gullah features being too briefly, and thus inadequately, described.

She provides many examples; however, she states in her introduction that she relied not only on spontaneous data but on elicitation and correction from informants who, according to Cunningham had only 'indirect' knowledge of Gullah; she says she could barely understand some spontaneous speech of the true Gullah speakers. (p.7) Since in her data she does not distinguish between elicited and spontaneous speech it is not clear what weighting to give the variant forms. In some features Gullah seems nearer to Caribbean basilect than Bahamian\textsuperscript{3}, although without any idea of frequencies this is difficult to judge. As a result of this confusion, when her data gives no evidence of a form found in Guyanese basilect, Bahamian Dialect and Black English\textsuperscript{4}, one wonders whether there exists a genuine difference between Gullah and related varieties or whether in fact the method of data collection may be deficient.

Since Gullah would seem to be in many aspects the variety closest to Bahamian, it is unfortunate that I have been able to make little use of existing studies of Gullah.

Descriptions of southern US White English are almost non-existent (one exception is Wolfram 1973); Indirect comments, indicative
that features such as perfective use of *done* appear there, suggest that this variety will reveal itself greatly influenced by the surrounding Black speech, as is the case in the Bahamas. The nature of this influence — such as whether *done* is used in a Creole completive sense or as a mere lexical substitute for auxiliary *have* — would be of interest to study in detail.

2.4. For the Caribbean Creoles the number of studies is still small; Bailey (1966) is the most comprehensive analysis of Jamaican Creole, but being an overview it gives little detail on any one aspect. Other writings on Jamaican such as LePage (1957, 1958) or Cassidy (1961) give briefer description of the syntax, although vocabulary is well covered in Cassidy and LePage (1967).

With Anglo-Creoles there has been some preoccupation with isolating the 'core Creole' (Bailey 1966); this has undoubtedly been more difficult than in some French Creoles or Sranan where a different superstrate language (in Surinam, Louisiana or Dominica) or political circumstances (in Haiti) have prevented the formation of a continuum. It was recognised that a continuum of varieties exists in Jamaica between the most non-SE variety and SE, and DeCamp (1971) attempted to characterize it. It is the detailed and documented characterization of not only the basilectal forms of Guyanese Creole but also of the Intermediate forms and their relationship with the acrolect which makes Bickerton (1973, 1975) valuable in the field of Afro-American language studies. I have taken Guyanese Creole for comparison with my data because the detailed description provided by Bickerton facilitates such comparison. I would expect that more detailed descriptions of other Caribbean Creoles would show Bahamian to have comparable
similarities to those found with Guyanese.

**Terminology**

3.1. I have called the speech variety I discuss the Bahamian Dialect (BD) mainly because this is what it is called in the Bahamas. This is not meant to imply that Black BD is not to be considered a creole. Although it is certainly the case that even the most non-Standard form of Bahamian speech is more easily understood by the naive SE speaker than a creole such as Haitian by a Frenchman, nevertheless there are many features which form an integral part of Black BD which are similar to those found in Anglo-Caribbean Creoles.

3.2. In discussing Black BD I shall make use of the terms basilect, mesolect and acrolect in the sense defined by Bickerton (1975):

"basilect will be used to refer to that variety of Guyanese Creole most distinct from English, acrolect to refer to educated Guyanese English (a variety which differs from other standard varieties of the language only in a few phonological details and a handful of lexical items) and mesolect to refer to all intermediate varieties." (p.24)

Bickerton shows that the Guyanese Creole mesolect can be better understood if it is seen in its place in the synchronic continuum between GC basilect and Standard English. Most of the basilectal features of Black BD are similar to GC mesolect; I shall try to show that Black BD basilect can also be better understood if it is postulated that it arose historically through decreolization from a variety similar to present-day GC basilect.

I have loosely labelled as basilectal, speech wherein the greatest number of non-Standard features are found. Inevitably, in the characterization of these it will sometimes seem as if I am seeking to
"unweave the 'pure' Creole syntax from the complex mass of material" which Bailey (1966) states as her aim for Jamaican Creole. In BD there is no integrated basilect used by some speakers with far less variation than further along the continuum. Individual features in the speech of one speaker at this level, (such as the lack of dummy subject) may be clear-cut and become variable in the mesolect but other features, (such as the use of does) are better defined in the mesolect. For many features there is variability at all levels. This may be due in part to the fact that I have samples from different geographical areas, with data obtained by different means; however variation can be seen for one speaker in one style at one time and thus must be considered an inherent part of the dialect.

3.3. It is not always clear what to label basilectal. Consider, for example, the second person plural pronoun. There are four possible forms --- unə, yinna, you-all and you. Since the first is close to basilectal Caribbean Creoles (see Bailey 1966) this is perhaps the most basilectal in BD. However, unə was recorded from one old speaker, BF100S, from a community not otherwise investigated and seems unknown elsewhere. The most basilectal form for most is yinna (/yɪnə/) apparently a synchresis of you or ye and unə; It is widely known, although in Nassau it is mainly used by the old and by pre-school children. However no speaker I have recorded uses it exclusively; instead, three basilectal speakers with sufficient output to provide clear evidence seem to divide SE you consistently in the following way: you = singular and impersonal; you-all = polite plural; yinna = plural to children and in insults. One can treat the politeness distinction as a style shift; however, when BM93R asks me:
(8) You-all live on the boat, eh? and within

a few minutes quotes his own speech to his children:

(9) I love all of yinna; now whether yinna love me...

He seem to be using the pronouns in the same way as Standard French 'tu' and 'vous', where such a distinction is regarded as part of the grammar. Both you-all and you are thus also basilectal in the sense that what is basilectal is the three-way distinction.

3.4. The acrolect is that form of speech used by educated Bahamians in formal situations; it is on the whole the same as the conversational SE which usually forms the basis of linguists' intuitions. I have not analyzed the BD acrolect in detail and will not discuss it in this study. However, there are certain characteristics which seem to mark it, such as greater frequency of past modals and an under-use of the present perfect (as compared for example to British conversational SE) but the differences are few in syntax. I believe that the differences in such areas as conversational conventions or in frequency of different sentence types such as clefts or non-restricted relatives are still evident in the acrolect, but there is a lack of material from other varieties of English with which this could be compared.
The Historical Background

The Bahamas is an archipelago between Florida to the north, Cuba to the south-east and Haiti to the southwest (see Appendix 1 for map). Save for two narrow deep-water channels the waters are shallow—between ten and forty feet deep—and strewn with rocks, small cays and reefs. The thirty or so habitable islands are low, seldom over 100 feet above sea level, the soil everywhere being a thin layer over limestone rock. There are no rivers, fresh water lying underground in a layer on the salt water. The average temperature ranges between 70 degrees in winter and 80 degrees in summer. Hurricanes though much discussed, are rare for any one island—New Providence last experienced one in 1965 and the one before that was in 1929.

A Bahamian island, San Salvador, was the first landfall made by Columbus. He claimed the archipelago for Spain, but, as has frequently happened since, these small barren islands were disregarded in favor of larger richer lands beyond. The major Spanish contribution to Bahamian history was the efficient removal of all her Lucayan Indian population by 1520. For the next century Spanish and then English sailors became familiar with her dangerous waters, but it was not until 1648 that the first colony was established, on Eleuthera, with settlers from Bermuda. Around 1670 New Providence was also settled, but with Spaniards firmly established in both Florida and Cuba, Nassau became a refuge for privateers and pirates—by 1713 about 1000 were estimated to be there at one time—with the result that the colony was several times ransacked by the Spaniards in retaliation. In 1717 a Royal Governor was sent from England and imposed some sort of law upon the
colony.

Between then and 1783 the population rose to about 2000 free inhabitants and 1000 slaves. The inhabitants bartered salt, turtle-shell, pineapples and dye-woods with north American colonies, the French or the pirates, who were still often unofficially welcomed. The American revolution brought first a brief period of prosperity as a privateering base and then an influx of Loyalists who chose British colonial power. Though the numbers who came - some 1000 Whites and 7000 slaves - may seem insignificant today, they altered the character of the colony. Large land grants were made, plantations on fourteen formerly unsettled islands established and the new Whites seem to have largely taken over the organization of local society. Craton notes that "of the 114 landowners listed, practically all their names could be found in a 1966 list of Bay Street merchants and members of the government." (1968).

The subsequent history of the Bahamas was not, however, that of a plantation economy. Within twenty years of the optimistic establishment of the cotton crop, the thin soil was worked out. Although the industry survived in some places until Emancipation, many plantations were abandoned, and those which remained diversified their crops to become almost completely self-sufficient, producing, incidentally, a more bearable life for the slaves than the monoculture of a vast sugar plantation such as those in Jamaica. Most of the Bahamian staples of the present-day Bahamian diet are mentioned in contemporary accounts, and the daily life of the slave will have differed little from that of some of today's subsistence farmers or from his poorer White contemporary.
The pattern of present-day settlement was largely established at this time. There were the larger plantations where Blacks far outnumbered Whites; when abandoned, areas of Black settlement resulted. There are settlements of poorer Whites mainly on several small islands off Abaco and Eleuthera; these had banded together for co-operation in fishing and boatbuilding enterprises, and farmed the adjacent mainland. Thus such islands as Spanish Wells and Man O' War are still all White, whereas the nearby mainland has Black settlements. In Nassau there was the usual fluid mixture found in any port; the final noteworthy additions to the Bahamian population were several boatloads of Africans seized by the British blockading the US coast and brought to the nearest port. These, free but destitute, were allotted small plots of land, the most favored being in the area 'over the hill' from White Nassau in the still mainly Black southern section of the city.

The fortunes of the Bahamas varied enormously in the nineteenth century. At first privateering in the French war, cotton and salt brought some income, but until the Civil War subsistence farming was the lot of nearly all ex-slaves and many Whites. The running of the blockade provided brief wealth, but this merely made the subsequent depression more unbearable and indeed, then, as so often afterwards, the profit made in Nassau went into foreign pockets and left with them. Other sources of income - conch shell for cameos, pineapples and sisal - had brief periods of success but not until sponge fishing was established in the 1890's (bringing some Greeks who maintain their ethnic identity today) was an export found that could withstand competition on the world market. However, it was another U.S.
misfortune which once again brought prosperity; during Prohibition the Bahamas was the natural center for bootlegging activities. Once more large profits were made by a few but all benefited from Customs revenue and inflated wages.

Nowadays the islands depend almost completely upon tourism. Last year there were about one and a quarter million tourists in a territory with a population of 200,000. Most of the food and all other supplies are imported and the economy, though more prosperous than most other territories in the Caribbean, is dangerously dependent upon the U.S. Despite a Black majority the government was run until 1967 by the White Bay Street merchants mentioned earlier, who had little motive for changing the status quo with improvements in education or agriculture. Since 1967 the P.L.P., a Black party, has been in power; foreign employers in banking and tourism have been induced to train Bahamians rather than importing expatriates, much money has been poured into education and the Black middle class has expanded greatly. At the same time, however, the government is bedevilled by problems such as one of the highest live birth rates in the world and the need to balance encouragement of foreign investment with retention of Bahamian control. Another social problem which could well become serious is the Haitians, possibly as many as 20,000, who have entered the country, often illegally, and are either settling in the bush or taking unskilled jobs for lower wages than Bahamians.

2. Prior to the influx of Loyalists in 1783, the 1000 or so slaves in Nassau and nearby probably shared the somewhat precarious fortunes of their more numerous masters under conditions making for
rapid decreolization. The Loyalists, however, brought plantation customs, and although their slaves also came from the States, they were plantation slaves; once in the Bahamas, plantations there, successful or not, resulted in groups of Blacks becoming settled in The Family Islands with relatively little contact with Nassau Blacks, whom, in any case, they out-numbered six to one. The core of the ancestors of the present Black population were thus from the States bringing with them the form of plantation Black English spoken at the time; it seems fairly certain that Black Bahamian English and US Black English have common origins.

The Black population was augmented only slowly by the purchase of slaves from abroad. There is record of some slave ships stopping on their way to Cuba, but most ships preferred to discharge their cargo at one port, and Nassau was too small and poor to absorb such numbers at one time. It seems likely that most of the slaves imported came piece-meal from other American territories rather than direct. However, relatively few slaves needed to be imported. Compared to plantation-rich colonies where vast profits were to be made by the inhuman overuse of young African males, the gentler pace of broad spectrum farming, and the better care taken of slaves when profits were slim resulted in better balanced slave communities and a natural increase of births over deaths in the Bahamas at a time when in other West Indian islands there was an annual decrease as high as 6% (Craton 1974).

There was probably then a smaller percentage of pidgin speakers in the Bahamas than elsewhere in the Caribbean until the beginning of the nineteenth century, when there was an influx of
Africans from the captured slave ships. These, however, unlike the East Indians in Guyana, were completely assimilated into the Bahamian population. It would seem that conditions were favorable for some elements of African culture to have survived and for some time, in fact, African working men's clubs existed and African recipes were known, but they are barely remembered today. On Andros folk tales with African elements are in circulation, but these can nearly all be found on the U.S. mainland also (Parson 1918). I know of no survival of African day-names such as documented for Gullah by Turner (1949). It is not possible to tell whether this group of late arrivals did slow down the gradual drift of decreolization of Black Bahamian Dialect, but they were probably assimilated into the Black community as easily as most immigrants where there is no ethnic or religious clash.

3. Of the population of 200,000, half lives in Nassau and another 30,000 in Freeport. The remainder lives in settlements mostly of a few hundred people scattered throughout the islands. In the Family Islands subsistence farming and fishing form the chief means of livelihood, supplemented by any craft-work that will sell; a few areas have tourist facilities which may radically alter the employment patterns of a settlement and there are a few attempts at larger-scale farming.

The population is roughly 90% Black of African origin and 10% White, though no official statistics on race are taken. Of the Blacks, an unknown percentage is Haitian, whose language I have not attempted to record. For this small population the numbers of expatriates living in Nassau, particularly in times of wealth from piracy, gun-running or tourism, has been relatively large. The Family Islands have
remained largely outside this, though their adult males were often the sailors carrying legal or illegal produce. Under the Colonial administration a settlement's commissioner and teacher were often foreigners, usually British.

Most Family Island settlements are Black; I have marked the White ones distinctively on the map in Appendix 1. In Abaco and Eleuthera geography maintains some separation of adjacent settlements, only in Long Island does land communication seem to have been established for some time. Most communication is with Nassau, with many Family Islanders visiting relatives in the capital on occasion.

In Nassau the two races are largely integrated in work and residence and somewhat separated socially. This often extends to schools, - the White children seldom attend public schools - churches, and middle-class employment, with the Whites tending to be found in commerce, the Blacks in the professions. This is a gross over-simplification, but such trends can result in there being far less close contact between the races than a casual observer might assume.

The closest contacts with the outside world have been with the U.K. and the south-eastern U.S. Commercial contacts with the latter and the former's administration of the colony have both had influence on the acrolect, so that the vocabulary, for example, has elements of both. Contact with the Anglo-Caribbean has been very slight; it was too far for the Inter-Island freight boat while the U.S., Cuba and Haiti were not. This situation seems to have existed from the beginning; there was little that the Bahamas could offer the Caribbean, or vice versa, which could not be better obtained from the US or the UK.
If social history, then, can explain the mixture of British and US vocabulary and phonetic elements in White speech and the acrolect, it leaves unexplained the close similarities of syntax in the Black Bahamian Dialect to that of Guyanese Creole at the other end of the Caribbean. In this study it will become clear that not only are similar or identical non-Standard syntactic distinctions made, but also that the same lexical items are taken from English to express these distinctions. Some of these same elements are also found in US Black English; this makes it probable that the plantation language brought by the Loyalist slaves to the Bahamas was a language very similar to present-day Guyanese Creole basilect. In the Bahamas this decreolized much less rapidly than on the mainland owing to isolation and a higher proportion of Blacks to Whites.

If this is so, it means that the problem of the similarity between Bahamian and Guyanese is pushed further back in time, and becomes a problem of the origin of Afro-American varieties generally. I do not attempt to enter into this discussion in this study, but simply to indicate the Bahamian facts as a further piece of the puzzle for others to fit together.
The Data

The data used in this study comes from approximately twenty-six hours of transcribed speech itself selected from about forty-five hours of tape. The data was recorded in Nassau and in the Family Island settlements marked on the map in Appendix 1. With limited time and resources it was not possible to obtain adequate samples from all ages, social positions and geographical areas. Since from my previous knowledge race and geographical differences seemed the most likely to be reflected in speech I concentrated on these as much as possible. Even so, settlements of possible importance in the south are not covered in this study.

It is unfortunate that I am not a native speaker of Black Bahamian Dialect. However, any student of non-Standard variety of a language has grown away from that variety to some extent whilst acquiring the education necessary to make the study, so that my deficiency may be less serious than it would seem by comparison with the best possible case. My examples are thus perforce of recorded conversation, not from my own intuition; my twelve years' residence has however given me much passive knowledge which has served as guide.

I have also not sought to tap the native intuitions of the interviewees or others by the elicitation of forms; I feel that it is uncertain whether such idealized examples and judgments are helpful when seeking to characterize a social continuum. Throughout the study the examples quoted are therefore from spontaneous recorded speech, not the product of elicitation or translation.

I selected older informants since they were on the whole the
most enthusiastic (hence least inhibited) speakers; they also provide
as basilectal a sample as anyone in the community except probably pre-
school children, whose speech poses particular problems of recording
and analysis.

The material not transcribed was either acrolectal (such as
several interviews within the White community) or very monitored (from
school-age children) or was of poorer quality than average (many of the
group recordings). The tapes not transcribed have been scanned for any
evidence which might contradict the conclusions I have come to in the
study.

In Appendix 2 I give details of the background of those
speakers who provided the best combination of quality and quantity of
fluent narrative and conversation for the statistical counts of copula
and negation in Chapters 2 and 3. I also give details of those speakers
whom I have quoted several times. However, for every quotation I give
the source by race, sex age and island of origin, for example:
B(lack) F(emale) 44 C(at island). Abbreviations for islands will be
found in Appendix 1.

Most of the tapes were obtained by my interviewing
individual members of the community. Since I was a unknown White
expatriate, sometimes meeting the informant for the first time, I
felt it necessary to increase the possibility that his or her speech
would be relatively informal and 'unmonitored'. I did this by
recording the second meeting rather than the first, and by asking to be
shown skills such as straw-work or cooking. I also obtained recordings
made by Black Bahamians. Surprisingly, when the interviewers were
adult, even where, for example, a man was interviewing his own uncle,
the recording situation or the interviewer's formality often resulted in more monitored speech than I achieved. Students also recorded for me; here far greater informality was achieved, the problem being poor quality of recording since they did not use lavaliere microphones. Finally, I made several recordings of conversations when I was not present and where the participants were not aware until afterwards that they had been recorded, though they had given permission in principle. The quality here was again mainly poor, so that I did not use such materials for statistical counts of features. These recordings provided some little check that there were not in fact more basilectal patterns in Bahamian speech that had not been obtained in the interviews.

In the interviews, most informants were self-conscious about being recorded, at least initially, and in the statistics this is perhaps reflected in a higher incidence of SE features than might have been obtained if surreptitious recordings had been used as the basis of the counts. However, SE features such as the use of don't with stative verbs are found in the most animated sections of surreptitious recordings, so the variation I report is certainly an integral part of the dialect, although the percentages reflect the more measured style used to outsiders and tape-recorders.
Note to Chapter I

1. The significance of this coding is explained in section 4 below.

2. See for example her section (pp. 144-7) on WH-questions where the only non-SE feature is lack of inversion of AUX and of do-support but where only her examples make this clear, not her rule.

3. For example in the use of for as infinitive marker:
   (a) My mother never tell me for fight. (p. 172)
       or DE = /dɛ/ to mark present progressive:
   (b) I still DE look. (p. 66)

   These are very rare in BD but she presents them as normal in Gullah.

4. For example different negators for statives and non-statives, see Chapter III; or lack of dummy subjects, Chapter IV.

5. The information in this section is adapted from Craton (1968).
CHAPTER II

COPULA
Introduction

1.1. The copula has been analysed in detail for Black English (BE) by Labov (1969b) and for Guyanese Creole (GC) by Bickerton (1973). In the following section I will analyse BD copula and compare this with these two analyses.

Labov (1969b:718) postulates an underlying copula for BE (or at least one inserted in deep structure) which would be identical to that required for Standard English; this copula would be variably contracted and deleted by phonological rules whose constraints are marginally grammatical but largely phonological (see his p.748). Contraction in White conversational speech and BE contraction and deletion are viewed as fundamentally similar processes, the BE difference being in the addition of a few rules near the end of the phonological component.

Bickerton (1973) views the copula of the GC mesolect as a series of transitions between the copula system of the basilect and that of the acrolect. According to Bickerton (p.649), the GC basilect has three different methods of handling sentences which all have the verb be in the acrolect (zero before adjectives, because in the basilect these are stative verbs; a before NP complement and in continuatives; de for locative and existential) the underlying forms will be different from those in SE. The output of GC mesolectal speakers can best be accounted for by postulating grammars wherein reanalysis of more basilectal forms is made, so that use of SE forms is found in a gradually increasing number of contexts as the speech of individuals becomes more acrolectal. The mesolect can thus only be understood
by reference to the basilect as well as to the acrolect.

1.2. As the tables in this section will show, the data from BBD show basic similarities to data from both BE (see tables Labov 1969b: 735) and mesolectal GC (Bickerton 1973 p.652), although BBD seems nearer to BE in the amount of variation and in the pervasiveness of zero in most environments. I hope to show, however that, as distinct from Black English, phonological rules, whilst sufficient to account for the contraction of the copula, as in SE, cannot account for the wide differences in copula presence among the various syntactic environments. Alternative explanations can be found for much of the irregularity, and motivation for this irregularity given by postulating that BBD lies on a historical continuum linking an earlier stage of the language (very similar to present-day basilectal GC) with the acrolect and SE.

1.3. In Tables 1 and 2 I have tabulated the occurrence of parts of the verb be, the locative de and zero as they occur in past and non-past copula environments. I include, as Labov (1969) does, in addition to the copula proper, the environments before present participle (V ing) and 'going to' (go in BBD). The data are taken from eight basilectal speakers whose output was representative and sufficient to provide several examples of each type of copula sentence. In Tables 3 and 4 I give for comparison a similar analysis of the outputs of a Black Nassau teenager, a White couple from a mixed community and a White from an all-White community. In these tables I have omitted negatives, discussed in Chapter III, and 'going to' (go in BBD).
TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES OF OCCURRENCE OF NON-PAST COPULA IN DATA FROM EIGHT BASILECTAL SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is (am, are)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(does) be</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers

+NP = before noun-phrase  30  28  95  53  142  100
+PP = before past participle  310  3  57  10  2  1
+PA = before predicate adjective  0  0  0  21  0  0
+Loc = before locative expression  3  1  2  6  1  0
+Ving = before present participle  0  0  4  9  1  0
+G = before 'going to'

Totals  343  32  158  99  146  101
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(does be</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 1 for abbreviations

Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 132 75 89 144 120 19
TABLE 3
PERCENTAGES OF OCCURRENCE OF SURFACE NON-PAST COPULA IN DATA FROM FOUR MESOLECTAL SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+V'ing</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(am, are)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(does) be</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 1 for abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 10 40 21 44 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 7 39 21 12 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 3 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154 17 80 49 57 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**PERCENTAGES OF OCCURRENCE OF SURFACE PAST COPULA IN DATA FROM FOUR MESOLECTAL SPEAKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See Table 1 for abbreviations**

### Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|     | 88 | 24 | 59 | 47 | 39 | 8 |


excluded sentences where the subject ends in a final sibilant or fricative, the commonest being the pronoun this; contraction of /lz/ to /z/ after these final consonants would give rise to such impossible BD clusters as /sz/, /cz/, leading to assimilation. Since I wish to discuss contraction versus deletion of the copula I have preferred to omit an environment that so strongly favors deletion.

Comparison with Labov 1969

2.1. It is not completely clear what Labov includes in the data which form the basis for his variable rules. I am assuming that he excludes the negative and non-finite as I have, and also past, which I tabulate separately. He states that he "will focus upon the quantitative analysis of the forms of is in the environments 1 - 12" (1969b:729). However, this would exclude both am and are, although his rules on page 748 include both of these, and are but not am must be presumed deleted in the "environments 1 - 12" for examples such as:

(1) We on tape. (Labov's example (6):717)

Am definitely seems excluded from his analysis since it is apparently not deleted. He states:

In the first person, the form I'm is regularly found:

(33) I'm tired Jeanette.
(34) I'm not no strong drinker.

This form occurs with overwhelming frequency, despite the fact that it is possible to find rare instances of plain I, I's, or even I'm is. If the task of writing a grammar for a non-standard speech community is that of finding the regular linguistic patterns, we must conclude that the form I'm which occurs in well over 99% of the cases, represents the pattern here. (1969b:719)
In the tables of Bahamian data I have included with *is* the rare examples of *am* and *are* (ten altogether, for the basilectal speakers of Table 1) and will refer to the non-past inflected-*be* forms collectively as *is*, in part as a convenient means of avoiding confusion with uninflected *be* and in part because for most of the informants it is the only form which is used even in non-third-persons environments, as in:

(2) *You's a parasite!* (BM46R)

(3) *Sister, all of we is pigeon tonight.* (BF75R) = we are all pigeons.

(4) *Set of rattlers, that's all they is.* (BF32R)

In Table 5 below I summarize the copulas which appear where SE would require *am* or *are*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(I)s</th>
<th>(a)m</th>
<th>(I)s</th>
<th>(a)re</th>
<th>(I)s</th>
<th>(a)re</th>
<th>(I)s</th>
<th>(a)re</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 basillectal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

The ten basilectal examples of *am* and *are* are produced by only three of the eight speakers; furthermore, six sentences are in religious context, which often calls forth from BBD speakers an ornate SE style full of Biblical phrases; these inflected-*be* examples are accompanied by SE question inversion in two cases, another characteristic of style-shift:

(5) *Are you prepared* to meet your God? (BM93R)

(6) *Miss F-, are you right* with God? (BM93R)
and there are two examples of quotations of an SE speaker, such as:

(7) Mr C- say.... I'm looking for P-. (BF75R)

The frequent use in BBD of full or contracted is for first person copula as in:

(8) How old you think I is? (BF87A)

(9) I's the damn boss! (BF44C)

thus constitute a major difference from Black English. The quotation from Labov(page 31 above) seems to indicate that am or 'm appear in environments where is and are usually deleted (such as before 'gonna') and such evidence does make it more plausible for deletion, as well as contraction, to be by phonological rather than syntactic rule. The surfacing of one of the three contracted forms /m/ and not /z/ or /ə/ could be explained by their different phonetic character - final nasal is the most stable in BE - more easily than by syntactic difference between them. In BBD however a copula, either is or am, appears no more frequently after I than elsewhere.

I have included in the tables examples with it, that and what as subjects. It seems that these are also excluded from Labov's data since they are not in the environments specified; he also says:

The cases of I's, th's and wha's provide other examples in which the copula is frequently represented:

(35) I's a real light yellow color.

these forms [iːs], [ðə s], and [wəs] are again found in the great majority of cases. (1969b:719)

As he explains, he wishes to exclude environments where is is not deleted since this would obscure important constraints on the
variable rule; however, he also says that it's, that's and what's "assume considerable significance for the final statement of the rule." (p.719)

This significance lies in the fact that since, in Black English, there is contraction but no deletion in such cases, conditions upon deletion must be such as to prevent it after an underlying final /t/.

However, in my BD data, after it and that the copula is present before a noun phrase but absent elsewhere in a pattern similar to other pronoun subjects (I discuss a class of exceptions with that's before +PA in section 3.4. below):

(10) That's the same one you was telling me about? (BF77H)
(11) It's election day now.... (BF32R)
(12) That quite enough for B-. (BF32R)
(13) Yea, it fix. It moving, it working. (BF16N)
(14) That go finish directly. (BF19N)

Since the significance of it and that subjects for Labov lies in the conditions for deletion, rather than in determining the ordering of contraction and deletion, my inclusion of it and that subject sentences in the tables does not vitiate comparison of Black English and BD data. There seems to be a clear difference between the behavior of the copula in the two varieties at this point.

Other categories excluded by Labov (1969), such as short answers and tag questions, are rare in BBD and I have no examples in the data under analysis. The remaining environments can be grouped together as those where SE cannot contract the copula (as discussed
in Zwicky 1970). In BBD as in BE copula is nearly always present in such environments and like SE cannot be contracted. From my Table 1 the numbers of \textit{is} involved are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Zwicky points out, contraction of inflected \textit{be} is not possible when material following it has been moved or deleted by transformation. This occurs in several types of sentence: direct or indirect questions:

(15) Where \textit{J- is}? (BF32R)

(16) Let me see how broad your back \textit{is}. (BF32R)

or pseudocleft:

(18) All she could do after that \textit{is} say she spite me. (BF32R)

In BBD the verb may be similarly 'exposed' by becoming sentence-initial, where there is then no rule inserting a dummy subject. Here too the copula is present and not contracted. Such examples are created by extraposition:

(19) \textit{Is} best for B- to have \textit{m} here on R.I. (BF32R)

or in existentials:

(20) \textit{Is} only one big Boss, you know. (BF44C)

Labov uses environments such as these, in which inflected copula appears on the surface, as evidence for an underlying copula for all environments. However, it would be possible for \textit{is} to be inserted by transformation in just these environments where the VP slot,
or AUX, had become clause-initial or final as a result of transformation. Some marking of these environments as a group is required for all varieties of English to prevent their undergoing later contraction.

**Contraction and Deletion**

3.1. In Tables 6 to 9 I give an analysis of each individual's output, for both basilectal and mesolectal speakers, contrasting *is* and *was* with zero and dividing *is* into full and contracted forms. I include *am* and *are*, also *is* after *it* what and *that* but exclude the stressed and non-reducible forms discussed immediately above. It can be seen that, as opposed to Guyanese Creole mesolectal data, variation is still prevalent at the level of the individual. Grammatical conditioning on deletion seems to carry far more weight than in BE; although the relative importance of the following environment is the same as in Labov's data - deletion is less likely before NP complement than before PA and so on - his subjects delete almost half the copulas before NP, while still only deleting about 80% before Vng. This contrasts with BBD 89% occurrence before NP and 99% deletion before Vng.

Labov (1969) orders deletion after contraction and, following his rules, deletion only occurs in environments where contraction is found. In BBD basilect and most of the mesolect this is not the case. Of the contracted forms shown in Table 6 all but three are after one-word personal pronouns and *that*, see (2)-(4) and (9) above or:

(21) Old J- he's a joke. (BF50R)
### Table 6

**OCCURRENCES OF NON-PAST FULL, CONTRACTED AND DELETED COPULA FOR EIGHT BASILECTAL SPEAKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF32R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF44C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF87A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF71A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM78R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF75R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM93R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF64N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 38 221 30 2 28 6 30 95 4 1 53 1 1 142 1 100

**Percentages** 13 76 11 6 3 90 5 23 72 7 2 91 1 1 99 1 99

F = **full**  C = **contracted**  D = **deleted**
TABLE 7
OCCURRENCES OF PAST FULL, CONTRACTED AND DELETED COPULA FOR EIGHT BASILECTAL SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF32R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF44C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF87A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF71A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM78R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF75R</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM93R</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF64N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ages</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = full  C = contracted  D = deleted
TABLES 8 & 9

OCCURRENCES OF NON-PAST AND PAST COPULA FOR FOUR MESOLECTAL SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-PAST</th>
<th>+NP</th>
<th>+PP</th>
<th>+PA</th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th>+G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F C D</td>
<td>F C D</td>
<td>F C D</td>
<td>F C D</td>
<td>F C D</td>
<td>F C D</td>
<td>F C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF19N</td>
<td>4 18 2</td>
<td>- - 3</td>
<td>3 8 17 1 3 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 24</td>
<td>- - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF80L</td>
<td>3 14 6</td>
<td>- 1 4</td>
<td>- 3 7</td>
<td>- 2 - 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM80L</td>
<td>5 27 2</td>
<td>- 1 1</td>
<td>1 4 5 2 1 6</td>
<td>- 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM84M</td>
<td>9 53 -</td>
<td>2 4 2</td>
<td>2 18 11 5 9</td>
<td>- - 5</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21 112 10</td>
<td>2 6 10</td>
<td>6 33 40</td>
<td>8 13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>- 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ages</td>
<td>15 78 7</td>
<td>11 33 55</td>
<td>8 42 50</td>
<td>19 31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>- 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAST

| BF19N    | 5 - - 5 | - 1 | 17 | - - 4 | - 2 | 8 | - - 1 | - |
| WF80L    | 4 - - 1 | - 1 | 1 | - - 3 | - - 4 | - - 1 | - |
| WM80L    | 15 - - 2 | - 1 | 3 | - - 6 | - - 4 | - - - | - |
| WM84M    | 59 - 1 11 | - 35 | - 2 22 | - - 17 | 1 6 | - |
| Totals   | 83 - 1 19 | - 3 56 | 2 35 | - 2 33 | - 1 8 | - |
| %ages    | 99 - 1 86 | - 14 96 | 4 95 | - 5 97 | - 3 100 | - |

F = full  C = contracted  D = Figures for 'non-reducible' non-past copula not included
(22) I guess you done tell her say l's your papa. (BF32R)

(23) *That's* who he is. (BF32R)

The three exceptions are two examples of contraction after a proper noun ending in -I, e.g.:

(24) *Baldy's* a little girl. (BF32R)

and one of contraction after a complex NP subject, although this ends in a personal pronoun:

(25) *That same hat I got now what I tell you's* my sun hat, that's a Haitian hat. (BF75R)

Neither of these examples is typical; there are far more examples of such proper nouns having full copula after them:

(27) *Chuckie is* a nice little boy. (BF19N)

and sentences with complex NP subjects nearly always have pronoun copy between that NP and the verb. An inspection of other basilectal data besides these eight speakers shows the same limitations upon contractions as with these; the only contraction not after personal pronoun is a further example after a one-word noun ending in -I:

(28) but *chickcharney's* a funny boy. (BM74A) (chickcharneys are goblins who live in pine trees.)

Other pronouns do not permit contractions, either simple or complex:

(29) I mean the young womens-dem now what is womens they ain't got no God in them. (BF87A)

(30) *Yours is* yours and *mine is* mine. (BM93R)

(31) *One is* eighteen and one is sixteen. (BF34A)

(32) *You-own is* boys? (BM78R) = yours are boys?

(33) *The big one is* lemon. (BF71A)
Most of them is our grandchildren. (WM80L)

neither is it only the phonetic shape of the personal pronouns which permits contraction, since contraction is not permitted even where the word preceding the copula is monosyllabic ending in a tense vowel, or non-tense +/t/:

My best bet now is high tide. (BM46R)

Raccoon Cay (/ke/) is eight miles. (BM78R)

Plait is not a hard work. (WF80L)

A simplified rule for contraction would thus be:

That is, a vowel is lost when initial in the copula following either a pronoun ending in /t/ or a tense stressed vowel, or a polysyllable noun ending in an unstressed vowel.

The last environment is perhaps not part of the grammar for most basilectal speakers.

In the data of the mesolectal speakers of Table 8 the above
The environment for BBD contraction is thus much more limited than for Black English. In Labov's (1969) data there is variable contraction after consonants and near categorical contraction after vowels and pronoun. The BBD basilectal speakers of Table 6 have still only optional contraction after personal pronouns; of the full forms in this table nine occur after I, he, she, we, you or they compared with forty-eight contracted forms. Once optional contraction after non-pronouns begins as with WM84M there is categorical contraction after pronouns.

Deletion in BBD is not limited in the way that contraction is, by the preceding phonological or syntactic environment. Labov tabulated his data to show that copula realization was affected by whether a noun or pronoun preceded. In Table 10 below I give the totals from Table 6 (basilectal speakers) reanalysed in this way. Figures in brackets represent deletion occurring after NP subjects ending in non-stressed /i/ and after pronoun subjects after which contraction is not allowed. Even if contraction is possible in the community as a whole after non-stressed /i/ it can be
Table 10

seen that 67 deletions after nouns and 37 after pronouns occur in phonological environments where contraction cannot occur in BBD. Examples are:

(38) *His* daddy name R-o- and his mother name is S-. (BF71A)
(39) She's a *twlnj* boy dead and the girl *living*. (BF44C)
(40) S- Smith *suppose* to run for the House? (BF32R)
(41) Some *people* black, some clear. (BF44C)
(42) N- and Turo coming to the dock now; M- and Keith behind. (BF32R)
(43) Alison *ga* take a little while. (BF32R)
(44) You know when they get soda-water and beer and thing; *them* the kind of bottle you sell. (BM78R)
(45) *One-one* here now. (BF44C) = Just one Is here now.
(46) Alison *own doing* right now. (BF32R) = Alison's is being done right now.
(47) *This here* *ga* record, eh? (BF44C) = This is going to be recorded, isn't it?

Comparison of these data with Labov (1969)'s Black English data shows a significant difference in frequency of deletion versus
contraction. In his data not only contraction but also deletion is more than twice as likely to occur after a pronoun than after a noun subject. This is not the case with BBD. I repeat below the percentages from Table 10, contrasting them with percentages taken from Labov (1969 Table 1. p. 730) for occurrence of copula in Black English 'group style' after NP and Pro:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP-</td>
<td>Pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

As the percentages show, deletion in BBD is in fact slightly higher after nouns; Labov's ordering of deletion following contraction, with the same phonological and grammatical constraints operating twice, so that the favorable environment of preceding pronoun has a double effect does not operated in BBD. Most deletions after nouns and some after pronouns would be left unaccounted for. BBD contraction seems to be a phonological rule whose syntactic conditioning is limited to that of the preceding environment which for most speakers must be a pronoun. This seems to operate whatever the following environment.

It is obviously some aspect of the following grammatical environment rather than phonological conditioning which causes deletion. If there is postulated an underlying is for all non-past
positive environments, it will have to be deleted by syntactic transformation, not phonological rule.

**Comparison with Guyanese Creole**

3.1. From the preceding analysis it is apparent that Black BD has zero in most non-past positive environments where SE has finite *be*. There are other languages where a similar situation exists, for example in Russian where a copula surfaces in negation, past, non-finite and 'exposed' positions but not non-past positive (Ferguson 1971). For such languages I do not think that a phonological deletion would be suggested; there could either be an deep structure COPULA which is lexically realized as zero in the appropriate context or, following Bach (1967) the copula would not be inserted transformationally if tense or negation have not been selected (p.479).

The case of BBD is different in that one of the copula environments, that before +NP complement, has surface copula in non-past positive contexts in the vast majority of cases. In this it is similar to Haitian Creole which uses *sé* as copula before NP complement but zero before adjectives and phrases of location:

(48) *Li sé journalist.* = He is a journalist.
(49) *Li kontan.* = He is pleased.
(50) *Li nan machin-nan.* = He is in the car. (adapted from Valdman 1970)

These have the same negation and past markers:

(48') *Li pa journalist.* = He is not a journalist.
(48") *Li tô journalist.* = He was a journalist.
(49') *Li pa kontan.* = He is not pleased.
(49") *Li tô kontan.* = He was pleased.
It seems that the same alternatives exist for the zero forms in Haitian Creole and BBD as for Russian; however in the case of the first two there could not be the same copula for all environments. Whether viewed as present in deep structure or inserted transformationally, the environment +NP would have to be differently marked — perhaps with a feature [+equative] — from the attributive and locative meanings so that lexical insertion of is occurs only before +NP.

In the case of the Guyanese Creole basilect there does not seem to be a single copula category. Whereas in Haitian and BBD the differences are neutralized in past or negative this is not so in GC; the equative marker a becomes na-a under negation, bina for [+anterior]; locative de becomes na de and bin de. To account for such forms one might well postulate underlying abstract predicates EQUATIVE, LOCATIVE etc. rather than an overall copula, since there are no basilectal rules which mention COPULA as a unit.

In GC decreolization the two environments for a, the equative copula and the continuative-habitual marker, change at an earlier stage than the locative de or adjectival contexts; the BBD basilectal situation is very like this mesolectal GC stage where equative a has become is and continuative a has become -ing. The pull of the SE be forms in all these contexts, including where the basilectal de still exists, causes a little uncertainty at this stage of decreolization; there is probably a unifying feature [+copula] for the copula contexts but there must also be differentiating markers so that is can be inserted in nearly all equative contexts but seldom elsewhere.
I will now examine each of the environments separately to show that much of the variation between copula presence and absence in both past and non-past contexts can in fact be accounted for without recourse to variable rules of percentage frequency of occurrence.

3.2. From Tables 7 and 9 it can be seen that the copula is usually realized in past environments. It is, however, less usually omitted before +NP than elsewhere. This could be accounted for by proposing that the equative copula has a distinguishing feature favoring lexical insertion, as I discussed above. Since the past tense marker is usually also realized, the +NP environment would have two features favoring a surface copula whereas other past environments would have only one.

The question presents itself as to why there should be any deletions at all before +NP if the underlying structure is presumed to require one. In the present tense, although is, especially after contraction, is not a phonetically salient form, the deletions do not seem to be phonologically conditioned although this is possible, since nearly all are after pronouns that permit contraction. However, constraints would have to be different from those proposed by Labov (1969) where a preceding vowel favors contraction but not deletion. Moreover, there are several examples where there is also a following vowel; in English in general such an environment:

(51) I a old woman. (BF32R)
(52) I about the only one on R.I..... (BM93R)
(53) The teacher tell me he one of the backward ones. (BF19N)

would not favor deletion of an intervocalic consonant,
so that a phonological rule of deletion would hardly begin in the community in one of the less likely environments.

Seven of the omissions of is before +NP are where context would require non-reducible is, largely by BF32R:

(54) All we coulda hear____ say he in Exuma. (BF32R) = ...hear is that...

(55) Who that? I ain't know who that is. (BF32R)

The omission from (55), which is quite common, is presumably sentence-final, since BBD does not have inversion for questions: such omission is possible after that, as in Where that? but not after personal pronouns.

Several omissions occur in a type of complex sentence which has the form of an equative sentence but where the semantic content may cause confusion. Sentences such as:

(56) That's how I does plant. (BF44C)

(57) That's where he live, right there. (BF71A)

have most probably an underlying structure:

```
S
   /   
That be NP
      /  
     NP  S
       |  the way
       I does plant in that way
```

with a relative clause on the NP complement.

However they are semantically nearer to manner adverb (which I have grouped with +PA) or locative; this may account for omissions such as:

(58) Yea, that where we had to go for water. (BF75R)

(59) _what T- get vex with U- for. (BF32R)

Variability in +NP environment is to be expected
In a continuum situation. There is a basilectal distinction of copula type, but as speakers move away from this they move towards an acrolect, of which they all have at least passive knowledge, where all these copula environments require the same verb, and are treated as a unit. Thus decreolization blurs the distinction between +NP and elsewhere, making possible an occasional deletion of a verb which seems to be underlying both in basilectal BBD and in SE.

3.3. The decision as to what to label a past participle is to some extent arbitrary. I have called items past participles if they are such in SE; even there however items such as tired, surprised or vexed are probably more common than the corresponding active verbs, and in BBD I have no evidence of the active equivalents. There is, however, no clear-cut distinction one can make between items such as these and others, such as finish, cut and paint(ed), where the active equivalent is common in BBD.

The get passive in BBD as in SE refers only to the performance of the action:

(60) ... after the Cuba trade and Haiti trade get cut off. (BF75R)

In SE the be passive can refer either to the activity or to the resultant state, as in:

'The dress was finished at 2 p.m. and I checked it was finished.'

In BD many transitive verbs can be used in a 'middle' sense; that is, they can take as subject not only the agent of the activity as usual but optionally the patient. These then become an equivalent to the 'activity' passive of SE:
(61) Maimai does make out of split peas. (BF83N) = Maimai is made...  

(62) Soldier crab could eat. (BF44C) = ...can be eaten.  

(63) My wife she in Nassau. She expecting on this same mail. (BM78R) = she is expected on the next boat.  

The above examples, because of tense and modal markers, are obviously full verbs. However, because the passive is always stative, stem form alone can be used for non-past; there is thus no difference in form from the past participle, which is nearly always also indistinguishable from the stem form, and which in non-past does not usually have a copula form preceding it. I have thus excluded from the tables stem-forms where the activity rather than the state is being referred to, such as:  

(64) Agiri make out of grits. (BF83N) = is made  

(65) All of this throw away. (BF51R) = is thrown  

even though they correspond to SE passive. Note that if these had been included, the only result would have been an increase in the percentage of zero copula before +PP, which would not affect the conclusions reached here.  

Non-past copula before past participle seldom appears amongst the eight basilectal speakers; of the three examples, one is in the religious style discussed in section 2.2, above (example 4) another might be an SE phrase learnt as such:  

(66) ...It's registered under the Bahamian flag. (BF75R)  

but the third seems to have no rationale for copula:  

(67) "The work is finish over here!" (BM93R) - quoting what he said on the death of his father.  

In the past tense, the environment +PP is the only
one where zero occurs more frequently than was. Rather than being
a peculiarity of the environment as a whole, closer inspection
reveals that much of this is in fact due to lack of was or bin before
one lexical item born amounting to 25 of the 34 instances of zero+PP.
It is doubtful that one lexical item should be given such a weighting,
particularly when this item is idiosyncratic in SE also. In fact
born seems to be, for all speakers except (BF75R), a full verb, most
commonly used with the patient as subject, as in the examples
classified as participle:

(68) I born in 1897... (WM80L)

but appearing also as the non-stative:

(69) I's the oldest child Mamma born. (BF44C)

in the 'middle' sense, it appears with tense marker did:

(70) Well, they born the time I did born, some of them couldn’t bin
living. (BM74A) = If they had been born when I was born...

Born was included as a past participle not because it is
such in SE; this would not be sufficient, as several BBD stem-forms
derive from SE past or participle (e.g. left, lost, broke) but because
BF75R uses was before it:

(71) I was born on T- Street. (BF75R)

although she also omits was:

(72) He born, they born in Nassau. (BF75R)

Numbers are too small for good generalizations to be made
about other lexical items. However, some of the variation in the
table in the past tense is almost certainly caused by individual
differences in the assignment of lexical items to 'verbal' rather than
'participal' categories. A good example of this is the item marry.
Was marry in BBD refers to the resultant state; unlike SE where it can be the activity:

(73) I was marry until I had my 1st child before she dead. (BF44C)

But after both bin and zero either activity or state can be referred to:

(74) I bin marry twice. (BF87A)
(75) I bin marry bout fifty years, you know. (WM80L)
(76) And then I marry. I marry now fifty-odd years.... (BM78R)

I have, perhaps arbitrarily, omitted from the tabulation any 0marry where the context indicated past punctual context, while including those with -punctual reference:

(77) English lady bin here Miss H-. Miss H-marry to a German man (BM78R)

One further item name which I have included in the past participle category causes no irregularity in the tabulation, but is of interest because sentence such as:

(78) What the place name? (BF75R) = What is the place called?

is ambiguous between a +NP and +PP interpretation, that is, between 'What is the name of the place?' and 'What is the place named?' Clear examples exist in my data of name both as NP:

(79) His daddy name R- D- and his mother name is S-. (BF71A)

and as PP:

(80) He girlfriend were name D-. (BF32R)

and there is no evidence, such as that from negative or tense aspect markers, to suggest that name may also be a stative verb. I have assigned doubtful cases such as (78) above to +PP category, since clear examples of these are more numerous in the data than NP
examples. Examples such as:

(81) They name by the oldest dead. (BF64N) = They are named after the oldest inhabitants.

(82) but he name W-S-. (BF87A)

remain ambiguous since he and they can be possessive adjectives as well as subject pronouns.

The variation in the +PP category, then, seems to be almost certainly a result of the idiosyncrasies of lexical items and differing treatment of these amongst BBD speakers. It may be that the analysis of more data would reveal regularities which are obscured at present.

3.4. With predicate adjectives, I have again taken items which are adjectives in SE, but this seems valid on the whole for BD also. These items are not stative verbs in the BBD system, as they are in the GC basilect (see Bickerton 1973 p.648); they take -er for comparative:

(83) Some darker than others....some whiter then others...(BM78R)

and was as a past marker:

(84) He just buy them up cos they was cheap. (BF32R)

In the data established only two items which I have treated as adjectives may well be verbs; rotten seems to be used for both 'rot' and 'rotten' in BD, although the BBD example is ambiguous:

(85) He ain't care If all the fish rotten. (BF32R)= Is rotten or rots.

but elsewhere I have:

(86) My nose gonna rotten right off. (WF5M)

(87) When that comes out, it'll be when it's cut out or burnt out or rottens out. (WM54M)
Dead is much more frequent in the data; in the present tense all 14 examples lack is copula, leaving them ambiguous between copula +PA and verb. However there is one example of be dead:

(88) Oh he be dead anyway. (BM93R)

In the past, of eight examples only one has copula was, again from BF75R:

(89) But it was dead. Had it dead all that time. (BF75R)

It may be that dead is both adjective, as in (88) and (89), and an alternative to die (which is also found) as in:

(90) That's what she tell me the night when she dead. (BM78R)

From the Tables it might appear that a difficulty with postulating no underlying copula except before +NP is the large number of surface copulas in the environment +PA. However of the thirty unstressed copulas before +PA twenty-three occur in what are probably set phrases:

that's right - 16
that's all right - 2
that's O.K. - 3
that's true - 2

since these are probably generated as clichés, rather than with internal structure, I do not think that they constitute proof by themselves of underlying copula for the +PA environment as a whole.

Of the remaining basilectal examples two are expressions of age and one of price, e.g.:

(91) cos she's twelve years old. (BF71A)

(92) In my boy days meat was sixpence a pound...but now today is 65¢ a pound. (BM93R)

These are variable both in the community and in the speech
of some individuals, so that BF71A also omits copula and a mesolectal
speaker has both:

(93) I think he bout two months now. (BF71A) - cf. (91)

(94) If you 49 this year and next year say you're 48 and you'll
never get old. (WM84M)

These expressions, like those of distance which I have entered
under locative have the form NP -- NP. If the copula is lexically
inserted or not dependent upon the form as well as the semantic content
this could explain the variation of these expressions which are
equative in form but attributive in meaning.

The remaining four examples of non-past copula presence
before +PA seem to have no common lexical, syntactic or phonological
characteristics to distinguish these from the overwhelming number in
which there is no copula. In the past tense, except for dead discussed
above, deletion seems to be mainly an individual characteristic -
BF75R contributes six of the nine examples apart from dead --
rather than grammatical or phonological. Copula presence in the
environment, like absence before +NP, seems to be attributable to
the pull of the SE form toward treating all these categories
similarly, but it does not seem as though there is a basilectal rule,
even variable, of copula insertion here.

In the mesolect this category is the most variable;
although there are no phonological regularities amongst those forms
where copula appears, for example:

(95) ...cos he is too cruel.... (BF19n)

(96) He too dumb. (BF19N)

(97) But It's too close to the water. The mouth of it too close
to the water. (WM80L)
a variable rule could be inserted for speakers such as WM84M whose grammar allows contraction before consonants. However, even for this speaker the variation seems to be influenced by the syntax; age expressions are variable (see example 94) and measurement similarly:

(98) Some of them's headboards is seven feet. (WM84M)
(99) They go down in water that's five fathoms deep. (WM80L)

Labov does not discuss these more specific categories such as age or price nor items such as dead or born. It would be of interest to ascertain whether within his main category of +PA the frequency of occurrence of copula in such environments departed significantly from the overall frequency, as it does in BD, in other words, that lexical or semantic considerations might outweigh structural or phonological ones.

The assumption that BBD basilect does not have underlying copula insertion before +PA which would then have to be deleted by syntactic transformation in most instances can be accounted for historically by postulating an earlier stage in the language in which, as in present-day Guyanese Creole basilect, the adjective was a stative verb. The appearance of the copula in expressions of age, price etc. would be explained since these do not have typical predicate adjective structure. The acquisition of more acrolectal elements is a gradual learning through time and social ranking; thus common SE expressions such as that's O.K. will be acquired before the +PA environment as a whole is restructured to acquire a copula.

3.5. Apart from stressed copula is there are only a few examples of is +Loc. Two examples occur before expressions of distance:
for example:

(100) **Raccoon Cay is eight miles.** (BM78R)

since expressions of distance also occur without *is*:

(101) **Lowe Sound bout seven miles** that way. (BF87A)

there is uncertainty in the community over this category as discussed for age etc. above; I do not have enough data to ascertain whether some individuals may have categorical insertion or omission in these contexts.

Both the remaining +Loc sentences have *that* as subject pronoun, for example:

(102) Then St. Anne Society *that's on the parade*. (BF64N)

The unmotivated copula here may well be because when *that* is subject of a copula-type sentence it nearly always does have a copula following, since the vast majority are before +NP or in the set expressions such as *that's right*. That this also creates confusion as to the form of the subject pronoun is further seen in the occasional appearance of /dæs/ as subject:

(103) *That's was we home.* *That's Papa's place he did buy.* (BF87A)

However, more important in +Loc environment than the few examples of *is* are substantial numbers of sentences with *de, be, does, be* and, in the past, *bin*. I discuss *be* and *bin* in section 3 below since these affect other environments. *De* is found only in +Loc context; it is the same phonetically as GC basilectal copula before +Loc, although I understand (Bickerton, personal communication) that GC *de* is found with only non-past reference, *bin de*, which I have not found in BBD,

9 being used for past.
The frequency of occurrence of de for the eight basilectal speakers of Table 1 (there is no occurrence in the data of Table 2) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BF32R</th>
<th>BF44C</th>
<th>BF87A</th>
<th>BF71A</th>
<th>BM78R</th>
<th>BF75R</th>
<th>BM93R</th>
<th>BF64N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Past</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

This frequency is low; even those speakers who provide several clear cases in the present, such as BF32R and BM78R:

(104) I de here every night...You going sitting up there all hours till 10 11 o'clock...(BF32R)

(105) Two on am de here now. (BM78R)

or in the past:

(106) And so when he come, he bin in the room bathing...he de in the room bathing, I say....(BF32R)

far more frequently have zero+Loc in the present and was or bin +Loc in the past. Furthermore, because of phonological identity of de with the adverb there and their occurrence in similar sentences, it is not always possible for the hearer to decide between a zero copula + adverb analysis and one with copula alone, for example in:

(107) Children all know, well, little money de somewhere scatter bout. (BM93R)

Although I have collected examples apart from those tabulated for the eight basilectal speakers I have not taped or overheard any clear instances from Nassau. Such expressions as 'Who there?' may have originated with this copula, but synchronically
are equally likely to have adverb analysis for /de/.

Ten of the de examples in table 9 have stress on de, because they are in grammatically exposed position. The others, in fact, carry a greater stress on the copula than similar sentences with is would have, a degree of stress similar to that on be and bin. Phonological rules for deletion would thus be difficult.

For most of the Black community de does not appear as a copula, and may not even be recognized as such. I played a few samples of tape where this feature appeared to a group of Nassau students and they all either did not hear /de/ or wrote it as 'there'. Although these individuals command written SE and are therefore not typical basilectal Nassau speakers they did recognize other basilectal features not appearing in their own speech.

The relatedness of the marginal BBD de to GC de is so close as to make it probable that we have here the remains of an older form of BBD copula sentence where one would propose an underlying copula. For those de users in the BBD community there is available a choice between realizing a +Loc copula as either de or Ø (and for some a third possibility of SE inflected be) whereas acrolectal speakers would have one possibility. In any grammar there can be two or more different structures to convey the same semantic content without their being transformationally related at a superficial level, and in any community some speakers have access to more alternatives than others. The fact that basilectal and acrolectal grammars both require lexically-inserted copula does not prevent there being a third possibility of non-realization which may be the only possibility available to some speakers.

As can be seen from Table 4 WM84M, representative of a large
number of speakers in the all-White communities, differs sharply in
seldom having omission of copula before locative. However the Whites
in the mixed community omit the copula frequently, and in general
it seems that the influence of Black speech upon White will take
place more readily in the area of omissions, especially where, as
with the copula, the item omitted is phonetically exiguous. The
actual occurrence of BBD grammatical markers such as *does* or *done* is
far less frequent.

3.6. Variability in the mesolect -- in the speech of BF19N for
example -- occurs more often before +Loc than before +Ving or +Ga.
The copula before +Ving and +Ga is treated similarly in both
basilectal and mesolectal grammar; that these categories should differ
from the previous ones is not surprising since *is* is here auxiliary,
and the verb is already marked for +continuative by -ing or for future
by *ga*. There are only three examples of *is* in these contexts for
all the basilectal speakers in Table 3; of these, one is a direct
quotation of an SE speaker in answer to a BBD one:

(108) D- say, "Yes, sir, who you looking for?" "Well, *I'm looking*
    for P-." (BF75R)

The other by BF75R is an indirect quotation of an SE speaker;
(109) He don't want no teachers *who are working* for money. (BF75R)

and in spite of the non-SE negative concord in the first
half of the sentence, both copula presence and person-number concord
are probably influenced by the memory of the speaker's words.

Only the one example by BF32R seems unmotivated; she is in
the middle of a long excited discussion of a friend being cheated,
no SE speaker is present:

(110) You think if it was him on the line... and T- gone undermine him out the job, you think he'd run that freezer for T-? If it had been him in that situation, and T- had undermined him out of the job, do you think he would be running that freezer for T-?

It seems clear that in these environments there would be no justification for proposing a lexically inserted copula with subsequent phonological deletion. Indeed, since, from Labov (1969) figures and tables, deletion of Black English copula in these environments occurs in by far the majority of cases, it may well be that for some individuals in the Black English community the simplest grammar would have no underlying copula in these environments or that, as I propose for +Loc in BBD, the grammar would have two alternative structures available, rather than deletion being handled like contraction by phonological rule.

3.7. There are four occurrences of *is* in past tense in Table 1. Of these, three are before NP and one before +PA, all of them where the copula is in 'exposed' position, e.g.:

(111) The only thing they give me is food to eat and a room to sleep in.... (BF75R) (when she was in Nassau for training)

(112) How old was mamma when she die? (BF87A)

Only two members of the community have examples of such transformed sentences with past copula, e.g.:

(113) All he used to do was laugh. (BF32R)

so that maybe a more basilectal version of the rule simply inserts *is* without tense marker.

The five occurrences of zero past copula before +NP are the combination of occasional omission of underlying copula and that
of past marker. The past tense without underlying copula in other environments is omitted on average from 24% of examples in the basilectal data in Table 1, and non-past copula before +NP is omitted in 11% of cases. A combination of these two percentages would lead to both being omitted in the same sentence in 3% of cases, which is close to the actual figure of 4%.

I have given seven examples of contracted was in my data. It may well be that these are further examples of the copula is with reduced vowel giving the pronunciation /æz/. I have considered them to be contracted was because there seems to be no a priori reason for /æz/ in past context not to represent was with deleted initial consonant. Rules to delete a similar /w/ are required in BBD to account for will → 'll and would → 'd. Clear examples of this /æz/ occur in non-reducible context:

(114) The first Bahamian captain ever captain a boat from Europe out here əZ a Bah- a was a Ragged Islander. (BF75R)

(115) All C- used to do əZ laugh. (BF32R)

but once the initial consonant has been lost, the item when unstressed would be vulnerable to loss of /ə/, which would account for:

(116) After the other children-dem done gone -- now he'z the Saviour now -- (BF44C) = After they had gone -- he was the Saviour.

and also devoicing and assimilation of the lone consonant:

(117) All that was one kind of bread....That's one kind of bread.

Examples (116) and (117) would, however, be identical if the input to the phonological component had been is /Iz/. To say that the examples (114) and (115) had in fact underlying is would
leave unexplained the vowel quality /a/, but would account for the otherwise puzzling restriction of contracted \textit{was} to the +NP context. And in example (114) /a/ seems clearly to be alternating with \textit{was}; she is correcting the NP complement from 'Bahamian' to 'Ragged Islander', not modifying the tense. I do not feel the evidence is decisive either way, and have therefore noted these examples as contracted \textit{was}. Since in this study one of my purposes is to show underlying regularities behind surface variation, I do not want to assume there to be regularity without there being clear grounds for it.

4.1. If there is no underlying copula or \textit{be}-Aux in most BBD environments, then the occurrences of \textit{be} must be accounted for in another way. \textit{Be} is found in non-finite environments similar to those of SE; after modals, including \textit{used to}:

(118) These children they can't believe say you could be twelve years old and be a monitress....(BF75R)

and after another verb:

(119) They say they suppose to be having the first preference to that. (BF32R)

This \textit{be} is very rarely omitted (in three examples for the basilectal speakers) as in:

(120) Then enter days which used to very good. (BM93R)

It is, however, semantically empty and could well be inserted by transformation somewhat similar to that proposed for stressed \textit{is} in section 2.1. above. That is, whenever a specified modal comes to be placed immediately before +PP, +PA, +Loc or +Ving, the requirement that these only occur before a verb will be violated; the semantically empty \textit{be} could be inserted as a dummy verb required
by the BBD surface structure, just as dummy subject it is required by SE.

As seen in Table 1, be is also found in BBD in two non-SE contexts: after an invariant does either in non-past:

(121) Put that in the pot and they does be boiling until they come, all come together. (BF83N)

(122) The sisal when it done it does be white. (BF38R)

    or infrequently in past context:

(123) Then the boat sometime does be two weeks three weeks and I had to go get cabbage and beat m and thing. Things was bad. (BM78R)

    Be is also found alone, with habitual reference, either

non-past:

(124) When they come in...people be row right up (BF75R)

(125) Any time you come meet me I be the same man. (BM78R)

    or past reference:

(126) Oh, sometime you be lucky...we had a lot of boat then.

(127) Child, these pineyard here when we left home in them days we be back here one two-three week before you could go and you got to walk....(BM74A)

(128) This one gang of fellows up on the roof this morning they just be playing. (BF24N)

    As can be seen from the above examples, this lone be

occurs in all contexts discussed for finite copula except +G>. The meaning of both does be and be is that of habitual or iterative, and the negative for both seems to be don't be, since no other possible form such as *doesn't be or *ain be is found, and don't be has habitual reference:

(129) Yea, but he ain no good cos he don't be in the house, eh, pussy? = (he isn't usually) (BF44C)
In WBD be, often inflected for person, is found, but not does be:

(130) I be between here and there. (BF50M) = I live sometimes here and sometimes there.

(131) She bes there all the time. (WF80L)

(132) It bes cheaper for a person what can' t, you know, afford to pay. (WF39E)

The does found in examples (121) - (123) above is found frequently in BBD as a habitual marker on verbs; it is also found in mesolectal GC and elsewhere in the Caribbean. It is contracted to /az/, or /z/ after pronoun subjects optionally:

(133) ...and that's the name he'z carry. (BF75R) = that is the name he goes by.

Its use in BBD is somewhat like that described by Bickerton (1975) for GC, and the loss of an initial stop from an auxiliary, described by Rickford for this marker (1975), occurs also in BBD with mussy must be, which will be discussed below.

In BBD does is a habitual marker primarily for non-stative verbs, with the more basilectal speakers using it with both past reference, alongside used to:

(134) Yes, dry fish to Haiti. Used to carry dry fish - corn fish you see. They didn't take long time to dry, but sometime you'z go fishing little while before you get a boatload. (BM78R)

as well as non-past, as in example (133), whereas mesolectal speakers restrict it to non-past. This is like does in GC. However, rather simply being more and more restricted in distribution within the non-stative non-past, as occurs in the GC upper mesolect (Bickerton 1975 p.117) does becomes optional in these contexts even in data from basilectal BBD speakers who use it in past environments. There are many
sentences where a clearly habitual use of the verb is not marked by does:

(135) When you finish mixing it up you does had to put in the oven... The other bread you put Fleischman yeast and you call that light bread. (BF38R)

(136) People do a lot of straw work round here...Just make them, having a mind like they'll sell off. And the plait, sometime I plait this same kind of plait, send it off to sell. (BF38R)

(137) That's how I does plant. I plant the two together (What come out?) I plant the corn and the peas together....You see how that does be. You see how that is now?....You understand that? That's how you do it.

At the same time it can be found, also optionally, even with mesolectal speakers in contexts where it is seldom found in GC at any level; as Bickerton (1975) says:

The main stative rule applies to it...and in consequence it seldom or never appears before modals or stative verbs or in conditional or temporal (whenever-type) clauses. (p. 68)

In BBD it is found before stative 'verbs':

(138) I'z mean to act stupid; she can't help acting stupid. (BF19N) = I intend to act stupid..

and verbs with a 'middle' sense:

(139) Maimai does make out of split peas. (BF83N)

before modals:

(140) When the boats didn't used to run like now, island used to get out of grocery. Sometime we does had to get cabbage for food. (BM78R)

(141) Soldier crab you'z can't eat, eh? (BF19N) = Soldier crabs cannot be eaten, can they?

and in most subordinate clauses except for conditional, but including the 'whenever' - type mentioned by Bickerton:

(142) I tell him, when you'z go too slow, don't go get none. (BF32R)
In the speech of the younger Nassau BBD speaker does is found in non-past contexts more frequently than in that of the more basilectal Family Island speakers. BF19N, for example, does not seem to omit this marker on any non-stative non-past main verb with habitual reference. This may be stylistic; does is recognized to some extent as a marker of Black speech, and does not appear in White speech. However, its importance may be because at this level of BBD mesolect tense has become more important than in the basilect, yet there are still few marked past verbs except the copula. Time reference of stative verbs is inherently less precise but if the non-stative non-past verb is marked the time reference of actions is maintained.

When discussing the negative in Chapter 3, I will show that tense is clearly differentiated for non-stative verbs but not for statives.

In BBD does be is more frequent than in the data Bickerton used for his (1975) analysis, and he did not find lone be at all. In BBD does be and be together account for 14% of copulas in +Loc environments, for both basilectal and mesolectal speakers, and also occur elsewhere though less frequently. The meaning of these two forms seem to be identical, even to the use with past reference only amongst older basilectal speakers. As Rickford (1975) points out,

sentences like 'He be working', 'He be sick', 'He be in the club' which occur with iterative meaning in Black English, would result automatically if doz were deleted and lost completely from the equivalent Creole structures: 'He doz be working', 'He doz be sick', 'He doz be in the club'. (p26)

Unlike BBD, where does be and be are both common, be is not attested as a stable form in Caribbean Afro-English. Rickford hypothesizes that this may be because:
"...a precondition for the emergence of invariant be as iterative marker would be that doz is so frequently deleted in toto in the community, that the "dummy" be could be reinterpreted as the real iterative signal."(p.26)

Since does is frequently used by all Black members of the community amongst whom be alone is used with habitual sense, this would not seem to be the case in BBD.

Why should BBD decreolization differ in this respect? The answer may lie in the differing influences upon BBD; the non-SE speakers with whom the BBD speakers come into contact are the White Bahamians and the Southern US Blacks. Both of these groups have invariant be, White BD speaker probably acquiring it originally from BBD whilst eschewing the ethnically marked does. This invariant be, already perhaps occurring sporadically in BBD through deletion of does, would be reinforced at a stage of the mesolect when does is still frequently used. It may be that be in BBD, rather than being derived by phonological rules from an inserted does, may optionally arise direct from the +habitual marker in a copula environment.

To account for does be in GC, Bickerton (1975) suggests:

"At this level (upper mesolect), however, all speakers have variable copula insertion, and this affects all environments...But what happens when a speaker wishes to say 'John is frequently/usually sick' and lacks the necessary adverbs of frequency? He must use doz, just as in other contexts, but if....he simultaneously inserts the copula, the resultant form is not doz iz but doz be."(p.118) (emphasis mine)

However, this seems to imply that be is only inserted after does to the same extent that it is variably inserted in any copula environment. In BBD, as I have shown above, the percentage of surface copula is low save where stressed or before +NP; if
Bickerton's analysis also applied to BBD one would expect + habitual in a copula environment to be marked simply with does+∅ at about the same frequency as ∅ copula for non-habitual in that environment. However this is not the case; I have in my data only one example of does+∅:

(143) Them crabs does dead in the road. (BF9A)

and this, because of the item dead (see section 3.4. above) is doubtful counter-example to the generalization that does does not occur except before a surface verb.

It would seem better to account for BBD does be by the same rules as required for be after modals and used to. That is, when there are modals or tense-aspect markers there are surface constraints on most of them to occur only preverbally. Thus the sentence will be considered ill-formed if it contains a modal or a tense-aspect marker unless it has undergone a transformation inserting dummy be after it. This is similar to dummy-it insertion in SE.

The varying percentages of be and does be in Tables 1 and 2 are not artifacts of the data but reflect the semantic differences of the environments requiring SE 'be'. (Does) be is not found before +G∅ - '*I does g∅ read a book every morning' would be as impossible as '*I am usually going to read a book every morning'. Before +Ving it is infrequent, since in many contexts habitual or iterative overlap with continuative. However, example (101), repeated here:

(144) Put that in the pot and they does be boiling until they come, all come together. (BF83N)

provides a good example of
does be+Ving; this is a recipe description, thus basically iterative. In addition, each time the peas are cooked, they must continue boiling until they form a lump.

(Does) be is also rare before +NP; class inclusion or identity are usually permanent states and thus there is little need to specify they are habitual. When (105):

(145) Any time you come meet me I be the same man. (BM78R)

was produced, the speaker was explaining why he did not drink alcohol; at every meeting with him you find him the same, as opposed to others, who are presumably sometimes drunk!

Adjectives and past participles describe states, and, like stative verbs, are seldom marked with does. Marking occurs when in each of a number of repeated situations a certain state is produced. In (122) and (135) materials are treated each time with consistent results. Every year at a certain season:

(146) Soft soft. Crab az be soft. They whole body soft. (BF9A)

As in this example the habitual marker is optional for copula as for other environments.

Location is most frequently marked with (does) be since it is potentially the most temporary of the four true copula environments (+NP, +PP, +PA, +Loc). With +Loc it can signify repeated and intermittent location, as in (127) or:

(147) And when you cooking – straight over your pot...I mean you'z be over the thing! (BF19N)

or can emphasize the permanence of a location, often as opposed to a more temporary one, as in:

(148) I only have four home now....Only two does be home. (BF38R)
Of this speaker's seven children, four are actually sleeping at home at the time of speaking, while two live there on a permanent basis.

The vitality of does be and be and the spread of the latter to the White community would seem to be because it provides a useful distinction which SE has to make more clumsily with adverbs of frequency.

4.2. bin appears in two past non-copula contexts which were therefore not tabulated in Tables 1 and 2 but whose meanings are related to those of the copula. One use is as full verb meaning SE 'have been', the past of 'go' in the sense of 'go and return'; with a total of 44 examples for the eight basilectal speakers this use is almost as frequent as past copula bin+Loc. It is seldom pronounced with a long vowel in the basilect; not until the acrolect does BBD use have before bin in this sense, although most WBD speakers regularly do so.

The other non-copula use of bin is less frequent and further removed from SE: bin with stem-verb, used in only fifteen examples in the data for the Table 1 speakers and once for those in Table 2. It seems clearly related to the GC basilectal marker bin, although in my data I have no clear examples of it as a +anterior marker as opposed to +past. It marks past events, especially those remote in time or completed:

(149) And when I come back...how many of them wife ain't bin want to go since that! (BF75R)

(150) Yea, I bin like school, and I like church till now. (BF87A)
(151) He woulda bin vex with me for life if I bin ever catch him. (BF32R) = if I had ever caught him.

\textit{Bin} before past participles and adjectives, given in Table 2, seems plainly related to \textit{bin} + stem-verb; in these contexts \textit{bin} signals usually past, which would follow naturally if in an earlier stage of the language these were stative verbs as in the Guyanese Creole basilect:

(152) No sir, the bread \underline{bin so small} I couldn't give you none (BF44C)

When \textit{bin} occurs with items equivalent to SE past participles it could also be analysed as SE 'been' with loss of the auxiliary 'have':

(153) My kitchen \underline{ain't bin straighten} out today. (BF75R)

However such an analysis cannot be justified at this level, for basilectal BBD does not have the present perfect tense -- even the acrolect tends to avoid it. Nevertheless, the fact that sentences such as (153) are analysable in both a BBD and an SE framework probably reinforces their use.

With \textit{bin} + Loc and +Vlng some of the examples could be analysed with an SE pluperfect meaning:

(154) When you done get a pound from this one... you get more meat than I what \underline{bin out}. (BM93R) = By the time you finished getting a pound from this one... you had more meat that I who had been out.

(155) Now him and S- dem \underline{bin having} plenty fuss over that before he close down last season. (BF32R) = had been having...

\textit{Bin} here can also have perfective meaning, in both BBD:

(156) That \underline{bin} in my mouth since 1920. (BF75R) = and is still there.

(157) I \underline{bin plaitting} from I marry. (BF44C) = have been plaitting.
and in WBD, usually with have:

(158) That's just bin in the later years. (WF39E)

But for some BBD examples a simple past analysis is necessary:

(159) I bin in Florida, live in Florida. I had my own home. (BM93R)

(160) That were a ship there where I bin selling my plait and thing. (BF44C)

What I have called, from an SE viewpoint, perfective can also be analysed like bin+stem-verb with bin carrying a +anterior meaning. Most of the bin+Ving examples could then be considered, as the bin+PP, above, as ambivalent between an SE analysis and one such as proposed by Bickerton (1975 p.83) for mesolectal GC, where \textit{bin} = +anterior and -\textit{ing} = -punctual. Bickerton does not mention specifically the use of bin+Loc in GC; however it would seem that since a locative environment is stative a +anterior marker would be roughly equivalent to SE present perfect.

We are still left, however, with some occurrences of bin where, as in (159) and (160), the time marked by bin is concurrent with a simple past in the same S or in the surrounding context. This is also, however, the usual meaning of was discussed above. There are some examples where even for the same speaker and similar contexts bin and was appear interchangeable, although the sense is usually that of a completed or remote state:

(161) Then who was here? Somebody bin here laugh. D- was here, that's right. (BF32R)

(162) Within our life of living now my best gain was home here at the salt pond. (BM93R)
(163) Long as I bin home, I used to run that Bacardi. (BM93R)
(BM93R does neither activity any longer)

In Table 13 below I tabulate the frequencies of bin+Loc and bin+Ving for the individual basilectal speakers, repeating for ease of reference the frequencies of was and $\emptyset$ in the same environments from Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+Loc</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>+Ving</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bin</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>bin</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF32R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF44C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF87A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF71A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM78R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF75R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM93R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF64N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

What is apparent from the relative frequencies in Table 13 is that individual speakers vary in their preferred copula in these two environments so that any attempt to write the same rules for even the basilectal section of the community would be misleading. BF75R, for example, uses was most frequently, with her few bin examples remote in time:

(164) He bin to war. He bin on the front. = in the First World War.

or with a defined time limit:
(165) And he came right home and stayed with us the twenty months we bin in Miami.

BF44C, on the other hand, uses bin for nearly all +Loc environments, but was before +Ving, while BF64N does not use bin, but makes more use of zero, out of the number of possible contexts, than anyone else. This variation in preferred markers extends outside the copula environment: BF87A has few occurrences altogether of +Ving and it is perhaps not coincidence that she has, for the amount of speech, the highest proportion of anyone in the table of bin+stem-verb. She can thus use this where a +continuative marking is superfluous:

(166) We bin live down one place call Prospect Hill. (BF87A)

(Compare:

(167) Lowe Sound people they was living in camp. (BF44C)

BF32R prefers bin+Loc, but uses both bin and was before +Ving, most of her examples showing the rough division of meaning between these two markers which could be foreseen from their origins. Bin is either remote in time altogether or the beginning of the activity or state was long before the time of speaking; was is preferred when some other activity occurred during the time span marked by was, or the activity itself is not viewed as complete. There is overlap, but was would not be likely in a sentence such as (155) with past anterior meaning, and bin not likely when describing an incomplete activity such as:

(168) That same morning, boy, she was coming right down past here -- she ain't reach far as here...(BF32R)

Marginally different grammars in the basilect would result if one speaker realizes all past copula as was unless specified +remote and another all as bin unless clearly marked -complete.
These two markers retain these respective meanings in the mesolect, although nearer the acrolect unstressed bin is gradually restricted to perfective SE meaning, even when not accompanied by have, and was is found more frequently.

4.3. As mentioned in section 4.1. (p. 63) above, be occurs after tense-aspect markers; the only regular exception is done, which occurs as a completive marker before verbs:

(169) Peas done boil. (BF75R)

but never has be following:

(170) We late now -- we done late. (BF24N) - we are really late.

(171) When they get there I done home long time. (BF32R)

Be is found after modals, most of which are similar in use to SE though perhaps more restricted in meaning. Will (usually /ə/ from 'll) is found:

(174) This a be a good bit when these go. (BF32R)

Although a is more frequent even in the contexts where SE favors will:

(175) I a be so glad that day J- and S- go off to school. (BF32R)

Shall and can have been lost in BBD and could has 'moved up' to cover the meanings of can, with coulda following, so that the latter is found expressing non-past irrealis as well as past. Should with the meaning of 'ought to' is found as in SE, but shouida is also found in present context:

(176) They have accident up there, you shouida turn back. (BF20N)

- advice for present action.

Under the influence, probably, of could - coulda, would - woulda has also shifted. Would, not used for past habitual at all in
BBD, is used for simple future as an alternative to will, and woulda in non-past as well as past conditional. However, when the -a forms are used but the context is non-past, they seem to take be after them, although I have only a few examples, whereas in past irrealis we have bin. Thus:

(177) If everybody woulda be like me, M-, this would be a beautiful world. (BF46R)

(178) Was the day like today, I don't know what P- woulda bin. (BF75R) = if those days had been like today...

(179) One time he fly out there. J- say "You shoulda be living close by." (BF32R)

(180) She shoulda left the old man from the time the old man done get married. She coulda bin a married woman today. (BF32R)

However, this past marking does not extend to copula after used to or had to, which always take be and not bin. Double past marking does exist, however, in that habitual past obligation is normally 'used to had to'; I will return to this in Chapter 3 below.

4.4. There is a further lexical item mussy /məsi/, presumably derived from the SE modal 'must', which creates problems of analysis in BBD. It is related to GC mosi which Bickerton describes (1975) as a variant of mos (must) and as "derived presumably from 'must have' but not always used with a perfective sense."(p.43) However, BBD mussy will not fit such an analysis. It is used only with the inferential meaning of SE modal must, which is the case with 'must have'. However, it occurs far more frequently than must alone, which is a marginal form for basilectal speakers who nearly always use got to for obligation. By contrast mussy occurs frequently - I have 93 examples, which include only two from White speakers. It occurs before
all elements of the verb-phrase:

(181) He mussy come when he want something. (BF44C)

(182) ...you mussy does lead a boring life. (BF19N)

(183) Then she had one old Haitian man mussy was he sweetheart. (BF34A)

(184) And boy, God mussy used to be with her: (BF32R)

It commands negation, so that the latter is in the form required by the following verb:

(185) Plane mussy stil I ain't ga reach. (BF19N) - The plane is probably still not going to arrive.

(186) K- mussy wasn't watching what he was doing. (BF24N)

It occurs separate from the verb phrase:

(187) He draw mussy eleven hundred dollar off he post office account. (BF32R)

(188) Be a hour mussy fore he plait one string. (BF32R)

(189) He scared of him mussy. (BM20N)

(190) Mussy cos you beat books too much you don't pass. (BF24N)

Its behavior is thus unlike any other modal; it is also distinct from the few examples of WBD /m st/ which is limited to past inferential context like SE 'must have' from which it derives:

(191) Last time we went to N. we musta pass about five horses. (WF80L)

It seems likely that BBD mussy is derived historically from 'must be' and in slow speech it can be pronounced with the stop /mæsbi/. However it seems doubtful that the /bi/ is generated independently by a mechanism similar to that required for used to be, could be and so on. The only evidence in favor of this /bi/ being related to be elsewhere is that when mussy occurs in non-past copula
sentences the copula is not present, even before NP:

(192) You ain get you mussy a sissy. Mussy worse than a sissy.  
(BF32R) = if you do not get anything....

(193) I think he mussy deaf. (BF24N)

These examples could quite easily be viewed as derived synchronically from 'must be'; however, they form only a minority of the examples. Also, if the /bl/ is separable so is the /mAs/, but there is no example of must in BBD alone with inferential sense before any other verb. A few other examples could be derived from 'must have':

(194) They all mussy gone off or die....(BF38R)

but with the same objections. It seems clear that we are dealing here with a one-word lexical item with the relative freedom of distribution of an adverb, rather than that of a modal. 14 If both adverbs and modals are held to be higher predicates in deep structure there is no difficulty of derivation, as long as it is not considered necessary to tie BBD lexical items closely with their SE cognates.

As an adverb, mussy would precede tense-aspect markers in the verb phrase, like only, even or hardly:

(195) They even ain look like a Chinese. (BF32R)
(196) I only just could visit. BF38R)
(197) C- live right down the road and hardly does come see her. (BF19N)

and could occur clause-final, like hardly:

(198) They ain got nothing to sell not hardly. (BF78R)

In some cases it is qualifying one element of the sentence, as in (190) where it qualifies the reason clause, or:
She come down mussy two or three trips after that...(BF32R)

and its position on the surface in such sentences can be derived for rules required for only etc. as in SE.

The one difficulty of this adverb analysis is the above-mentioned non-appearance of non-past copula when mussy is before NP complement. A special rule handling this will be required, but this would be less complex than deriving must+be+was for (157) or must+be+used to+be for (158).

5. Conclusion

For BBD it would seem best to account for the verb or lack of it in copula sentences by proposing that an underlying copula is inserted in the +NP complement environment only. Variable absence of this copula would be accounted for by sporadic but not phonologically-conditioned interference from other environments which have no copula.

Presence of non-past copula in those environments for which I propose no underlying copula would be accounted for in several ways. A dummy is would be inserted where the VP slot is clause-initial or clause-final; the verb in this position is differentially marked in SE also as can be seen by the greater degree of stress borne here by SE be. Certain expressions semantically attributive, such as of age, price, distance etc. vary within the community as to copula presence or absence, since they have the form of equative expressions. In the locative expressions those individuals who use the older locative verb be will have underlying copula in just those cases as an alternative deep structure form to the zero copula which is the
basilectal form for the majority. Dummy be is inserted after modals and all tense-aspect markers except done; in the case of does be contraction of the aspect marker frequently occurs. It is possible that the remaining /z/ is deleted by phonological rule; I feel that it is more likely that, influenced by Florida BE and by WBD, the habitual marker may well be realized simply as be in copula environments.

In the past tense, was and bin are the surface realizations of tense only, except for +NP complement where they are a synchresis of tense and copula, motivating a lower frequency of past copula deletion here than elsewhere. Individual differences between selection of bin and was are found, but on the whole bin is used for remote or completed past situations. Zero copula in the past involves non-realization of the tense marker; in BBD this is not unlikely since tense is only optionally marked on stative verbs to which copula sentences are related. A few occurrences of zero past copula given in the analysis in +PP and +PA environments are probably not such; lexical items such as born and dead seem to be full verbs for most BBD speakers. A few of those speakers who use de have it with past reference also. This is probably because, like the examples of is +NP with past reference, the underlying copula has surfaced without tense marking. The higher percentage of bin in the +Loc environment as compared to elsewhere may well indicate that de in conjunction with a past marker is realized as bin, a logical development from an earlier stage of BBD similar to present-day GC basilect where the past copula before +Loc is bin de.

5.2. The environments in which contraction of the copula is
permitted are more restricted in BBD than in BE or SE. It is thus not possible to order deletion after contraction as a phonological rule dependent upon prior contraction. The following syntactic environment appears to be the only factor which influences the presence or absence of copula. In lexical insertion therefore the underlying forms themselves will have to have distinguishing features, or reference will have to be made to the environment.

BBD also differs significantly from Black English in that there is no unstressed copula form which does not delete, as is the case with SE am, or is after it, that or what. These make it probable that in BE the deletion rule is a phonological one, albeit with grammatical conditioning at least for most speakers.

The presence within the BD continuum of de provides evidence that the underlying copula system is different from that of Black English and also SE. There can be no superficial or phonological reason for surface de rather than is or 0 only in the +Loc environment. At the point of lexical insertion de is optionally inserted before a locative expression, never elsewhere. This means that at that point for at least some speakers there must be two different verbs where there is only one in SE. Once this is conceded, it seems that the figures for the +NP environment, contrasted with those of the +PP, +Ving and +G environments make it probable that there is a further distinction here. There is some variation in most of these categories but remarkably little considering the passive knowledge most of these speakers have of SE with its one verb common to all environments.
Notes on Chapter II.

1. In Table 1 I have distinguished between past and non-past reference. One difference in these compared to SE is in the sequence of tense in the reporting of speech. In BBD it is, of course, possible to report the exact words used by the speaker; there, as in SE, the original tenses remain. However, it is also possible to alter the pronouns to conform to the point of view of the reporter, as in indirect speech in SE, but in this case in BBD the alteration of the tenses after a past verb of saying does not take place. This shows clearly in the use of the copula, negative and modals:

(a) So when J- hail him, he tell him say Momma come, say he **coming home**. (BF75R) = he told him that...

(b) (We) never build to no trade but just take it up and say **we'll build** a boat (BM93R) - describing how he and his father started boatbuilding.

(c) L- tell him... far as they concern **he ain't got no boat**.... J-H- say **ain't no bill** in the office....(BF32R) = L- told him...

(d) So she say she know what she **go do**, she **going** to her children. (BF75R) - So she said...

There is no clear case of reported speech in my data like those above where, for example, **was** appears before **go**, or **wasn't** rather than **ain't** is used. In the tables I have given I have therefore assumed that the reference of such copulas was that of the direct speech. In a few cases of supposed omitted past copula, it might be a case of reported speech without a verb of saying, for example:

(e) They tell me feed am the coconut. Oh Jesus, they **too** fat! (BF44C)

where the speaker may be reporting what she said when she found them.

2. Although Labov's (1969) example (8):
(f) They not caught.

is one of those he says he will discuss, he nowhere deals with contraction of \( is+not \) either as ain't or isn't. It seems as though he has excluded these, while including he's not, he not etc. I have not included these, since numbers are very low, making no significant difference to conclusions here; I discuss them in chapter 3.

3. What \( is \) is not contracted in my data; it is found only before NP.

with what \( \emptyset \) elsewhere:

(g) Then we didn't had no traffic not like what here now. (BF87A)

(h) What dead last, you just set am all in the pot. (BF44C) = Those which are dead last...

(i) What is a pound of steak?

4. \( is \) here lacks a dummy subject. It is pronounced /lz/ showing that it is not the reduction of \( it+is \) by phonological rules of contraction, assimilation of /z/ to the /t/ and subsequent deletion of one or other sibilant. I transcribe the phonological result of this reduction /ls/ as \( it's \) to distinguish it from zero-subject +is = /lz/, as here. The basilectal pronoun \( \emptyset m \) refers here to her; elsewhere its SE equivalent may be him, it or them.

5. The first of these was not included in the table because the subject ended in -s.

6. Matters such as prior vowel reduction as discussed by Labov (1969), and whether the same rule is operating to contract habitual marker (d)oes and delete vocalized 'll (/ə/) from will might complicate the rule.

7. I assume that Labov's category includes both predicate adjective and past participle which I keep distinct from each other and from locative,
which he does not.

8. The following phonological environment could theoretically be a factor, although this would entail loss of a whole syllable (/1z/ or reduced /əz/), since this equally could not be ordered after contraction. In fact, deletion of a full or contracted copula seems unaffected by the following phonological environment:

(j) That's the part what he waiting on. (BF32R)
(k) That quite enough for 8-. (BF32R)
(l) I think he over in the other garden. (BF32R)
(m) I is the damn boss! (BF44C)

9. There are a few occurrences of /bin de/ which are quite probably locative verb with preceding tense marker:

(n) When she born she /bin de/ on the ground mussy half an hour dead. (BF44C)

However there are no unambiguous examples such as those with non-past reference with /de hɪŋ/ where a transcription of 'there here' is impossible. I have therefore counted these /bin de/ examples with bin locative.

10. In example 105, /de/ is stressed more strongly than it would be if representing a copied subject "they". In 106, the parallelism of /de/ with the preceding bin makes it highly probable that the former is also verbal.

11. Although contracted does is pronounced in the same way as contracted is, that is /z/, I transcribe them differently for ease of reading.

12. The loss of shall seems to have occurred in conversational US English also. The contraction 'll, though originally perhaps from
shall as well as will, is probably in BD only a contraction of underlying will, since shall never surfaces save in formal acrolect.

The most striking feature of the modal system in BBD is this loss of can, not suffered in BE apparently, or in GC. The reasons for this loss are probably phonological. I do not have, obviously, an example of BBD pronunciation of this word, but the noun can is pronounced almost identically with the negative can't, that is, with palatalized initial consonant and front nasal vowel /kʌ/. The loss of the final -t in BBD has thus not been compensated for by lengthening of the vowel, as is the case in GC (Bickerton 1975), so that the negative and positive came to be pronounced alike. The positive has therefore been replaced wholly by could for non-past meaning. This is a possibility in all forms of English to convey a greater degree of uncertainty on the part of the speaker, so that BBD examples do not sound ungrammatical. However, examples which have can't and could in contrast show clearly the equivalence in modality between them:

(o) He can't do no other work. He family only could rake salt. (BF75R)

13. The sibilant does not seem to be voiced. Presumably, then, the underlying form is 'must be' with the /t/ remaining long enough to prevent voicing.

14. The behaviour of mussy is in many ways similar to SE 'maybe'; I find the latter awkward within the verb phrase which is mussy's most usual position:

(184') 'God maybe used to be with her.'
and also sentence-final:

(189') He's scared of him maybe.

but both these are possible. May be also can replace the simple copula, although there is separate word stress in this case, whereas mussy is pronounced similarly in any position.
CHAPTER III

NEGATION
Introduction

1.1. In the first part of this chapter I will describe the forms of verbal negation and their distribution in the basilect and their gradual modification through the continuum towards SE. Once again I will try to show underlying regularities beneath surface variation. I give a detailed description, accompanied by data, so that the similarities to and differences from related varieties may be perceived. I will then compare these BD negators with those in Guyanese Creole and in US Black English, although the data for this latter are scanty.

1.2. In the second part of the chapter I will discuss negative concord in BD. A very full treatment of this phenomenon in Black English, which seems similar in most respects to that of BD, is given in Labov 1972; I will discuss this analysis and hope to show that his basic premise -- that Black English and hence BD surface structure has underlying it features exactly equivalent to those of SE -- leads to his having to propose very broad optional rules. An analysis of concord as a phenomenon separate from SE shows that far more constrained rules can be written than he proposes. Similarities with Guyanese Creole can be seen, but negative concord, rather than being a specifically Creole feature of Afro-American varieties, seems to be the basic pattern for most non-Standard English varieties. It is thus possible that SE negative patterns are best considered derivative from non-Standard rather than the reverse.
Forms of Verbal Negation

2.1. I will use the term verbal negative to refer to a negator within the finite verb phrase, either alone or in conjunction with modals, tense or aspect markers. I give in Table 14 a summary of these forms used in the basilect and mesolect. I have divided speakers into three groups according to their use of these markers; the number of speakers whose data I have analyzed is larger than for the copula, but it can be seen that the members of the basilectal group A here were included in the basilectal tables for the copula. I give in each category for each group the most frequent form used and its frequency of occurrence. In parentheses I also give the other forms found.

It can be seen that from basilect through mesolect the system changes from one in which the favored negator is *ain't* in all contexts save non-past (habitual) non-stative and past copula to a system similar to SE except that person-number concord is not fully established. I will give further details below of the working of the continuum in each category and try to account for the non-SE distinctions found. I will also discuss *never* since the use of this in BD is clearly different from that in Guyanese Creole.
TABLE 14

MOST FREQUENT FORMS OF VERBAL NEGATION FOUND IN THE BASILECT AND THE MESOLECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Non-Stative</th>
<th>be</th>
<th>have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>ain’t 60</td>
<td>don’t 100</td>
<td>ain’t 100</td>
<td>ain’t got 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(don’t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Past Mesolect 1</td>
<td>don’t 73</td>
<td>don’t 100</td>
<td>ain’t 96</td>
<td>don’t have 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ain’t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect 2</td>
<td>don’t 93</td>
<td>don’t 100</td>
<td>isn’t 51</td>
<td>don’t have 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ain’t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>ain’t 73</td>
<td>ain’t 92</td>
<td>wasn’t 91</td>
<td>ain’t had 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(didn’t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Mesolect 1</td>
<td>ain’t 50</td>
<td>ain’t 72</td>
<td>wasn’t 98</td>
<td>didn’t had 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>didn’t 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect 2</td>
<td>didn’t 100</td>
<td>didn’t 90</td>
<td>wasn’t 100</td>
<td>didn’t have 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ain’t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Alternative forms are given in brackets for each category.
2.2. **Stative versus Non-Stative.** This is a fundamental distinction of the BBD basilect verb; non-stative non-past verbs are categorically negated with don't but stative non-past verbs may have either don't or ain't even with the most basilectal speaker:

(1) (You does do am just for you? I mean not like to sell?)
   Not me man, I don't do for selling. (BF44C)

(2) Anytime it get like this I slow down on plaiting, cos I don't send no more than ten or twelve ball at a time. (BF32R)

(3) She be nice to you but maybe you like how she act, but I don't like so far.... Too much company. Everybody ain't like it you know. (BM78R)

In most basilectal speech non-stative past punctual verbs are categorically negated with ain't, with didn't slowly superseding, whereas stative verbs again are more variable in the basilect and use didn't categorically much earlier in the continuum.

(4) After he see I ain't do it he walk away. (BF44C) = after he saw I didn't do it he walked away.

(5) They ain't got no petrol, but they ain't send for none on the boat. (BF32C) = They don't have any gas, but they didn't send for any by the mail-boat.

(6) I could remember when an old woman die here, her own children didn't know how old she was. (BF75)

(7) I ain't know none of them. I only know one bubu we had. (BF75R)
   = I didn't know any of them. I only knew an 'uncle' we had.

It is not impossible to find a semantic difference or a difference in individual grammars between those stative verbs taking don't-didn't and those with ain't; even in the output of individual speakers the same verbs are used with both SE and non-SE negator. Know, for example, the commonest, is used by BF32R with non-past
reference ten times with don't and fourteen times with ain't; in all the Table 1 data it is used fifty-four times with don't and thirty times with ain't.

If the use of ain't in all contexts but non-stative non-past is the older system, as seems probable, a distinction of [+punctual] seems to have been of primary importance, rather than tense. Don't marks [-punctual] on those non-past verbs which are generally punctual in their meaning; this is equivalent to the positive marker does, which is seen co-occurring with don't in example 1 above. Don't may be used with statives, although this is redundant since these are inherently non-punctual; because of the pull of the SE use don't is found with statives more often than does, but it is not obligatory as with non-statives. The exceptional stative verb is habitual be, which is always negated with don't in non-past:

(8) Saturdays I don't be round here. (BM18N)

Although the punctual-habitual distinction may be primary, tense is also clearly assuming importance here. The don't-didn't marking for statives is already present in the basilect; although they are both alternates for ain't here they are not confused and don't is not found with past reference as it is in Guyanese when it first enters the continuum. The growing need felt to mark tense is probably why didn't is found more frequently with statives, since ain't already indicates past tense with non-statives. Rather than being solely influenced by the SE marker, didn't here may be viewed as corresponding to the positive marker did which is optionally used to mark past time, translating either SE pluperfect:
(9) But all the old set and the young set what did build up the place after that they dead... (BF100S) = who had build up the town...

or simple past:

(10) That's why I did want to go too. (BF64N)

Didn't can also be found with pluperfect as well as simple past reference:

(11) Not a soul wouldna know if I didn't come here. (BM93R)

(12) We started from here Saturday. Didn't get in Nassau till Thursday night. (BF75R)

2.3. Have and Copula. Ain't is found in all copula and auxiliary environments corresponding to SE be, neutralizing the differences I discussed in Chapter II between +NP and elsewhere; it persists well up in the continuum and even in upper mesolect it is almost as common as isn't:

(13) He ain't name that... That ain't his real name... (BF75R)

(14) He ain't coming for this piece of bread cos God know ain't ga give you none of this. (BF44C)

(15) And C- ain't on none now. (BF32R)

Wasn't is the commonest past copula, although ain't bin is used about as frequently as its positive equivalent; in the basilect it can be used for any past marking, particularly completed or remote; in White BO it is confined to SE perfective use:

(16) No Jumper Church ain't bin here then. (BF87A)

(17) They ain't bin getting no crawfish now for about four weeks (WF80L)

This was discussed in Chapter II.

Tense seems more clearly marked in the negative than in the
positive. Does may be used with past reference but don't cannot; in the same way the positive copula is before +NP and zero copula in other contexts are occasionally found with past reference; in the negative I have no occurrence of ain't or isn't with past reference.

The negator ain't is usually considered as derived from be+not and have+not for general non-Standard English. Its use in have and be contexts in BD could certainly be analyzed in this way. However, its use in other contexts such as non-past stative where such an analysis is not possible, its phonetic difference from have and be and the fact that BD does not use have as auxiliary all argue against such an analysis even in these two contexts. It may well be its historical derivation however.

2.3.2. I have tabulated the item I have labelled have separately from other verbs because it is a common verb which displays idiosyncrasies which preclude its being categorized as a normal stative verb. For both possessive and modal obligation the negators and their distribution are the same, being ain't got - don't have (doesn't have) for non-past and ain't had - didn't have - didn't have for past.

The positive non-past form of this verb is usually got (to); in groups A and B of the table have (to) is used almost exclusively after negator or tense-aspect markers. One speaker BF38R uses only have (to) after markers:

(18) Some people does have order, just pass it on...(BF38R)

= Some people have orders and they just pass them on.

(19) I don't have a real agent. (BF38R)
but uses got (to) in the majority of positive contexts:

(20) But mind, you just got to go in her right time. (BF38R)

Being a stative verb, one would expect the more basilectal form got to vacillate between ain't and don't marking. But although one example of don't got occurs:

(21) If, you see, them don't got me in the thing -- "Aunt J- you ain't coming?" (BF44C) = If they don't have me in the show...

there is nothing like the almost equal numbers of don't and ain't found for know cited above. Another peculiarity of this verb in the non-past is in group C of the table, where ain't got is categorical for two speakers.

The key to this idiosyncrasy may lie in the mixture of British and US influence on the acrolect mentioned in Chapter 1. British English uses 'haven't got to' whereas US English seems to use 'don't have to'; both these forms are current in BD acrolect. WBD tends to use the British form, as seen in the positive:

(22) We'd say, "Well, she's got 150 yards in a mainsail". (WM84M)

Even for these WBD speakers it is doubtful whether ain't got is derived synchronically from have or has + got; not only is plain got still the most common positive form, but when an auxiliary is inserted as in (22) its first person equivalent is 'm:

(23) I have to use a ice-pick. I'm got three or four of them right up here somewhere. (WM84M)

This is obviously patterned after the copula, the most frequent third person is being heard as a contraction of is and the first person formed by analogy. It may be that ain't is analyzed
by this stage as *is not*, strengthening the analogy.

B30 then has two non-SE influences favoring the selection of *ain't got*, the stative basilectal *got* favoring *ain't* as negator, and the WBD form. However, in decreolization a tendency to avoid non-SE forms is felt and *ain't*, however common, is non-SE. If this results in a tendency to select *don't*, as with other stative verbs, *don't got* will receive no reinforcement either from more basilectal or more acrolectal stages of the language. Thus the dialect is influenced to select *don't have* at an earlier stage of decreolization than positive *have*, since *got* is receiving reinforcement from WBD, and also sounds quite close to one acrolectal form *'s got*.

Forms for past *have (to)* with negative are variable. Although the preferred form for group C is the acrolectal *didn't have*, speakers in a minority of cases will use the other two forms:

(24) People who *didn't have* horses we used to carry it on our head. (WM80L)

(25) Some of these people *what got* money today *they didn't had* no jobs to get nothing. (WM80L)

(26) We *ain't had* no kerosene stoves in olden days. (WM80L)

The most basilectal of the three past *have* forms, *ain't had*, has the tense marked obligatorily on the verb as in the positive *had*. This sets it apart from nearly all other verbs; at this stage, if statives have the tense marked, it is combined with the negator as *didn't*. *Had* is thus closer to non-statives whose stem-form usually indicates past punctual, however in the non-past *got* does not have the categorical marker *don't* of the non-stative.

*Didn't had*, the second stage, represents a common phenomenon
in BBD which takes place for most verbs higher in the mesolect. When irregular past tenses first appear, they are negated by the then most frequent *didn't*, resulting in 'didn't went' 'didn't taught' which double marking is the bane of school-teachers' lives. At this near acrolectal level it is usually considered a hypercorrection, since variability in past marking on the stem, particularly of weak -ed endings which are phonetically vulnerable, results in many past negatives being 'right'. In the case of *didn't had* this seems even less likely to be a hypercorrection than with the others. It is used consistently by speakers who are only using *didn't* variably with other verbs. This is probably because marking of simple past is being acquired one environment at a time; *wasn't* was the earliest, already complete at the basilectal level. The verb of possession and obligation is the second commonest single environment. The double marking of tense would cause no problems in BD structure. At several points in the BD grammar as with tense again with *never* (see section 2.4. below) and negation in negative concord a copying rule must be postulated. If, as has been proposed for SE, movement rules operate in two stages, with copying and subsequent deletion, the BD forms would be easily explained as having undergone copying alone.

By WBD mesolect and BBD near-acrolect *didn't have* has become established; the forms *haven't* and *hadn't* are more or less unknown for this verb, although they begin being used at this stage for perfective auxiliary.

2.4. *Never*. The analysis of *never* poses the problem of whether it is functioning as an adverb or a verbal marker. It has the sense
of the SE frequency adverb -- 'on none of many occasions' -- and it is used throughout the continuum. However in Guyanese Creole the cognate is a verbal marker so it may well be one in BD also. Never occurs in the data from Groups A and B of Table 14 as shown in Table 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markers</th>
<th>Habitual Non-Past</th>
<th>Habitual Past</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ain't never</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didn't never used to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never used to</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never bin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Examples are: habitual non-past:

(27) When she go to town she never go without bringing something for mamma. (BM71A)

(28) Them little children don't never go to school round here. (BF19N)

habitual past:

(29) We never meet no more till he -- I was in Florida...(BM93R)

(30) You didn't never used to hear so much about Ragged Island then. (BF75R)

(31) I used to go to school in stripe gown but we never used to wear no short dress -- we az wear dress. (BF87A)

perfective:

(32) He never own that to me yet. (BF32R)

(33) I ain't never sell a pennyworth of things yet to nobody. (BF44C)
(34) (What you think...about San Andros?) *Never bin spend* no time there. (BF87A)

The examples are mostly non-stative, but stative is possible both in past and non-past:

(35) But *nobody never know* nothing bout it till later long couldn't find him aboard the boat. (BM93R)

(36) She used to steal to go out. *He ma never used to know.* (BF32R)

Whether *never* is a verbal marker or a frequency adverb is a question of its function in transformations; in BBD its meaning and position are both similar to SE, so that it would seem reasonable to consider it an adverb. However, in BBD adverbs in the mesolect have a certain flexibility of position:

(37) *He can't even* go in shallow water. (WM80L)

(38) And *even can't talk* self: (BM46R)

whereas in my data *never* has a fixed position, before all simple verbs, including modals and *was*:

(39) When the doctor *was up here...say he never could* forget. (BF75R)

(40) But *I never was* so keen on boats. (WF39E)

and before other non-negative markers, but after other negative ones, as can be seen from above examples.

The fact that it can co-occur with verbal negators is not an argument for or against *never* itself being one; as mentioned in the discussion on *d**idn’t had* features are often copied and neither deleted. However, if *never* were an adverb all but five of the examples tabulated in Table 2 would have no verbal negator; although it is possible for a verbal negator to be omitted in BBD when the negative is incorporated into an element preceding the verb-phrase, this only occurs in about
50% of cases in general. If never were considered an adverb under-
going this rule, we would have to account for the far lower occurrence
of verbal negator in never sentences. Also, since never in fact
follows such undoubted verbal negators as don't, didn't and ain't the
statement of such a rule becomes more complex.

If never is a marker with the features [+iterative] [-NEG] it
would sometimes be the only marker in the sentence incorporating these
features. With a more complex verb phrase such as (30), repeated here:

(30) You didn't never used to hear so much about Ragged Island then.
     (BF 75R)

both didn't and never
Incorporate [+NEG], didn't and used to, [+PAST] and never and used to
for habitual/iterative.

In general the basilectal does not distinguish between past
and perfective with specific marker as does SE; the use of ain't
never only in this sense occurs with too few examples to be
significant; further investigation is required to determine if this is
consistent.

2.5. Whatever the historical origins of the form ain't it is used
in basilectal BBD with past and non-past reference for statives, for
past with non-statives for non-past copula, and before cot, had, bin
and never. It thus definitely seems to be the unmarked negator; other
have specific limited distribution: don't[-punctual][-past]; wasn't
[+copula/aux] [+past]; never [+habitual]; didn't [+past].

2.6. Comparison with Guyanese Creole. The verbal negator in
basilectal GC in all contexts is na. I have one BBD speaker who uses
this form in three examples, e.g.:
(41) I *na* remember. (BF100S)

(42) I *na* have *na* teeth. (BF100S)

This speaker also uses *didn't*:

(43) My grandmother he *didn't* born here.

However she may be using this form as a direct negation of the BBD basilectal *did* which she also uses:

(44) Me couldn't eat it. I *did* scared of it. (@BF100S)

This would then be similar to the situation in GC where *didn't* occurs sporadically (Bickerton 1975 p.95) at an early stage of decreolization where *na* is still found. This co-occurrence of *na* and *didn't* although only with one speaker, combined with the GC evidence, adds weight to the hypothesis discussed in section 2.2. above that *didn't* occurs at the basilectal level because of the influence of the positive marker *did* rather than simply the effect of the SE form.

In the GC mesolect there is a "proliferation of negative markers." (Bickerton 1975 p.91) By the mid-mesolect the situation would seem to be similar to BBD basilect in most respects: statives have variably *ain't* - *don't* in non-past, non-statives always *don't*; copula non-past has *ain't*, and the modals *wouldn't* and *couldn't* are used. There are several differences in GC from BBD: past copula *wasn't* apparently only appears "sporadically" at the same point as *isn't* whereas in BBD *wasn't* is categorial even in the mesolect, and *isn't* is still variable in the White mesolect; in the GC mesolect *don't* and *ain't* got are used with past reference, Bickerton also quotes forms *mustn't*, *haven't* and *hadn't* which are only found in BBD acrolect.

The most clear-cut difference is in past non-stative:
Neva occurs exclusively before non-statives and in contexts which would satisfy English simple past but not creole [anterior]. (Bickerton 1975 p.98)

Never begins to be replaced by didn't higher up in the mesolect but in the mesolect, where, on the whole, GC has the greatest similarity with BBD basilect, the very common past punctual non-stative verb has ain't in BBD and never in GC, whereas never in BBD is used for past iterative.

There are in fact two kinds of difference between BBD and GC. The first is trivial: whether never or ain't marks past punctual is a matter of the lexical item selected, what is important is that both creoles distinguish this category whereas SE does not. The other difference is in the greater importance in the BBD basilect of the marking of tense whilst non-SE categories of stative and non-stative are still of importance. Bickerton (p.101) shows that both don't and ain't are possible markers for past and non-past, stative and non-stative because the latter distinction has weakened, even with those speakers who still use na elsewhere — the most basilectal marker. In BBD tense marking is clear and obligatory with have and copula, and don't is obligatorily non-past, yet stative versus non-stative is still of primary importance in choice of verbal negator.

2.7. **Comparison with Black English.** Few details are available for BE verbal negatives, but these reveal many similarities with BD. Labov (1968 p.255-257) mentions ain't for negative copula and ain't had for past possessive, pointing out that these are common to non-SE White speech also, although he explains the latter form as arising from ain't.
as the negative of the auxiliary have, not possible in BBD. He gives only don't as present negative but does mention ain't as a possible past negator, with a frequency as high as 45% for his adolescent peer groups. (see tables on p.256)

For Gullah Cunningham (1970) gives rules which do not seem to account for some of her own examples (see pp.204, 206); her examples show that ain't is negative copula and don't is non-past habitual:

(44) He ain't home. (p.83)
(45) It just be a bunch of Em working and stuff. (p.84)  

didn't is considered the past of don't; one example is like BBD:

(46) I didn't born a girl so I had to be a boy. (p.84)

but there is a difference from BBD in that past copula seems to be invariably didn't been:

(47) It didn't been long before he dead. (p.84)

She simply mentions ain't and don't as occurring before 'predicators' -- full verbs and adjectives. Her examples seem similar to BBD:

(48) I ain't belongs to church. (p.83)
(49) I ain't know how to give him his supper. (p.83)

although she glosses all the examples of non-stative past verbs with the SE perfective e.g.:

(50) He ain't end that war. (p.82) - he hasn't ended that war.

She does not discuss never but it appears in an example:

(51) She ain't never did tell no truth. (p.142)

The use of did here does not correspond to BBD use
(she does not discuss it) but ain't never is similar.

It is unfortunate that neither her rules nor her examples permit clear parallels to be drawn since in most respects it seems that BBD would be nearer to Gullah than to Guyanese, which would be plausible considering the historical facts. In particular, it would be of interest to examine those occurrences of Black English ain't found by Labov, and obtain further details for Gullah, to determine if a stative-non-stative distinction can still be discerned, or whether ain't is simply an option in these varieties to mark present or past with any verb.

Negative Concord

3.1. I give in Tables 16 to 18 an analysis of BD negative concord and related phenomena. For comparison I have used the same individuals grouped in the same way as for the forms of verbal negation in Table 14.

In Table 16 I contrast clauses in which there are two or more negatives with those in which a non-definite within the scope of negation is realized with any or an any-compound or with a. Column 1 of the table includes all clauses wherein there is a negated subject or verb and at least one other negative, for example:

(52) No rain nor nothing don't come in the cave (WF80L)
(53) Nassau ain't no good now. (BM78R)

Column 2 and 3 examples have at least one element lacking concord:

(54) She don't want any of that feed. (BF75R)
(55) She ain't like a common Negro. (WM84M)

In Table 17 I give figures for two other aspects of negation.
TABLE 16
NEGATIVE CONCORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% Negative</th>
<th>% any</th>
<th>%a</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 17
OTHER NEGATIVE PHENOMENA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>+VN</th>
<th>-VN</th>
<th>Postposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VN = Verbal negator after other negative
Postposed = negator on element after verb

TABLE 18
DET. BEFORE NP IN NEGATIVE S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%no+NP</th>
<th>%any+NP</th>
<th>%a+NP</th>
<th>%o+NP</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55 0 5 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35 7 14 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37 8 20 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In BD as in SE an indeterminate subject in a negative clause must carry a negative surface marker; this is called negative attraction by Labov (1972) since he proposes that the negative is moved from the verb leftward onto the subject. In SE if the subject is so marked, the verb cannot be; in Guyanese Creole the verb is always negated and in BD the marking is optional. Thus we have:

(56) But nobody could turn me back when I was looking for something. (BF75R)

(57) Not a soul on N.T. does sell it. (BF44C)

but:

(58) Nobody else can't get it but them. (BM93R)

(59) Some of them not all, not all ain't born the full time. (BF71A)

As can be seen from columns 1 and 2 of Table 17, the presence of the verbal negator does not decrease from basilectal to mesolect as might be expected of a non-SE feature. A speaker such as BF32R omits it more often than WF80L although the former seems to be the more basilectal both with negation and with other features analyzed.

Columns 3 of Table 17 on the other hand, in spite of small numbers, varies predictably with the continuum. These are examples of what Labov (1972) calls "negative postposing", where the verb is not negated but some NP after the verb:

(60) ...and you have the money and they got nothing. (BM93R)

While the few examples I have are like (60), relatively unmarked stylistically with the negated NP immediately after the verb, this rule is probably more common in formal and literary speech, and does not operate in my data from the basilect. Those speakers who use this rule are mostly those who have also acquired any.
In Table 18 I contrast the percentages of no, any a and zero before noun phrases within the scope of negation. The figures for no and any are included in the overall percentages in columns 1 and 2 of Table 3. Examples are:

(61) I ain't no Andros woman. (BF44C)
(62) We couldn't get no fresh water. (BM93R)
(63) I never catch in a storm not going neither coming. (BM77R)
(64) "I don't see any tongue it has". (WM84M0
(65) Crab can't do with the shingle. (BF44C) = can't do it.
(66) That's leaf. That ain't sack. (BF75R)

I have tabulated examples with a separately since Labov (1972) states (p. 806) that "the indefinite article a is not an indeterminate and is not involved in NEGCONCORD." I discuss this in section 3.3. below.

I will consider Labov's (1972) treatment of negative concord and try to show that because his rules account for SE first, with concord being a more superficial and derivative phenomenon, these rules do not characterize negative concord as it operates in BD, which seems very similar to BE. Furthermore, because he combines SE and several non-SE varieties his rules for BE are unnecessarily broad and therefore unrevealing. Even the highly variable behavior of markers of NPs under negation varies predictably with the continuum; the acquisition of any and a markers with mesolectal speakers consists probably of adding a superficial de-marking rule to the end of their grammars to achieve a more SE output.

3.2. **Comparison with Labov 1972.** Labov is discussing mostly Black English negation, but he also discusses two types of White non-SE
and SE itself; his rules are intended to encompass all these dialects.

He feels that negation in BE differs from copula rules:

In some ways, PE is converging with other dialects of English, and reflects a Creole origin with structures more different from English than we now observe. But so far as rules of negative concord and negative attraction are concerned, we are looking at the further development of traditional, well-established English rules with no reflection in Creole structures. (p.774)

I am not certain what he means by there being "no reflection in Creole structures" since negative concord has been reported for Jamaican Creole (Bailey 1966) and Guyanese Creole (Bickerton 1975) besides others. Since Labov himself in this article reports differences between Black English concord and that of other varieties it surely has to be shown that these differences could not have had Creole origins.

He further states:

...there are many dialects of English which convert some any's into no's, differing from SE in a variety of ways, but there is no dialect which converts all any's in negative sentences into no's. (p.774)

If by this he means that in all varieties some any's will be found within the scope of negation, this is not true for basilectal BBD or for Guyanese Creole. Within the whole continuum, of course, any is found, so it becomes a matter of his definition of dialect. He may have made an implicit exception of Creoles, but this seems strange in view of his previously quoted comment.

Because of his two assumptions quoted above, he makes clear in the Introduction to his 1972 article that he will regard SE
negative distinctions as basic and those of other dialects as
derivative. Using the example sentence:

(67) It ain't no cat can't get in no coop. (his (1) p.773)

he comments:

It is generally agreed that the no in no cat
represents an underlying indefinite any
combined with a negative which has been attracted
to it from elsewhere in the sentence. (p.775)

He subsequently explains in detail the semantic features of
any in all SE contexts and labels the complex of features developed as
INDET which he uses in his rules for negative placement and concord.

These rules are as follows:

139 NEGPLACEMENT : categorical

\[
X - [+neg] - [\emptyset, M, be, have] - NP - Y
\]

\[
1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \rightarrow 1 \ 3 \ 4+2 \ 5
\]

(140) NEGATTRAC I

\[
X - INDET - [+neg] \quad (\sim \text{does not contain})
\]

\[
1 \ 2 \ 3 \rightarrow 1 \ 3+2
\]

Condition: Obligatory if 1- [+neg] or [-fact]
commanding 2 and 4 and 2 is [-stress]

(142) NEGCONCORD III : variable

\[
X - [+neg] - Y \quad \{INDET, VB\}
\]

\[
1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \rightarrow 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 2+4
\]

Conditions:
a) 4 cannot be directly dominated by a VP which is dominated by an S dominated by a lexical NP which does not dominate 2.

b) 4 = VB in WNS2 and BE....(pp.813-4)
The negative is thus first placed preverbally, then moved away from the verb if there is a preceding indeterminate, then inserted before any following verb in the same sentence (usually the same one from which it was moved by the preceding rule) or indeterminate. This complexity seems motivated largely by SE rather than by BE facts. Labov states:

The most relevant fact about NEGCONCORD in BE is that it is NOT optional; in the major environment, within the same clause, NEGCONCORD to indeterminates is obligatory. (p.806)

However a verbal negator co-occurring with a preceding negative is "optional" but frequent in BE as in BBD (see Labov 1972 tables p.807); the marking of a verb or indeterminate outside the same clause is sporadic. Nevertheless, the categorical marking in BE of clause-mate indeterminates and the optional marking in other varieties are all subsumed under his one 'variable' NEGCONCORD rule.

As Labov himself says "the difference between a variable rule and a categorical one is a fundamental one", (1968 p.278) yet he has negative concord, most usually a categorical rule, labelled 'variable' in the same way as negative postposing, an optional device of formal speech.

3.2.2. In basilectal BBD and BE the negative marking of the subject indeterminate and that of any other indeterminate in the same clause are equally obligatory and are very similar processes. To reflect this fact it would seem better to perform both operations by the same rule, marking all INDET within the scope of negation with a negative. This rule could be subsequent to negative placement; however this
would require copying the negative then both leftward and rightward. It would be easier to provide for the marking of all indeterminates by one rule prior to verb placement, when the negative had been lowered to a position immediately before the S. The verb then could be obligatorily marked if the first rule marking indeterminates had not operated.

However, whereas in SE the verb is never marked if there is a negative element preceding it, in BE and in BD such marking may occur. (see Table 4 and examples 56 - 59) This could be accounted for by a condition on the second rule, that it is obligatory where the first rule has not applied to an NP to the left and in the same clause, and that it is otherwise optional. However, there are several other environments where negative marking within the same clause can be found in BD. 7 I propose that both these and the optional marking of the verb are accounted for by a later optional rule of negative concord, distinct from the obligatory marking of indeterminates.

Adverbials of time, manner, place etc. may be optionally marked with negative, whether phrases or clauses:

(68) I didn’t had no loss of them not then. (BF75R)

(69) But you didn’t had to wall it in then. (BM77R)

(70) But they never used to do the crawfish not like how they doing it today. (BF38R)

(71) They ain’t had no furniture like how you have it today. (BF38R)

(72) They ain’t got nothing to sell not hardly. (BM78R)

(73) Beforetime didn’t had no creature round here at all hardly. (BM78R)

As can be seen this rule is optional within the speech of
individuals; adverbs of whatever length may be marked in this way, the result being to bring the adverb into greater prominence.

Another negative marker which is occasionally found has even stronger contrastive force. No +NP is found where the SE translation of the sentence would demand an existentially presupposed NP:

(74) Where? In Haiti? No man, they can't sell that in no Haiti!
    (BM51R)

(75) (I say to my mother --) You ain't say to no mother! (BM13N)

Most existentially-presupposed NP remain marked with the under negation in BD as in SE. A non-emphatic version of (74) or (75) would not have an indeterminate marker in BD but, like SE, would have in Haiti and to your mother respectively.

A further case in which a negative is optional is that of sentence elements external to the clause. (N)either when it appears sentence final is a conjunction linking two previous negated elements; here negative concord is optional:

(76) S- ain't get none of that neither. (BM46R)

(77) cos I didn't want no more either. (BM46R)

Nohow, rather than being a meaning-bearing element acts as a sentence intensifier as in:

(78) I don't go to no doctor nohow. (BF44C)

In non-emphatic contexts it is thus simply omitted:

(79) She couldn't decide to go to the doctor. (BF75R)

With many verbs which may be transitive or intransitive one can view the direct object nothing as being an optional added intensifier rather than an underlying semantic element. In the two sentences:

(80) No, you wouldn't know about Miss N- L-. (BF75R)
(81) I wouldn't know nothing about it. (BM93R)

It seems as though nothing could have been omitted from the one and inserted in the other with no change save in the prominence of the negation.

I propose then that there is a second, optional rule of negative concord which inserts +NEG at one or more points in the clause in addition to the obligatory +NEG(S) already present; this would introduce +NEG before verbs, adverbs, or presupposed NP's. Since there is no constraint upon the number of negatives at any one point, this can result in the double verbal negative discussed in section 2.4. above, or in doubling at other points, though this is uncommon:

(82) I don't smoke, neither nor drink. (BM78R)

If there is an element in the sentence unspecified, such as optional NP object or manner adverb, the negative can copied into the slot, where it will be spelt by the most semantically empty lexical item appropriate to the slot, such as nohow or nothing discussed above.

Labov's (1972) NEGCONCORD rule quoted above could not account for the negative on adverb clauses; he comments that "the expansion of the negative goes beyond the two environments INDET and VB" (p.805) for emphasis in BE, but gives no detail of the rule required. Since such a rule placing NEG in additional environments is required in addition to his NEGCONCORD rule, it would seem a further reason to remove the obligatory non-emphatic marking of non-definities from this optional rule, combining it instead with NEGATTRAC; to the NEGCONCORD rule would then be added the other environments for optional marking.

3.3. Negation of NP. The possible markers for an NP under
negation are no, any, a and zero tabulated in Table 18 above with examples (61) to (66), and also the. Further examples are:

(83) They don't bring the biters along with the crab. (BF50R)
(84) No, you ain't got to put no peas and rice. (BF44C)
(85) He don't have any boat. Only sometime he'll go with different people what does carry him but he don't have no boat. (BF65L)
(86) She didn't take a bath in water for six weeks. (BF75R)
(87) Only one thing what goat don't eat....(BF71A)
(88) If you don't work hard work in R.I. you won't get nothing. (BM78R)

These should be considered in relation to the BBD determiner system for positive sentences. This, like so much of the non-SE structure in BBD, is related to the basilectal system of Guyanese Creole. In GC, as described by Bickerton (1976), there is a three-way distinction as illustrated by his examples:

6a. di dag bait di kyat 'The dog bit the cat.'
   b. wan dag bait wan kyat 'A dog bit a cat.'
   c. dag bait kyat 'Dogs/A dog/The dog bites cats.'

(p.6)

with existentially-presupposed NP marked by di, existentially-asserted by wan and existentially-hypothesized by zero. Di = the gives no difficulty, being the same in GC, BD and SE, although in the Creoles it is not possible to have di/ the marking generic NP. In BBD as in GC generic nouns are marked with zero:

(89) Soldier crab could eat. (BF44C) = Soldier crab can be eaten
(90) Baby look like baby. (BM32N)
and so are non-definites, as subject or elsewhere:

(91) Jamaica vessel used to come then. (BM93R)
(92) You find cuo right there. (BF32R) = you may find one or more...
Sometimes the asserted NP is marked with one, which is used by the more basilectal speakers and related to GC wan; in the majority of cases such NP's are marked by a:
(93) So he come out there and take one big rock. (BF15N)
(94) It have a pen like where they go and clean out...(BF32R)

This three-way distinction of the/one, a/zero is consistent for positive sentences in the BBD basilect.

In the negative the a marker does not correspond to that of the positive. This is of course because the positive a marker is used for asserted NP, which are not possible within the scope of negation. (see Givón n.d.) The few occurrences of a in the negative in group A (basilectal) speakers are all of one type, semantically empty:
(95) This government ain't doing a horse ass I mean. (BF32R)
(96) And I tel I him ain't a damn bit of use a-cursing. (BF32R)
(97) I ain't never sell a pennyworth of things to nobody. (BF44C)
   (the penny is not used for the name of a coin)

The expression a horse ass in (95) seems to be a synonym simply of nothing; the replacing of the a in these examples by no would be ungrammatical, whereas in most cases of mesolectal a under negation such as (63) or (86) the result would be quite normal, e.g.:
(98) Used to have a flag for school, didn't have a bell. (WM84M)
(98') ....didn't have no bell.

It is not possible however to view expressions such as
a horse ass as lexically equivalent to nothing, since when similar expressions occur as subject they are overtly marked with not:

(99) Not a soul on N.T. does sell it. (BF44C)

and this is parallel to a soul as object:

(100) I ain't ask a soul to change my time for me.... (BF75R)

These expressions are idiosyncratic in the subject in having not a rather than no; they are of course found in SE also with these peculiarities. It seems probable that they are learnt in the baselect before a general rule for a under negation is learnt. The Group A speakers also have not acquired the rule for any; there is one speaker who uses anything in one sentence. In my data there are a few Group B speakers who use anything, anybody but not any+NP; numbers are too for firm conclusions, but it may well be that these are acquired as lexical alternates to nothing, nobody before the broader rule is acquired.

In Table 5 I have not attempted to distinguish between no in emphatic or contrastive sentences and elsewhere. In some cases it seems fairly clear that the no before NP is emphatic, as in (74) and (75) above or:

(101) B- no business with that amount of money in hand, in no hand! (BF32R)

Also clearly emphatic is when no marks an NP in contradiction to an asserted NP in preceding discourse marked either with one or a:

(102) (We got one ladder?) I ain't got no ladder! (BM36N)

(102) "Mind E-" say "is a ghost here."....She say oh, she ain't scared of no ghost. (BF32R)
In the positive basilect sentence a zero marker is used for generic, mass and plural count nouns. In the negative zero is often also found as in (65), (66), (87) and (88), but no is also found with such nouns in contexts similar to those with zero:

(103) No, don't have turtle round here not these days. (BF38R)

(104) Beforetime didn't had no creatures round here at all hardly.. (BM78R)

(105) ....cos couldn't get food, you know, and had to go to Haiti...
(BM78R)

(106) We couldn't get no fresh water. (BM93R)

Although SE rules permit zero-marked mass and plural count nouns in the scope of negation as does the basilect, mesolectal speakers tend to avoid these (see Table 5); the use not only of SE any but also of general non-SE no increases for these in the mesolect at the expense of zero.

In the case of singular count nouns the basilect marks these with no, as in (61) above or:

(107) B- ain't had no wife here to please. (BF32R)

although since number is not well-established when the existence of the noun is being denied, sometimes a basilectal zero-marked noun would correspond to an SE singular noun:

(108) ..every two years that's a baby! I ain't want see baby not even draw on paper. (BF32R) = I don't want to see a baby..

The incidence of no and to a lesser extent zero will diminish as the SE rule of a before singular count noun is learnt. This rule is acquired a little earlier than that of any-marking, although both are still only options to full concord even in Group C:
Labov (1972) does not discuss the use of a; he simply states:

the indefinite article a is not an indeterminate and is not involved in NEGCONCORD:

106a. I ain't never lost a fight. (p.806)

He has defined 'indeterminate' as, amongst other things [+distributive] (like 'each') which would exclude a. However, he then has to propose for his example 122:

(110) I don't want a piece...I don't want no piece. (p.810)

that the second sentence differs from the first by a transformation inserting any -- which seems difficult to justify.

There does not seem to be any semantic distinction between those non-definites marked with a and those with no. The second half of Labov's example above differs from the first merely by being more emphatic. It seems that in the BBD basilect negative concord is obligatory within the same clause to singular non-definite count nouns as to other non-definites; in the mesolectal and in Black English, however, singular count nouns are excluded from this obligatory rule and are subject only to the much wider optional rule of concord for emphasis. Labov is thus correct in saying that those nouns marked a are not obligatory marked, but this is not so much because of a basic difference in the singular count noun but because at the stage of decreolization reached by his Black teenagers the negative concord rule has weakened in this one environment. This follows a common
tendency for decreolization to cause the spread of an SE rule gradually one environment at a time.

3.4. Concord from outside the clause. Like Labov, I have some examples of negative concord being extended to a following clause. To account for this, Labov's (1972) NEGCONCORD rule quoted (p. 805) above is made very broad in its scope, causing NEG to be 'variably' transferred to any following INDET or verb in the same sentence.

The condition on this rule only excludes negative concord on the direct object of a subordinate relative clause. Since, when discussing the optionality of negative concord in these contexts Labov gives an example of its lack in a because-clause, he obviously intends this rule to apply optionally if rarely to any subordinate clause where the main clause is negated. I will try to show that such concord is rare only because the conditions for its application are quite constrained and that (within these limits) it is in fact obligatory to non-definites and optional on the verb in BBD and possibly BE also. The same rules of negative concord can thus serve for these as for concord within the clause, without making the concord rule so wide in scope.

The few examples Labov gives (and from his wording in (1968) and (1972) he seems to have quoted all that he found) fall into a few well-defined types which are similar to those found in my BBD data. He stresses the copying of negation onto a subordinate verb since he finds this particularly strange; indeed he opens his 1972 article with a quotation of this 'semantic contradiction':
(111) It ain't no cat can't get into no coop. (his. no. 1.)

where negative concord is in a following relative clause
without the relative conjunction, as the BD:

(112) Ain't nothing don't smell worse than that. (BF19N)

The other type of concord is after know and the 'neg-raising'
verbs:

(113) When it rained, nobody don't know it didn't. (1972 # 47)

(114) I told you, I don't believe there's no God. (1968 # 356)

These are similar to BD examples:

(115) P-J- ain't know say them tablet ain't had no penicillin. (BF32R)
    = didn't know that they had penicillin.

(116) I don't think it's no other area of the Bahamas you could find
      no nicer. (WF39E)

Labov mentions that negative concord to lower clause non-
definltes is more common that to the lower verb, which it is for BD
also, but again he quotes clauses subordinate to think and relative
clauses. The only extra type he quotes for non-definltes alone is in
a co-ordinate clause, of which I do not have an example although it
seems quite normal for BD:

(117) I'm not gonna stand there and let nobody hurt him. (1968 # 341)

Although he calls this aspect of negative concord optional
he gives no BE example where any does occur in a subordinate clause
below a negative, either similar in type to his examples of concord,
or different. Labov makes no mention in either discussion (1968 or
1972) of this BE 'extension' of the concord rules that the environments
for concord to non-definltes are those where writers on SE have long
recognized that 'some-any suppletion' occurs (Klima 1964, Ross 1968
and others). This is because, as Labov outlines in the 1972 article, he considers that an analysis of the semantic features of some and any show them to be different. Presumably, though he does not say so explicitly, he is assuming an underlying any (or rather, the complex of features which can be spelt any) rather than the suppletion of some under negation. But he then makes no attempt to account for the occurrence of this [-fact] determinant any only in certain restricted environments. Some-any suppletion with all its weaknesses (see for example Lakoff 1969) did attempt to do this with features such as Kilma's (1964) +AFFECT.

Furthermore since Labov bases his analysis of SE any in part on the properties of any in hypothetical sentences he is not distinguishing between this any and the one under negation. His NEGCONCORD rule would thus allow negative marking of the any in:

'I don't think that if any Martians land I will go and meet them.'

although I doubt if either BE or BD would transfer the negative to the any in this case.

My data and Labov's coincide in showing negative concord only to a certain type of relative clause and sentential object. Adverb clauses seem to block concord; negative concord to an adverb, which may optionally occur as I discussed in section 3.2. above, does not go down into the clause itself:

(118) Not me, not when I get woman I never get no bite. (BF87A)
- I never got bitten when I became a woman.

The relative clauses where concord occurs are where the head noun is itself non-definite and therefore, for all except nouns with determiner a, have themselves undergone concord. Because Labov has
excepted a from entering negative concord, an example of such a relative clause concorded leaves him at a loss, and indeed he asserts that it is not typical:

And in (49), the citation from 'The Fall', the extension of NEGCONCORD to a following clause is triggered by an indefinite with a, which is not a part of the usual NEGCONCORD rule and does not incorporate the negative in the way that any does; "For there wasn't a son of a gun who this whore couldn't shun."

We therefore see speakers of BE extending the scope of the NEGTRANSFER rules to environments beyond any formal rule we can now write, since there is no reason to believe that these are productive patterns. (1972 p.312) (emphasis mine)

(In fact, of course, Labov's rule of NEGCONCORD as it stands -- my page 112) -- would handle this example since there is an unconditioned variable between the negative and the element to be concorded.) His example quoted in the extract above does complicate the writing of a rule for this aspect of negative concord, since his other examples such as (111) or:

(119) There ain't no kid around that ain't - wasn't even thinking about smoking no reefer. (1972 # 43)

any my example (112) or:

(120) Well, what I can't give you, ain't nobody else can't give you I don't believe. (BM78R) = I don't believe there is anyone else who can give you what I can't.

are all of concord in relative clauses with the head NP having the obligatory negative concord I discussed in section 3.2. above, and where the relative conjunction is, or would be if inserted, the subject of the relative clause. It may be that for his #49 Labov is right to consider it non-typical: it is a quotation from oral literature and thus stylized. However he does seem to generalize from it to imply that BE negative concord cannot be
A further limitation upon these concorded relative clauses is that they are all, including #49, qualifying the complement NP of existential sentences. Although more data are required, it seems that both BE and BD examples form a homogenous class.

For negative concord in noun clauses, combining Labov's data with mine yields six examples with believe, five with think, five with know and one with say, see examples (113) - (116) and:

(121) I don't believe that'll win no race in the world. (WM84M)
(122) Ain't say he was ga borrow none. (BF32R)

Of these, only (113) and (115) have clear verbal concord. Although Labov treats (114) as such, I think that is more likely a case of negative concord on the NP complement. Verbal concord is thus rarer than on the verb in the main negated clause; concord on non-definites is obligatory in all these cases as in the relatives.

I have far more numerous cases of negative concord in non-finite clauses, which Labov does not mention. Since he regards NEG-CONCORD as a superficial rule, these presumably did not worry him, since by that stage the lower clause would have been raised into the main clause and the S-node pruned. Examples such as:

(123) She ain't want him to do no hard work. (BF32R)
(124) I ain't had nobody to send me nowhere else. (BF75R)

are very similar in underlying structure to the finite noun clauses and relative respectively.
Tree for: Ain't say he was q> borrow none:

S

NEG S

PAST S

NP VP

(he) V NP

say N S

It he borrow indef-thing

Tree for She ain't want him to do no hard work:

S

NEG S

PAST S

NP VP

she V NP

want N S

It he do indef-work

Tree for It ain't no cat can't get into no coop:

S

NEG S

EXIST NP

NP S

Indef-cat Indef-cat get into Indef-coop
Tree for I ain't had nobody to send me nowhere else:
If concord were an early transformation it could operate in all these structures before a transformation such as raising subject to object in (123) and before tree-pruning.

It would seem at least possible that those transformations not peculiar to one language may be earlier than language-particular ones. In this case, negative concord to non-definites operates in Spanish in an identical fashion in all four of the above examples, although Spanish lacks the transformations which make two of the four subordinate clauses in English non-finite. The Spanish equivalents would be:

(122) A'int say he was g'd borrow none.

No dijo que tuviese la intención de pedir nada prestado.

(123) She a'int want him to do no hard work.

No quiso que él hiciese nada difícil.

(111) It a'int no cat can't get into no coop.

No hay gato que pueda insinuarse en ninguna jaula.

(124) I a'int had nobody to send me nowhere else.

No tenía a nadie que me mandase a ningún otro sitio.

I proposed above for BD that the marking of non-definites was by obligatory rule which was separate from the optional marking of the verb. In Spanish, negative marking of indeterminates is obligatory but that of the verb is not permitted; the Spanish verb is marked, however, by subjunctive endings. If cross-language similarities are considered it seems that Spanish provides further evidence that NP and VP marking should be by distinct rules.
The BO and BE facts point to obligatory concord for non-definites in subordinate noun and adjective clauses, and if the structure for these is correct, then the negative concord rule could specify concord down the tree into any structures of the form

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S NP}
\end{array}
\]

but not where there was an adverb bracket.

I do not have any examples of indirect questions with non-definites to see whether Q blocks the lowering of NEG; indirect commands, however, do have negative concord:

(125) The law ain't say board up no yard. (BF75R) = The law doesn't say to board up ones yard.

and POSS-ing complementizers as well as for-to complementizer such as (123):

(126) B- ain't have no right giving U- no chicken feed come over in her yard feed no chicken. (BF32R) = B- didn't have any right giving U- chicken feed for him to come over in her yard and feed the chickens.

Concord into the VP is rare when the verb is a surface non-finite, as it is when it is finite subordinate. It does occur however:

(127) If it ain't beat, it ain't worth not ga made. (BF100S) =

if it is not beaten, it is not worth being made.

Since verbal negation on the main verb is optional, it is to be expected that it should be less favored on the lower ones where emphasis is less likely to be a factor.

Apart from the co-ordinate example (117) which would pose no problem if negative concord is ordered before co-ordinate clause reduction, Labov's examples and mine fall into two related categories, both having obligatory concord on non-definites -- at least in the
3.5. **Other BD Negation.** There are two further aspects of negation which are of interest. BBBD questions do not usually have inversion of subject and verb; one type of negative question appears to have inversion regularly, e.g.:

(128) *Ain't* we got one ladder? (BF16N)

(129) *Ain't* you hear her say that? (BF19N)

These are not sporadic attempts at the SE rule increasing in frequency along the continuum but occur throughout for the type of question which conveys the speaker's assumption that the positive is correct, like the SE equivalent:

(128b) *Haven't* we got a ladder?

Other questions are marked in one of three ways: Wh-questions have the wh-word sentence-initial and characteristic intonation; tag questions have an invariant tag *eh?* and positive yes-no questions have intonation only. Inversion in these types does enter sporadically in mesolectal BBBD and increase towards SE in a pattern similar to other features of decreolization.

The initial negator *ain't* in examples (128) and (129) seems plainly to be a verbal negator, since the negator for other constituents is *not*. However it does not trigger negative concord (though I have only a few examples) for example in (128) or:

(130) *Ain't* he got *some* conch to the dock? (BF43R)

It also does not combine with tense-aspect markers or modals:

(131) *Ain't* you *does* bite? (BF43R)

(132) *Ain't* M-*could* bring them for you? (WM80L)
If this is a case of inversion it must then occur before +NEG combines with any preverbal markers. However, this cannot then be the same rule as required for SE which moves any tense-markers and modals with the negative. Furthermore the trigger for such BD inversion cannot be the usual question marker, since other questions do not invert.

It would seem best to generate this negative sentence-initial as it occurs on the surface. If all negators are originally higher predicates, however, there would have to be some underlying difference between (128) and:

(128c) We ain't got no ladder, eh?

since these are non-synonymous, the latter conveying the speaker's assumption that the answer is negative.

(128) is roughly equivalent to SE:

(128d) Is it not (the case) that we have a ladder?

and in this SE sentence negative polarity items such as any are ungrammatical:

(128e)* Is it not the case that we have any ladder?

A common tree for (128) and (128d) could be:
whereas 128c would have the tree:

```
S
  | Q
  | S
NEG S
  | we got one ladder
```

However, although this would provide for the lack of tense marking, since the equative verb would be non-past regardless of the tense or modality of the lower verb, the lack of negative concord must be accounted for, since this operates into lower noun clauses (see section 3.4. above).

Baker (1970) shows that where there are two negatives the polarity of one cancels the other, so that in clauses commanded by both, negative polarity items are ungrammatical.

Such polarity is also affected by a question; in the case of (128) both NEG and Q, are affecting the polarity and therefore concord is not possible.

The analysis of this question form as having a higher equative verb which combines with the negative seems to be correct; it is thus not a case of inversion. The dummy it is not inserted as would be required in SE.

Another interesting negative is what Labov (1972) calls a "NEG from nowhere":

(133) Bitch, before you get the price of nothing...(102)

similar to BD examples:

(134) I catch him before he don't go to M- (BF24N)
(135) You don't go without J- don't go. (WF23M)

These are examples

conjunctions that Klima (1964) considers contain[+Affect](p,314)

which in SE accounts for the occurrence of negative polarity items

in the clauses they introduce. In Spanish there is once again a

parallel. A translation of (134) would be roughly:

(135b) Puta, antes de que te paguen nada...

with once again a subjunctive marking on

the verb and negative indeterminate. In view of the facts of the

situations referred to by these sentences -- the female is not going
to get any money (134), he will not reach M-- (135) -- it would seem

likely that there is an underlying negative in these sentences which

SE has suppressed.

Bickerton (1975) states that in Guyanese basilect the only

multiple negation permitted is where the speaker is negating a state-

ment containing a singular count noun.

The statement:

6b, wan dag bait wan kyat. (p.6)

is negated by:

13c, non dag na bait non kyat. (p.9)

which:

is logically equivalent to:

13c' There is no dog such that it bit a cat,

and there is no cat such that it was bitten

by a dog, so there wasn't any biting either.

If this is indeed the natural-logical form

of a negation of 6b, it follows that the

multiple negation of 13c is simply a maximally-

transparent syntactic rendering of it. (p.10)
In other words, in the deep structure of a semantically-based grammar, the negation is marked already on all the non-definites and the verb; there would be no rule of negative concord. It would seem that Bickerton is implying by "syntactic transparency" that this underlying structure would be that of SE also.

This proposal is attractive; it would solve, as I suggest above, the problem of where the 'NEG from nowhere' comes from after the [+Affect] elements themselves not overtly negative. It would be historically satisfying; negative concord is the older form for English as a whole and, as Curme (1947) implies when he says:

Under Latin influence this older usage has disappeared in literary English. (p.147)

it is the

non-concorded indeterminate that is derivative in English. The conversion of no to any would be a superficial language-particular rule which would not exist in some varieties of English. Klima (1964) considers and rejects such a proposal for SE, arguing (p.290) from the evidence of postposed negation and the ambiguity of 'I will force her to marry no-one' amongst other arguments.

I cannot discuss SE complexities here; however, it would seem preferable not to have BD deep structures differ radically from SE. There are many Individuals who, in the Bahamas as elsewhere, command both SE and a variety of English with multiple negation. If an independent analysis would make it seem preferable to have underlying multiple negation for these non-SE lects, then SE should probably be examined in this light.
The problem for BD with Bickerton's analysis above is that verbal negation is optional in BD if the subject is negative. I have suggested in earlier sections that this be accounted for by postulating an earlier obligatory negative concord rule affecting only the indefinites. The same arguments would apply if these were marked not by rule but in the underlying semantic representation. Taking Bickerton's 'natural-logical' semantic structure:

There is no dog such that it bit a cat, and there is no cat such that it was bitten by a dog so that there wasn't any biting either. (1974 p.10)

it can be seen that this would entail that the BD underlying semantic representation be modified, for example:

...so that any biting becomes hypothetical.

This would have a relationship with the facts of Spanish. The indefinites are marked with negative in a subordinate clause within the scope of negation, but the verb is in the subjunctive. This mood is the marking for hypothetical clauses, such as irrealis conditionals or the expression of wishes.

Bickerton has pointed out (personal communication) an interesting parallel with child language. There is a certain stage of language development at which negative concord appears (see Bloom 1970) and for the middle-class children, in whose presence even the most informal language will not contain negative concord, this appears unmotivated. If the underlying structure contains negated
Indeterminates as in the Guyanese basilect this would be explained. The children's initial negative concord and later suppression of it would follow the developmental lines outlined in Stampe (1972) of a natural 'process' which is later suppressed. Decreolization would follow a similar pattern.

If this is the case the decreolization here would be different from the other changes I have described. A rule suppressing verbal negation would have to be inserted as an early rule since the negative would have to be removed before it combined with tense-aspect or modals. Most decreolization involves superficial changes such as substitution of didn't for ain't or insertion of dummy subject.

It may be that such a deep structure change cannot be optional. The obligatory marking in GC basilect of negative on the verb as well as indeterminates seems to have been lost in BBD; the optional marking of the verb that is seen is probably achieved by the stylistic marking rule required for other elements in the sentence. This would account for the fact, although the change from verb-marking is a phenomenon of decreolization, the verbal marking does not show gradual change along the continuum as do the rules for any, a and zero use. (see Table 4 above)

For BBD negation I would propose, then, that the non-definites marked with no and its compounds are probably generated as such in deep structure, although an early rule marking these with the feature [+neg] from a higher NEG predicate would have the same surface result. There would be no rule of negative attraction such as proposed by Labov (1972), since the subject non-definite would already be
marked not the verb. The one other rule required for the basilect would be an optional rule, with stylistic and social conditioning, which would generate extra negatives within the same clause as a [+neg], or within certain limited types of subordinate clauses. These extra negatives would be placed before the verb or before presupposed NP's either alone or in prepositional phrases, in which case they would be incorporated into the determiner of the noun. They could occur before adverbs or adverbial clauses, but could not be incorporated into them. The [+neg] could be inserted before an empty NP slot or other element permitted by the sentence structure, in which case the negative would be realized by a semantically empty item appropriate to the slot.

For the mesolect the SE rules required to convert underlying no into any or a would be acquired as optional rules perhaps only in some environments at first.
Notes for Chapter III

1. Past habitual is discussed in section 2.4, below on never.
2. The modal I transcribe with separate to is in fact pronounced with simply a final /i/ in BBD and /ə/ in WBD with both got and had. Thus we have BBD /gædɪ/ and /hædɪ/ and WBD gædə/ and hædə/; for both varieties have to is /hæftə/.
3. The verb go is another special case with past forms.

Three are possible: I ain't go = I didn't go; I ain't gone = I am not absent; I ain't bin = I didn't go and return, I haven't/hadn't been.
4. Negative modals in BD are on the whole the same as in SE; there are a few points of interest: since can has been lost (see note for chapter II for details) the negatives can't and couldn't both correspond to positive could:

(a) If you have favorable weather, oh, you could complete the trip in about two weeks, but if the weather get kind of rough -- you know, can't go. (BM93R)
(b) And I could pass the BJC exam... nobody else couldn't pass the test...(BF75R)

with can't being used in non-past contexts and couldn't in past. Won't, wouldn't and shouldn't have usually the same reference as in SE, but couldna, wouldn'a and shouldna are sometimes used for past reals as well as irreals, in the same way as their positive equivalents:
(c) I couldna stop. We keep sliding, sliding down the hill.

(BM20N) = I couldn't stop.
(d) Wasn't for B- he wouldna bin getting that. (BF32R) = if it wasn't for B- he wouldn't be getting that.
5. Labov at several points uses the term optional when discussing negative concord, but finally marks his rule of NEGCONCORD variable, although he gives no figures for frequency of occurrence such as used in his variable rules for the copula. He does not in the 1972 article on negation distinguish between optional and variable, but I believe a useful distinction could be made. The form of a rule does not change whether it is obligatory, optional or variable, what changes is the conditions of application. The term 'optional' is used, even when discussing an idealized homogeneous community, to describe those rules that the individuals in the community could apply or not and grammatical sentences would result. The conditions causing the selection of the option might well be stylistic such as negative postposing discussed above. The term 'variable rule' has been used to characterize rules which are socially conditioned for application. There may be some, or many, individuals in a social group for whom such a rule is optional; indeed, for them the conditions of its application -- formality versus intimacy -- may well be the same as those of an always optional rule. However, for others in the community such a rule may be categorical and for others non-existent. Labov labels his NEGCONCORD rule variable and indeed some conditions upon this rule are socially determined as are his copula rules. However, the rule as he states it (see my page 9) could not incorporate the mechanisms for determining the frequency of application such as he outlines for his variable rules for copula. This is because, as I show, he combines INDET and VB as both undergoing concord even though clause-mate indeterminates have almost categorical concord in his data and a lower verb concord only
rarely. I have therefore considered his label 'variable' here as synonymous with 'optional' more especially as he gives this label also to his rule for negative postposing, which I believe is optional for all varieties of English.

6. In BBD, indeterminates in certain lower S's commanded by the negated S are also obligatorily marked; Labov states that this is optional in BE (Labov 1972 p.807). I discuss this further in section 3.4. below.

7. Labov gives only one example of this:
   (e) She ain't in no seventh grade. She in eleventh grade. (1972 #121)

   and even this, though an adverbial phrase, has an NP which can be marked. He does not discuss these in detail, but the rule may well be more restricted in BE. This example is contrastive and may belong with the examples such as in no Haiti I discuss below.

8. Hardly itself poses problems in SE as well as in BD (see Klima 1964), and I do not have enough data to formulate rules for it, the only one of the 'incomplete negatives' to occur in my data. It triggers negative concord either in object or in phrases:
   (f) He hardly could do nothing he own self. (BF32R)
   (g) It's hardly worth it not with scale fish. (WF80L)

   but verbal negation is optional when hardly precedes as in example (f) or is within the verb-phrase:
   (h) ...cos he does hardly come to see her. (BF19N)
   (i) Well they don't hardly do nothing. (WF80L)

   Also hardly itself may be preceded
9. The following are the examples of verbal negative concord to outside the clause as quoted by Labov. All but the last are from his 1968 report; I give his numbering:

270. It ain't no cat can't get into no coop.

Commenting on the above example he states (p.282):

"We collected the following additional examples:"

344. Well, wasn't much I couldn't do.

345. I don't know if the girl never got fucked or not.

346. I told you, I don't believe there's no God.

347. When it rained nobody don't know it didn't.

348. Back in them times there ain't no kid around that ain't -- wasn't even thinking about smoking no reefers.

349. It wasn't no trick couldn't shun her.

49. There wasn't a son of a gun who this whore couldn't shun.
CHAPTER IV

SUBJECT AND TOPIC
Introduction.

1.1. I describe in this chapter several non-SE features of BD involving subjects and their relative importance in the BD sentence.

First I document the use of dummy subject amongst Black and White speakers. It clearly varies along the continuum; lack of dummy subject would seem to be a Creole feature and there are parallels with other Afro-American varieties, although I have found only brief mention of these.

Second I describe the double subject sentence in BD, where a noun subject has a pronoun copy between it and the verb. I relate this to similar phenomena in Black English and New Guinea Tok Pisin and discuss the function it appears to serve in BD compared to these languages.

Neither the double-subject sentence nor another type, where a non-subject NP occupies first place in the sentence, is radically different from possible SE sentence-types. It seems, however, that the use of these transformations is both more widespread and less marked in BD than in more Standard varieties; this is simply impressionistic, however, as I have no frequency counts of other varieties for comparison, nor have I found anything comparable discussed for other non-SE varieties.

More detailed analysis of such sentences with a wider selection of data is needed for BD to determine how important these fronting transformations are in BD discourse and the functions they serve, besides comparative analyses for other non-SE varieties.
Dummy Subjects

2.1. In Tables 19 and 20 below I show the presence or absence of a dummy subject for a few of the commoner types of sentence which have this feature in SE. I have contrasted data from Black and White speakers, since there seem to be significant differences between them. I will discuss each type of sentence briefly and relate the omission of the dummy subject in basilectal Black speakers to the omission of anaphoric subject pronoun which is also found. In the course of the discussion I will relate features of the BD sentences to similar features described for other Afro-American varieties of English.

2.2. The there of the SE existential sentence is usually considered (see for example Lyons 1967) a dummy subject inserted after a transformation has moved the underlying initial NP. In BD the existential there is mainly acrolectal, and there are three other types of existential which are more commonly found.

The most basilectal form in my data appears to be introduced by a form of the verb *got/have* with zero subject, the verb showing the same variation of form in present and past, positive and negative, as was described in Chapter 111 for its modal and possessive meanings. The tabulation of column 1 in Tables 19 and 20 takes account only of sentences with no subject, such as:

(1) Beforetime didn't had no creature round here at all hardly. (BM78R)

(2) (Turtle, is there much turtle now?) No, don't have turtle round (BF38R)
**Key For Tables 19 and 20**

Exist have = existential S with *have* as verb.

Exist be = existential S with *be* as verb.

I = sentence with anaphoric 1 omitted.

Extra = sentence with extraposed subject.

Time = expression of time.

Ambience = expression of weather etc.

Total A = no. of subjects present - omitted in speech of individuals

Total B = no. of subjects present - omitted for each category.

0 = all subjects omitted in that category.

X = variable presence - omission of subjects.

1 = all subjects present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Exist I</th>
<th>Exist+be T</th>
<th>Ambi- T</th>
<th>Subj./Ø</th>
<th>Total A. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM78R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-25 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF44C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-16 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF87A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-9 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF32R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4-37 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF71A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2-9 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF65L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF75R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3-35 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM93R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2-17 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total B. 0-15 0-49 0-21 1-27 3-16 6-16 4-8 14-152

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: BBD Dummy Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Exist I</th>
<th>Ambi- T</th>
<th>Exist+be T</th>
<th>Subj./Ø</th>
<th>Total A. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WF80L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-8 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMB4M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>22-10 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMB60L</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7-4 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF43N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF23M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12-0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF39E</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34-1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total B. 0-1 3-4 21-7 38-4 9-5 15-2 86-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>57</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 20: WBD Dummy subjects
(3) (You were the captain, eh?) Oh, when I bin, yea, but had other captains too you know....(BM78R)

BBB has here diverged slightly from the pattern found in basilectal Guyanese where the usual existential sentence also has got, but with an expressed subject dem (Bickerton, personal communication). I have collected a few examples of they got/have where the anaphoric reference for they is vague, as of course it can be generally in English:

(4) They got accident up there. You shoulda turn back. (girl in car)

but only one such sentence occurs in the data used for Tables 1 and 2:

(5) That's one up to Greys and one down to Millars. They have two on the island. (BF65L) (she is herself on the island referred to)

such sentences are generally infrequent.

2.2.2. More frequently even in the basilect the verb in an existential sentence is be, tabulated in columns 5 and 6 of Table 1 and columns 3 and 4 of Table 20 but in the basilect this is also found with zero subject: 1

(6) Is only one big Boss, right? (BF44C)

(7) Only be three live here, my husband and just that little grand. (BF65L)

(8) (Boy, they last a long time too) Ain't none last longer than them. (BF32R)

(9) Wasn't nothing for you to do then like today. (BF75R)

Amongst some basilectal speakers the omission of the subject is categorical; however, as Tables 19 and 20 show, the use of either it or there as subject is optional for much of the continuum, with only a few White speakers having obligatory dummy subject in this
environment. In the tabulation I have counted only clearly non-anaphoric it for column 6:

(10) We's a small community. *It's* not so many jobs available for them to do. (WF39E)

(11) And she couldn't get along over there, cos *it wasn't* nothing doing. (BF75R)

A comparison of Tables 19 and 20 shows that the use of *it*+be for existential sentences is far more prevalent amongst White speakers than amongst Black. Data from more acrolectal Black speakers not included in these tables show an increasing use of *there* nearer SE with only occasional use of *it*. I have not heard or recorded any Black speaker with the categorical or near categorical use of *it* that I have found with some White speakers.

In Black English there is an interesting parallel with this White BD use. Labov (1968) says:

For some speakers, *it* for *there* is categorical, but in general it appears as a variable with a high degree of frequency. (p.302)

and gives a table of frequencies averaging around 70% *it* subject for his Black teenagers. He further remarks that *it* is a socio-linguistic marker like consuetudinal *be*:

....white speakers are as a rule completely unaware of this particular feature. (p.303)

Labov is here, however, speaking of northern US Whites; it would be of interest in unraveling Bahamas – US linguistic relationships to discover if any White communities in the southern US use *it* in this way, since the
Whites amongst whom it is most prevalent in the Bahamas live in the ex-Loyalist Family Island communities with clear historical links with the US. Labov also gives an example of zero-subject existential:

(12) Ain't nobody complaining but you, man. (1968,#.351)

but without frequency of occurrence. Also found within the Black English continuum is an occasional use of they got, which Labov (1968) found equivalent to there are only:

(13) They got some bitches round here. (p.303, #433)

and an existential use of here go:

(14) So Calvin had a rock, and we -- us -- y'know, here go a wall and far away, here go a wall. (#435)

The latter seems to be idiosyncratic to Black English. Again for comparative study the place on the Black English continuum of these forms and their relative frequencies would be of interest.

2.3. Expressions of 'ambience' (term from Bolinger 1973) such as weather conditions, temperature etc. show considerable variation within the data from one individual and through the continuum. The figures used in column 7 of Table 19 and column 2 of Table 20 are, low, and perhaps a clearer picture would emerge with more data. Besides examples with zero subjects:

(15) When you pass, is moonshine night and you pass clear over. (BF44C)

(16) Had to rain for get water most. (BM78R) = It had to rain in order to get water as a rule.

and It subject:

(17) Well, look like it blowing a gale outside. (BM51R)

(18) If it comes plenty rain like it's bin here lately. (WM84M)
there are a few examples of sentences from Black speakers where the location occurs sentence-initial:

(19) Yea, out there blowing some wind. (BF32R) (answer to (17))

(20) Turn it back on, cos in here getting hot. (BF19N)

In these it is not possible to be certain whether the locative is a fronted adverbial or a subject. If the former, they would slightly increase the figures for zero subject used in Table 19, but would not alter the pattern of variation.

Bolinger (1973) discusses it in such sentences and gives evidence which indicates that:

not only is it more than an empty surface element; it has as its referent precisely the 'environment' that is central to the whole idea. (p.261)

Although he later rejects the possibility that it is inserted as a copy of an extraposed locative in sentences such as:

"It's pleasant in Chicago." (p.264)

because clear adverbial phrases cannot function as subjects in SE, i.e.:

"*In Chicago is pleasant."

this is, of course, not the case in BBD where similar sentences such as (19) and (20) are grammatical. The variability of forms for ambient expressions in BBD may therefore be because the it is more easily taken as co-referential with expressed or contextual environment, and so may be treated as anaphoric; on the other hand it is not so clearly anaphoric as those it's which refer to NP's previously mentioned in
discourse.

2.4. Expressions of time and sentence with extraposed subjects show most clearly the difference between the Black and White speakers. The former use zero subject in 48 out of 49 such sentences (columns 3 and 4 Table 19):

(21) Now when **time** for brokling corn, I broke out my corn. (BF44C) = When it *is* time to pull out the corn....

(22) You does see him, then after that does be couple of weeks fore you see him. (BF71A)

(23) Seems like just two three weeks Christmas bin here, you see. (BM78R)

(24) Ain't no use coming to me bout no practice cos I ain't **coming**. (BM20N)

whereas for most White speakers a dummy subject is obligatory:

(25) It ain't likely it's gonna be rough to both beaches. (WF39E)

(26) When that comes out, it'll be when it's cut out... (WM84M)

(27) It's no use for a foreigner to come... (WF80L)

as can be seen from columns 3 and 4 of Table 19 and columns 5 and 6 of Table 20 there is far less variability in these categories than with ambience expressions.

2.5. Labov (1968) makes no mention of his Black English subjects' use of dummy subjects save in existential sentences. For Gullah Cunningham (1970) does not provide for subject deletion except in commands as in SE. However, it would seem likely that lack of dummy **it** might occur in Gullah, since it is found in both Black English and BBD.

Bickerton (1973) mentions for Guyanese only cleft and
pseudocleft sentences, and impersonal expressions; for the latter he gives existential sentences as examples. In all of these dummy subject is lacking:

(28) a di seem ting hapn in ada vilij 'it was the same thing that happened in other villages.' (1973 #6a)

(29) a so abi yuus tu duu lang taim 'That was how we used to do it in the old days.' (1973 #6b)

(30) evri sekan a soocha in a vilij 'There were soldiers in the village the whole time.' (1973 #7b)

Later he quotes a GC mesolectal expression of time, where the verb is now is but the subject is still omitted:

(31) if iz midnait i week i gon bigin kos 'If it's midnight when he wakes up, he'll start swearing." (1973 #16a)

Since Bickerton speaks of impersonal expressions in general as lacking subjects (1973 p.654) it is probable that 'ambience' expressions would be included amongst these. The lack of dummy subject would seem clearly to be a Creole feature in BBD, lost gradually through decreolization.

2.6. A comparison of Tables 1 and 2 shows some clear differences between Black and White speakers. Some Black speakers in Table 19 seem to have no rule of it-insertion; when the rule enters the grammar of the continuum it does so soonest for ambience expressions tabulated in column 7 and to spread gradually to other environments, with extraposed sentences having no it-insertion for any Black speaker.

Amongst White speakers, on the other hand, only WM84M, the most variable speaker in Table 20, omits dummy it in extraposed
sentences; for the other speakers it-insertion here is categorical. WM84M is also the only speaker to use Ø+have with existential meaning, although this is used by most Black speakers. Ambience expressions are the most variable for both groups.

There are other less frequently found types of sentence requiring a dummy subject in SE; with these also the subject is omitted in the Black basilect but seldom in the White mesolect, for example in cleft sentences:

(32) *Was the same Mr. F- used to always say....*(BF75R)
(33) *It's K- and he two boys she for.* (WM80L) = She is for K- and his two boys.

2.7. Conversational English in general can truncate sentences and since in many of the above examples the dummy it would have occurred sentence-initial it might be felt that it has simply been lost by some of phonological erosion of an underlying element, by a process similar to that which gives SE:

"'s all right." "you ready?" "'s not finished."

However, it does not seem to be the case that it is the form it as such which is vulnerable to deletion. In the data of Black speakers in Table 19 the total number of dummy-subject sentences is 166 out of which 14, or 8% had an expressed subject. In the same data from these speakers there were 77 sentences requiring anaphoric it as subject; of these 65 or 85% had the subject expressed. This difference is significant.

2.8. As I mention above, in the data from Black speakers anaphoric it is omitted 15% of possible occurrences. I am counting only those
cases where the referent occurred in the previous sentence and thus could not be deleted by SE conjunction reduction; I am also not counting answers to questions. Examples are:

(34) (That bin in the house all the while?) Yea, see, is wattle and plaster house. (BF44C)

(35) You got old conch and you throw that in it. Taste good. (BF87A)

This is a phenomenon which occurs with other subject pronouns as well, to approximately the same extent. Some examples could be accounted for by postulating underlying conjunction, with the loss of and and the use of sentence intonation for the truncated clause:

(36) I ain't had nobody pass me thing sometime. Put a scaffold. (BM78R)

but often this is not possible:

(37) I still make it, cos keeping long age anyhow. (BM78R)

(38) When I finish with these, get them in the bag, put them in the bag bout Saturday or Sunday. Saturday, maybe tomorrow might put them in the bag. (BF32R)

This loss of anaphoric subject pronoun may be possible for other varieties of conversational English. It may be on the other hand a feature of Afro-American English, since in my data it is over twice as frequent amongst the Black speakers than amongst the White speakers of Table 2, who omit anaphoric it only 6% of the time. Even this figure may be high for White speech in general, since some influence from the Black community would be expected upon Bahamian Whites.

The omission of anaphoric pronoun is found more frequently in the more emotional sections of the relatively formal interviews used
to collect my data, for example:

(39) I had more losses than any one person. Lost a house and everything what in it. Then take out my suitcase to dry off the clothes that night and forget and left the suitcase on top of the bed. Had it underneath the bed and take it out... Forget left it there. (BF75R)

It would be of interest to compare the incidence of such deletion of a presupposed subject, rather than pronominalization, in other varieties of English to see whether it is, in fact, more common in BBD or perhaps in Black dialects in general.

There is a related deletion of the pronoun I found only amongst more basilectal speakers. First person is the most presupposed person in discourse and, if no other subject is specified for an active verb it is easiest to assume that the speaker means himself. In fact, however, it is only the Black speakers in the data I have analyzed who omit the first person pronoun when it is not recoverable from the preceding linguistic context. Amongst the basilectal speakers of Table 19 it is not rare; as can be seen from column 2 all speakers do this, with a total of 49 omissions between them. This, like the loss of it, can be found where phonological attrition of the beginning of the utterance could not be the explanation:

(40) Sometime when bad weather can't get to the boat to buy fish. (BF71A) = I can't get....

Also, another topic may have been the subject of the preceding clause, or whole passage:

(41) When you and N- was suppose to get married, come up here one morning, C- say...(BM46R) = I came up here
My uncle he was married over there. He gone over there a boy and get herself a man over there and get he family and he die there, Reuben. Had a uncle name Reuben... (BF87A) = I had an uncle....

Again, I have no figures for the incidence of such deletion in other varieties of English; however, as can be seen from Tables 1 and 2, this deletion corresponds to the lack of dummy subjects. The only White speaker to have this deletion - with only two deletions in 65 minutes of speech, a far lower incidence than amongst Black speakers -- is the most variable amongst White speakers for dummy it insertion. There would seem to be some connection between the omission of a subject which can be recovered from linguistic or non-linguistic context, and the lack of a rule inserting a semantically empty subject.

**Double Subjects**

3.1. In a small but significant minority of BD sentences with a noun subject, a pronoun copy has been inserted between that noun and the verb. For Table 21 I have analyzed the data from eight representative Black speakers, giving the number of such double-subject sentences as a percentage of all noun-subject sentences in each individual's output. These sentences are spoken without a break between noun and pronoun in the case of a short noun phrase such as:

(43) **Estelle she's a joke**! (BF50R)

(44) **Ghost and thing they ain't particular**. (BM74A)

although when the subject contains a relative clause a slight intonation break does occur but no more than would be found between subject and verb in SE.
## TABLE 21

**FREQUENCY OF PRONOUN COPY FOR INDIVIDUALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun Copy</th>
<th>No Copy</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% P - C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF100S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM93R</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF38R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF77R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF71A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF87A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF44C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF32R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in such cases:

(45) **Some people** what get glasses **they** really had to get them. (BF32R)

Wide variation amongst individual frequency of use of this feature can be seen in Table 21; moreover, the speakers who use this non-SE pattern most frequently are not in every case those who were found to be most basilectal in other features such as lack of copula or dummy subject. Note in particular the low incidence in the speech of BF32R and BF44C. Bickerton (personal communication) says that such sentence patterns are a feature of Guyanese mesolect, not found in the basilect; this would seem possible from the figures in Table 21, save for the high frequency in the speech of BF100S, the speaker who uses more basilectal forms of negator and pronoun than found in other BBD speech. More data would be needed to map adequately the distribution of this double subject feature in the community.

3.2 Givón (1975) calls this sentence pattern in Black English topicalization; I have therefore analysed this BBD data to ascertain whether the pronoun copying can be viewed as marking the topic, as far as the latter can be defined.

It seems to be agreed (e.g. Li and Thompson 1976, Schwartz 1976, Givón 1975) that the topic is definite, including generic. Givón (1975) furthermore states that topics are usually human (p.2). In Tables 22 and 23 below I give the overall numbers and percentages from Table 21, re-analysed to show the frequency of pronoun copying with definite versus non-definite subjects, and with human as opposed to non-human ones. It can be seen that although non-definite subjects are unlikely to be marked in this way, it is possible, for example:
### TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th></th>
<th>No-Definite</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun Copy</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Copy</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Human</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Human</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun Copy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Copy</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(46) They gone on the boat to the States and all about. And some of them they ain't come back. (BM77R)

In the same way, although this marking is less frequent for non-human nouns than it is overall, it can mark such nouns:

(47) The crab they cleaning out now, you know. (BF44C)

Subjects are mainly human and definite in any case; the probability of having a pronoun copy is only slightly increased where the subject is human or definite.

3.3. Givón (1975) proposes that the function of the Black English pattern similar to this is to mark the entry into the discourse of a new topic, in particular one that has not been mentioned for some time. I have therefore analysed the BBD data to see how far the pronoun copy is used to mark this. In Table 24 column 1, I give the frequency of marking a topic, either mentioned for the first time or reintroduced; in columns 2 and 3 I have divided those subjects mentioned in the previous sentence according to whether they were the subject of that sentence or have undergone case promotion. In column 4 I give the frequency of marking for those subjects which are contrasted to the subjects of the sentence before. An example of case-promotion is:

(48) I had to get an agent you know. Well, the agent he coulda speak English....(BM77R)

and of contrasted subject:

(49) My oldest boy 19 he in the police corps. My oldest daughter 22 she done bin in the College and come out....Percy he in the government high school. (BF38R)

As can be seen from Table 6, it does not seem to be
TABLE 24

FREQUENCY OF PRONOUN COPY; STATUS OF COPIED NP IN PREVIOUS DISCOURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS S</th>
<th>First Mention</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contrasted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun Copy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Copy</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant in BBD whether the subject was that of the previous sentence or not. Thus the mere change of topic does not seem to be what is signalled by this marker. It is only where the subject of the sentence is in contrast with that of the previous sentence that the incidence of marking is significantly higher. Sometimes the change of topic is quite a radical one; in the following example, there is a general conversation about losing teeth, and one participant starts to speak of a particular incident:

(50) (a) Boy, he don't take it out if he see the teeth still sound (b) Once you start losing them, boy, next one ain't far. (c) Tell the man take them all out. (b) Queenie she down there....(BF50R)

However, most of the contrasted subjects marked by the pronoun copy do not represent a change in overall topic. As in example (49) above, the 'topic' is the speaker's children, and in example (50) the conversation remains within the realm of dentistry.

Although a contrasted subject is more likely to be marked by a pronoun copy than are subjects in general, a majority of such subjects are still not so marked. When a speaker is making such contrasts, sometimes several contrasting subjects may be marked in succession as in (49), and sometimes the first noun or a subsequent noun may be left unmarked:

(51) The second one of mine that born in the hospital. I was in Nassau. Then all the other rest born right here.(BF44C)

(52) The baby boy what in Nassau now he was home here.... and the rest what was alive was in Miami....(BF75R)

Sankoff (1976) discussing a recent Tok Pisin development which seems similar to the BBD pattern calls it "an emphatic topic-
TABLE 25

FREQUENCY OF PRONOUN COPY;
COMPLEXITY OF COPIED NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Co-ordinate</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun Copy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Copy</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simple = Noun with determiner and preceding adjectives

Complex = Noun with phrasal or non-finite verbal modifiers

Co-ordinate = Two or more simple or complex subjects

Clause = Clausal subject or noun modified by a clause
changing marker" (p.17) and the examples she gives seem to have the marked subject contrasting with a previous one, as in my data:

(53) Mitufela sutim, givim long kandari, Bandarap. Bandarap em i-kuklm.

"The two of us shot it, and gave it to my mother's brother Bandarap. Bandarap cooked it."

3.4. There is a further function of this pronoun copying, mentioned by Dillard for Black English (1972.p.59) and by Sankoff for Tok Pisin, which seems true for BBD also. In Table 25 I show the frequency of pronoun copy after subjects of various degrees of complexity; it can be seen that after a noun subject which includes a relative clause there will be a pronoun as a reminder of the subject in the majority of cases. For example:

(54) ...and the one what sixteen she had a boyfriend. (BF34A)

(55) What got life he spring; what ain't got life he dead, eh?
     (BF44C) = (The seeds) that have life will grow, those that haven't got life are dead, aren't they?

Not only clauses, but other modifiers which add to the length of the subject will make a pronoun copy more likely, e.g. coordinated subjects:

(56) Yea, my grandfather and his father they all live just Nurse Cay. (BM93R)

(57) Old John and Thomas they were related? (BF32R)

or subjects with phrases modifying them:

(58) The crew aboard the mailboat he does get a little order. (BF38R)

Once again, however, such characteristics of the subject merely make the pronoun marker more likely; even with clauses, and
and certainly with other modifiers, some subjects are not so marked:

(59) ...and *who could work go* to work and mind your family. (BF87A)

(60) *Most those boats used to come from L- was sailing boats.* (BF75R)

(61) ...and time my husband and all them poor fellows use to sculling  
(BF75R)

(62) *Some part of Cuba, the southern part of Cuba is only sixty  
   miles from Ragged Island.* (BM77R)

Conversely, a simple noun

such in examples (47), (49) and (50) may have the pronoun copy.

3.5. Givon (1975) discusses this pronoun copying for Black English

and Tok Pisin, characterizing it as "a universal agreement marker"

(p.3): The Tok Pisin /i/ marker he cites does appear to be

obligatory in most environments (it appears in my example (53) above)

and thus could be so described, although it derived historically from

pronoun copying as Sankoff (1976) shows. The Black English examples

in Dillard (1972) to whom Givon refers seem similar to BBD data.

Where the pronoun is inserted after a complex NP it could be viewed

as an agreement marker; however, its optional and contrastive

character in BBD is not the same as the automatic /i/ cliticization

in Tok Pisin.

The rule for the insertion of pronoun copy would have to be

an optional one, with the main condition favoring its use the

syntactic complexity of the subject and a contributing factor whether

the subject was contrasted with a preceding NP. Factors against

copying would be if the subject were non-definite or non-human. Data

from Black English and other varieties of non-SE English would be

interesting for comparison, especially since Tok Pisin seems to be
developing a secondary wave of pronoun copying with constraints similar to those in BBD.

**Fronting of Non-Subject**

4.1. Fronting of an element other than the subject can occur in BBD as in SE, from any syntactic position in the sentence; where this occurs a pronoun copy is usually left in the 'normal' position for that element, and thus this transformation seems related to that discussed in the preceding section:

(63) Guinea corn I had it the other year. (BF100S)

(64) who go and laugh at him he swell right up and twist he mouth round. (BM74A)

(65) The Commissioner son house if anything happen to that... (BF75R)

(66) All of Cat Island he had bout forty children there. (BF75R)

(67) Plenty of them who the eve-man test they eye he ain't do much good for them, cos the glasses what they get they had to take them right back in to Nassau. (BF32R)

In the above examples the copy is a pronoun; there are also occasional examples of a noun copy being left when the noun is moved sentence-initial, with one speaker having this as preferred form:

(68) Watermelon I'll get watermelon now in the next four weeks from now. (BM93R)

(69) Haiti had to do the same thing round Haiti. (BM78R) = I had to do...

(70) Since they ain't play it, the money what we were go get they ain't give me the money. (BF44C)

In SE a similar movement of the NP to the front of the sentence may occur without a copy being left; if movement rules involve first copying then deletion here, as discussed for negation in
in Chapter III, the BBD transformation is simply the first part of the SE rule. A few examples of such fronting with deletion also appear in my data:

(71) What go off in the bush you had to go and hunt. (BM93R)

(72) All kind of shit government doing. (BF32R)

4.2. The eight basilectal speakers whose output was discussed in the previous section produced 39 fronted non-subjects with pronoun copy, 14 with noun copy and 8 without copy, a total of 61 compared to 84 copied subjects.

These non-subjects often seem to be fronted because they are in contrast with an element of the previous sentence:

(73) (You have to send to Nassau for it?) Everything what you want like furniture and thing you have to send to Nassau for them. (BF38R)

(74) (What do you think...about San Andros?) Never bin spend no time there. Fresh Creek I bin stay there good while. (BF87A)

which is similar to the pronoun copying of subjects. This is not always the case; as with subjects, the fronted and copied noun can have been used in the previous sentence:

(75) I mussy got bout thirty-odd, with the grand and the great-grand. (Great-grand too?) Uh, huh, great-grand I got more great-grand than what grand I got. (BF87A)

(76) What I pass through kill yinna dead. Yinna generation kill ye dead. (BM74A) = It would kill your generation.

These examples are clearly emphatic.

4.3. In the previous section I showed that the most likely subject to have pronoun copy was one modified by a relative clause;
with non-subjects the trend is far less marked. BM93R, for example, has seven instances of relative clause in a fronted non-subject out of a total of thirty-three non-subject relative clauses, whereas all six of his subjects modified by a clause have pronoun copy.

Another difference between the two types is that whereas the majority of the copied subjects are human (86%, see Table 5), that is true of less than one third of the non-subjects. This reflects I think the fact that the subject is usually the agent and therefore human, whereas this bias does not exist for most of the other case roles.

As I mention above, most of these examples would be acceptable in SE if the pronoun or noun copy were deleted. This is not the case when the noun fronted was originally modifying another noun:

(77) *snake since he head get through he body I'll get through. (BF44C)
(77') *Snake since head get through...

or after certain prepositions:

(78) Haiti had to do the same thing round Haiti. (BM77R)
(78') *Haiti had to do the same thing round.

or out of subordinate clauses:

(79) I forget some of them big tall woman what come home on the wharf say I deliver them. (BF75R) I forget that I delivered some of those women....
(79') I forget some of those women...(that) I deliver. (not the same sense)

(80) Some of those bigger boats they had another channel used to had to bring them around through. (BF75R) = another channel which they used to have to bring them through.

4.4. For SE the rule proposed to account for sentences similar to
my non-subject examples is left-dislocation; for BBD the element can be copied by one rule, and the original element either realized in full, or as a pronoun, or deleted. Since these rules are required in BBD grammar in any case, it would be best to have them operate on the subject also, rather than having a separate rule inserting a pronoun after the subject, and then having to place a limitation on the copying rule that it did not operate on subjects. In the case of the subject being copied, the original element would have to be realized as a pronoun (not a noun, and if it were deleted the rules would have had no effect).

Fronting as Topicalization

5.1. As I mention above Givón (1976) calls the subject-fronting topicalization, a speaker strategy to bring the subject/topic into prominence when the speaker "is not confident that the hearer could easily identify the topic". (Givón 1975 p.4) Although first mention or resumption of the topic does not seem to cause fronting, a contrast of the noun with an immediately preceding one increases the likelihood of fronting both of a subject or a non-subject, and this contrastive use seems to be a common one of so-called topicalization strategies in languages. The use of the pronoun subject to aid in identification of the subject/topic seems to occur after the long or complex noun subject, and would not seem to be marking that subject as any more of a 'topic' than others.

The term topic is somewhat imprecise; Li and Thompson (1976) have attempted to characterize it for 'topic-prominent' languages and I give below some interesting similarities between the generalizations
they make and the situation in BBD:

A. Topics are definite or generic; although there are a few exceptions, both the subject and non-subject fronted nouns fulfil this condition on the whole.

B. There may be a topic in addition to a subject; most of the non-subject examples I cite above have a pronoun subject following them; a noun is also possible:

(81) The rushes what leave some people open am on the ground. (BM74A)

(82) Every part of Exuma bonefish if you find any round there they only allow one. (BF32R) (Single-sentence intonation.)

C. The topic need not have a case role in the sentence. The fronted nouns in BBD are usually linked syntactically by means of coreferential pronouns; however in three cases they are not:

(83) Fresh water we got to go where those mills are. (BF75R)

(84) His wife I don't wish for nothing but God's grace. (BM93R)

(85) Sugar cane up there they closed down 19,000 tons of sugar on hand. (WM84M)

D. The topic controls co-reference. With subjects that are fronted it is not possible to discriminate; with non-subjects, where the sentence is followed by another where deletion has occurred it can be seen that the topic, not the subject, of the preceding sentence must be supplied:

(86) Strachan, the one what Strachan get, for fashion. Even can't see out of them. (BF32R) The glasses that S- got were for fashion. He cannot even see through them.
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(87) And this same boy they brought him here as a boy. Couldn't even talk good. (BF75R) = He (the boy) could not talk.

Many of the non-subject BBD examples would become acceptable in SE if "as for..." were added to the front and an intonation break afterwards, e.g.:

(87') As for this boy, they brought him here as a child.

These sentences are usually used when examples of topicalization in SE are given (see for example Schwartz 1976).

Conclusion.

6.1. Li and Thompson (1976) cite the lack of dummy subject as a characteristic of topic-prominent languages. While BBD has a subject in most sentences it may be that the omission of recoverable anaphoric pronouns and lack of a rule which inserts semantically empty subjects are connected to the fronting of an NP which does have prominent semantic content.

A further characteristic of languages where the topic is prominent is lack of, or reduced use of, the passive voice. (Li and Thompson 1976) BBD has a passive with get, used as in SE. However, as I mention in Chapter 2, verb-stem alone is often used in a 'middle' sense to describe an action with the patient as subject, e.g.:

(87) Crab could eat. (BF44C) = Crabs can be eaten.

and the stem-form without be is the equivalent of SE be+past participle to describe the resulting state:

(87) I marry now fifty-odd years. (BM78R)
BBU therefore has fewer contexts than SE in which the passive is marked as such; according to Li and Thompson the typical subject-prominent language must mark "this non-normal subject choice" (p.647).

It would be of interest to have comparative studies of these phenomena for other varieties of English to see to what extent lack of dummy subject and anaphoric subject, and use of topicalization and passives are related to each other and to Creole or general non-SE features.
Notes to Chapter IV

1. In Columns 5 and 6 of Table 1 I have arbitrarily divided the occurrence of Ø subject before be with existential meaning between the two columns.

2. The first word of this sentence is pronounced /lz/; I write the pronunciation /ls/ as 'it's' assuming that it represents assimilation of the /s/ to the preceding /t/ and deletion of the latter. The voiced consonant here indicates no assimilation and I assume therefore no underlying (i)t.

3. Compare for example the use of the -wa marker in Japanese.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION
1. In this dissertation I have described certain features of the Bahamian Dialect basilect and the changes which occur in their distribution and function through the mesolect. I have compared these BD features to those of other varieties of Afro-American English.

2. In Chapter II I analysed the distribution of copula forms and zero copula in BD. I took for comparison categories similar to those used by Labov (1972) for Black English and showed that, while there were many similarities of distribution between BE and BD, the rules Labov proposed could not account for the BD data. There are two crucial differences between the two varieties. First, it seems that am is found in all copula environments in BE thus making it probable that the non-appearance of is and are is phonologically motivated. Second, is is usually contracted after noun as well as pronoun subjects in BE, so that deletion can be ordered after, and made dependent upon contraction. This is not the case in BD where contraction after nouns is very rare.

Non-appearance of the copula in BD has therefore syntactic motivation and I showed that most of the BD copula variation could be explained by postulating an underlying copula before +NP complement only. Such an underlying difference between copula categories could be accounted for by postulating that BD copula at an earlier stage was similar to that of present-day Guyanese basilect, which has distinct copulas for equative and locative, and treats predicate adjectives as verbs. A locative copula de, identical to that in GC basilect, is found in the speech of some basilectal BD speakers; this seems to confirm both the relationship of Bahamian and Guyanese copula,
and the persistence of separate copula categories in BD.

The surface variability of the copula is thus a reflection of underlying differences; most of the copula forms present in environments other than before noun-phrase complement can be accounted for by syntactically motivated rules. 'Was, ain't and wasn't are past and negative markers; is is inserted in 'exposed' position and non-finite be after aspect and modal markers. The appearance of the copula in expressions such as that's right probably represents a frequent mechanism by which an SE rule spreads to other environments: the rule is acquired first in common set expressions learnt as lexical wholes.

3. From Chapter III it can be seen that the forms of the verbal negator show more marked differences between the basilect and mesolect in BD than did the copula. In the basilect ain't is the commonest negator for stative and past non-stative verbs. The obligatory use of don't to negate non-past non-stative verbs thus shows that a punctual/habitual distinction is of prime importance in the basilect.

The complexity of the influences working during decreolization is exemplified by the negative forms of the verb have/cot. Even with this variable verb I was able to show the principled nature of the gradual change of preferred form through the continuum.

This gradual spread of SE forms in BD has many similarities with Guyanese Creole, although fewer than with the copula. Ain't is more clearly the unmarked negator of the BD basilect than it is at any stage of Guyanese Creole and never is used differently in the two systems.
However there is an important parallel in the treatment of stative versus non-stative verbs.

3.2. In discussing negative concord I once again made comparison with Black English, using a detailed article by Labov (1973). The rules proposed by Labov in this article linked Black English negation closely with that of SE; I showed that they were inadequate for BD since they failed to capture the distinction between the obligatory concording of non-definite NP's within the scope of negation and the optional affective character of the concording of verbs, adverbs etc. For this reason I proposed that the negative concord of non-definites is an underlying obligatory rule and that there was an optional superficial rule adding further negatives for emphasis. I also showed that Labov's concord rule was too wide in permitting concord of non-definites and verb in any subordinate clause since it seems to be found in both BD and BE only in a certain limited set of such clauses.

Decreolization can be seen in negative concord as elsewhere; the sporadic use of any or a in the mesolect perhaps represents a surface de-marking of underlying negated non-definites, since in the mesolect the majority of non-definites still show negative concord. The greatest variability in the concord rule appears where a single category in the basilectal system -- zero marking for generic, count and mass nouns -- has to be recategorized to fit the SE system. Once again the BD system can be seen as following a logical path of decreolization from an earlier stage similar to the Guyanese Creole basilect.

4. In Chapter 4 I discussed the handling of subjects in BD. The
lack of a rule inserting a dummy subject is complete in the BD basilect; the SE rule then gradually spreads through the different environments, becoming obligatory in all environments by the White mesolectal stage in contrast to the far slower loss of negative concord. It is of interest that in the basilect both these semantically empty subjects and recoverable anaphoric subject pronouns may be omitted.

In contrast BD has an optional rule which gives a noun increased prominence by placing it sentence-initial, leaving a pronoun in its 'normal' place in the sentence. This results in some sentences having two NP's before the verb and seems to be favored where the fronted NP is complex or where it is in contrast with an NP of the preceding sentence.

This transformation has many of the characteristics ascribed to topicalization; the fronted NP is usually definite, human and controls co-reference.

Such a transformation is not found in GC basilect but in the mesolect. It occurs also in Black English, Haitian Creole and creolized Tok Pisin; further investigation would be needed to reveal how far the function of and constraints upon this rule are alike in these different varieties.

5. It can be seen that BD basilect is at a stage intermediate between Caribbean Creole basilect as exemplified by Guyanese Creole and mainland Black English as exemplified by Harlem teenagers. A plausible explanation of this is that these varieties had common origins and that the differing stages reached by them are the result of differences
in the complex social pressures which cause decretolization.

The continuum within the BD community would thus be a small part of a broader geographical continuum stretching possibly from Sranan of Surinam through the Caribbean varieties, Bahamian Dialect and Sea Island Gullah to mainland Black English. Bahamian Dialect syntax and even more that of Black English, may appear to differ only in detail from SE, but these differences are rooted in Creole structures.
Appendix 1

Key to Map Overleaf

• - Black settlement

○ - White settlement

⊙ - mixed cities

Capital letters marked on map and used in designating speakers are located near the individual settlement concerned, as follows:

A  - Andros, Mastic Point and Nicoll's Town (6 miles apart): Black.
C  - Cat Island (settlement unknown, recorded in Andros): Black.
E  - Eleuthera, Current: White.
H  - Harbour Island off Eleuthera, mainly White.
M  - Man O'War Cay off Abaco: White.
N  - New Providence, Nassau, mixed and Fox Hill, Black.
R  - Ragged Island, Duncan Town: Black.
S  - San Salvador, Cockburn Town: Black.
Appendix II

Data on Individual Speakers and Recordings

I give for each speaker their occupation, whether they have been continuously resident (cont. res.) in their island of birth, whether it was an interview and by whom, or conversation in my presence or recorded by inconspicuous tape recorder. All speakers have consented to tapes being used. Characterization of their speech as fluent etc. or not gives some indication of the likelihood of monitoring. The number in parenthesis is the number of minutes of actual speech by that speaker, not including the interviewer or others.


BF75R (83) Retired midwife. Total of 3 yrs. away from island. Interviewed by me while plaiting. Excellent narrator but at times monitoring.

BM93R (80) Retired boat-builder and captain. Approx. 15 yrs away from island. Interviewed by me. Fluctuated between long fluent narrative and stilted answers.

BM78R (40) Shop owner. Cont. res. Interviewed by me while working. Fluent and relaxed.


BF38R (23) Housewife. Cont. res. Interviewed by me while baking. At ease but not a loquacious person.
BM46R (10) Visitor to island after long absence. One of group recorded in my absence.


BF50R (4) Housewife etc. Cont. res. Interviewed by me while cooking.

BF44C (42) Housewife and farmer. Moved from Cat Island to Andros 24 yrs. before. Interviewed by BF19N and others. Fluent and uninhibited.


BF87A (26) Housewife. Cont. res. Interviewed by me. At ease but not loquacious.

BM74A (14) Shop owner. Short period in Nassau. Interviewed by me whilst working. One good narrative plus short answers.


BF14A2 (22) Part transcribed when they became involved in topic and ceased to monitor speech.

BF100S (13) Cont. res. Interviewed by G. Saunders, chief archivist, for data on socio-historical development.

BF64N (21) Shop-keeper, resident of Fox Hill (4 miles from Nassau). Interviewed by G. Saunders as above.


BF19N 35) Language student at college. Cont. res. Data from her when interviewing adults not counted in tables, although sometimes quoted. Taped when relaxing with friends.
BF16N (7) Student teacher. Cont. res. Tapes by herself when friends were visiting.

BM36N (7) Carpenter etc. Taped in conversation with BF16N.

BF77H (10) Living in Nassau recently. Most of life on island.

Recorded in conversation with BF16N.

BF65L (14) Housewife. Black living in mainly White settlement.

Interviewed by me while cooking. Somewhat inhibited.

WF90L (38) Married couple, housewife and retired fisherman &
WM80L (50) farmer. Living in mainly White settlement with nearby

Black ones. Interviewed by me together. At ease;
they sustained the dialogue with little questioning.


Fluent speaker.

WM84M (65) Sail maker. Cont. res. Interviewed by me at work.

Fluent and effective speaker.

WM76M (36) Boat builder. Cont. res. Interviewed by me at work.

Somewhat inhibited.

WF23M (36) Housewife. Approx. 2 years away from home. Conversation recorded while dressmaking, also without me with WF43N and others.

WF43N (9) Visitor to Man O'War, resident Nassau. Conversation with WF23M and others.

WF5M (3) Daughter of WF23M above chatting with mother and others.
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