Toward a Typology of European Languages

Empirical Approaches to Language Typology

8

Editors

Georg Bossong
Bernard Comrie

Toward a Typology of European Languages

edited by

Johannes Bechert
Giuliano Bernini
Claude Buridant

♾ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Contents

Foreword

The Standing Committee for the Humanities of the European Science Foundation aims at the development of high-level research topics which require the cooperation of scientists from all European countries as well as the frequent collaboration of non-European researchers.

Within the field of linguistics, a few projects on typological research have been set up, particularly at the suggestion of P. Ramat. This topic has presently received a world-wide attention as it is so closely connected with research on language universals. In Europe, the UNITYP group — supervised by H. Seiler — had, in fact, already provided a noteworthy contribution in the field.

After a number of preparatory meetings, the Standing Commitee decided to hold a conference in Rome to give European and non-European linguists an opportunity to talk about the results of their investigations. This volume will thus offer a wide-ranging spectrum of issues on language typology. In addition to studies on syntactic classes and semantic categories, attention is drawn to the relationship between certain types and their geographical diffusion through genetically unrelated languages (areal linguistics), as well as to the notion of "possible types" in the perspective of language universals.

On the basis of the conference outcomes and of their personal experience, a committee of linguists who represented the scientific community drew up the EURO-TYP project, which was adopted by the ESF General Assembly in November 1989.

Nine research groups have been organized under E. König's supervision. The research will develop from the themes discussed in the present volume and an Advisory Committee, composed of European as well as American and Russian linguists, will follow the development of the project. After a planned period of five years, the project will result in a joint publication, which will doubtless leave a mark on linguistic studies in Europe. We have, in fact, the opportunity to investigate diversified language groups, such as Finno-Ugric, Turkic, Basque, Maltese Arabic or Caucasian languages.

A convergence of interests among linguists must be moreover noticed. Comparative grammar, typological research, language universal investigations, the publications of new language descriptions are restoring *world languages* to the place they deserve after a period when theories based on a few examples detached from social context dominated the research scene. So called "exotic" languages are included in the corpus of the languages inves-

tigated. They belong to the schemes established on the basis of languages traditionally studied, but they also bring in their specificities, which advance our knowledge.

At present we are therefore witnessing an increasingly cooperative *dialogue* between specialists of language descriptions and theoreticians, which is resulting in a cross-fertilization beneficial for both parties. Other fields connected with linguistics will profit from this interaction, particularly the field dealing with knowledge representation — semantic or noemic models, inspired by the study of natural languages, but which have assumed the status of *tertium comparationis* — and the field of machine translation, such as the EUROTRA project.

Typology thus appears a "coalescing theme" for present interests focussed on a better knowledge of the mental mechanisms which are revealed by the many world languages, both in a non-random fashion — cf. language universals — and as realizations which can attain great specificity (cf. linguistic variation).

Bernard Pottier

Former president of the Standing Committee
Professor at the University of Paris-Sorbonne

Introduction

This volume contains 17 of the 20 papers read at the Workshop on Typology of Languages in Europe held at the Consiglio Nazionale delle Richerche in Rome, January 7–9, 1988. The workshop was organized by the Standing Committee for the Humanities of the European Science Foundation with the aim of exploring the possibilities of launching a Program in Language Typology, following a joint proposal put forward in 1985 by four European scholars since then called "The gang of four": Johannes Bechert (Bremen), Claude Buridant (Strasbourg), Martin Harris (formerly Salford, now Essex), Paolo Ramat (Pavia). This initiative actually resulted in a five-year "Program on Language Typology", started in 1990, which will be the main activity of the Humanities section of the European Science Foundation till 1994. The Program, under the "trademark" EURO-TYP, is directed by Ekkehard König (Berlin, Freie Universität) and will involve almost a hundred scholars from all over Europe (including the USSR) and the USA, organized in nine Thematic Groups ranging from pragmatics to prosody.

In this respect the volume actually reflects the first attempts at finding a set of features common to all languages spoken in Europe irrespective of their genetic affiliation. The topics dealt with broadly anticipate the nine themes constituting the main concern within EURO-TYP.

It is generally recognized that the languages of Europe represent a particular group — a sort of "Sprachbund" — with striking similarities shared by both Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages and reflecting a prolonged cultural contact within Europe over the centuries. This phenomenon of linguistic convergence opens a wide field of investigation not only in its own right, but also because of the long period for which records are available and the wealth of linguistic scholarship relating to the individual languages of Europe which has been amassed, specially during the last 150 years, but within a linguistic tradition going back to Ancient Greece.

The methodological approach adopted by the contributors is indeed typological, linguistic typology aiming at identifying those features which characterize particular groups of languages, related or otherwise, and wherever possible at uncovering the underlying principles which give coherence to surface phenomena that may at first sight appear unrelated. Moreover, the typological principle, mainly comparative-functionalist, does not exclude the variety of points of view and of theoretical positions allowing a very rich and comprehensive analysis of different phenomena.

From the papers read in Rome the following perspectives emerge, which are in many ways of interest for general linguistics:

— a preoccupation with central theoretical questions, partly from the point of view of formal logic, partly from the perspective of different linguistic traditions;
— the importance of an areal (geographical) approach to language typology, centering around the notion of "continuum" in various domains;
— the importance of gradation on scales in analysing the basic structures of the languages under consideration;
— the significance of the sociolinguistic approach drawing on notions such as language variety, register, dialect, standard *vs.* non-standard language and the like;
— the centrality of diachrony (language history) as a basic ingredient of the typological approach, with "drift" as a key notion.

As a first step toward the definition of a cluster of features typical of European languages and the explanation of their emergence in the diachrony either through typological drift or as a result of long-lasting contacts and influences under the same roof of Greek and Latin culture, the volume already presents some features that can be tentatively considered as typical of languages of Europe, and which will be incorporated into a full-scale investigation.

The volume is also an attempt at a first instantiation in linguistic terms of the notion of Standard Average European, suggested in 1939 by Benjamin Lee Whorf in order to refer to the cognitive background of Europeans as against that of American aboriginal populations (notably the Hopi) as manifested by their strongly divergent linguistic structures. The EURO-TYP Program will have attained one of its aims if at the end of its course it is possible to see Standard Average European in fact as an exotic language, as the keynote paper of the Workshop puts it, i. e. more objectively and more from the outside than now.

Johannes Bechert
Giuliano Bernini
Claude Buridant

1. General problems

Standard Average European as an exotic language

Östen Dahl

To start with, the idea of studying the typology of European languages did not make much sense to me. For many years, I have regarded typology as a method rather than as an area of study in its own right: it is one of several ways to find out about the nature of human language and from this point of view, restricting the domain to a geographical area is a rather strange thing to do. However, I had some second thoughts. One of the greatest problems that the universal study of human language has had to cope with has indeed been the European bias: most linguists have been speakers of European languages, and the other languages that they have known or had access to information about have more often than not been European. As Bell (1978) notes, even linguists who have an ambition to widen their perspective mostly end up with a European or even Indo-European bias in their data bases. This would of course not be so problematic if it were not the case that European languages are much more like each other than languages are in general. I think most of us still have a subconscious view of the "default" language as being something between English, French, German and perhaps Italian — actually, and probably not accidentally, something very much like Esperanto. One could thus turn the problem upside down: in what respects are European languages special and to what extent are the structures you find there "marked"?

At this point, I recall the label "Standard Average European" coined by Benjamin Lee Whorf (1956) in his discussions of the relation between language and thinking, and it seemed to me that one might (without of course buying the ideology connected with it) discuss the problems mentioned under this heading, adding "as an exotic language" in order to suggest that it might be a good idea to get out of our ordinary European perspective and think of the 100 odd European languages as if they were, say, the languages spoken in the North West corner of New Guinea. In the rest of the paper, I shall be suggesting a list of phenomena that should be looked at, taking as my point of departure some perhaps not very well-known Swedish research.

Natanael Beckman, who was Professor of Swedish in Göteborg between the two World Wars, wrote a fairly long paper in 1934 entitled (in translation) "West European Syntax — Some Innovative Constructions in the Nordic

and other West European Languages". In this work, Beckman notes that
there are a number of common features in the grammars of modern West
European languages, including the Germanic languages and in the Romance
group at least French, which are not found in the "old" languages (*forn-språken*). Beckman's perspective is thus historical and entirely internal to
Europe; still, some of the phenomena he points to are of interest also to
general typology. In particular, he notes two features which appear in roughly
the same area: (i) "inversion as an expression for direct interrogative sen-
tences", i.e. the systematic marking of the distinction between declaratives
and interrogatives by SVO vs. VSO word order, (ii) the use of formal and
"impersonal" subjects such as German *es* in sentences such as *Es kommt ein
Mann* and *Es regnet*. An important point that Beckman makes is that in
languages where, e.g., 'It is raining' is expressed by a one-word sentence the
inversion mechanism cannot be used to distinguish different sentence-types.
Beckman's observation is taken up to discussion and generalized in Ham-
marberg & Viberg (1977), a work focussing on those typological features of
Swedish that present particular difficulties for second language learners. Their
"subject placeholder constraint" is roughly equivalent to what is nowadays
commonly referred to as the "non-Pro-Drop" character of West European
languages, i.e. the fact that the subject slot in finite clauses must normally
be filled, even in cases where the referent of the subject is contextually given
or where the construction is impersonal. They also note, quoting Ultan
(1969), that inversion as a device for marking yes-no-questions seems to be
rather infrequent outside Europe, and that word order is exploited in Con-
tinental Scandinavian and some other Germanic languages also for distin-
guishing between main and subordinate clauses, so that one might argue that
these languages rely to an unusual extent on word order as a syntactic device,
in particular for distinguishing clause types. If Beckman's conjecture is right,
such a system could only arise in a non-Pro-Drop language, and given Ultan's
observations that "YNQ-inversion implies a basic order type in which subject
precedes verb", which, in view of the absence of rigid SOV languages with
YNQ-inversion, might be strengthened to a postulation of a strong connec-
tion between YNQ-inversion and SVO order, the conditions on what a
language should look like in order to allow such syntactic exploitation of
word order seem rather tight.

   In addition, one can make a few other observations. In the discussion of
the "Pro-Drop Parameter" postulated in Government and Binding theory
one usually assumes that there are two main types, one as in English, where
there must (practically speaking) always be either a lexical or a pronominal
subject in every finite clause, and one as in Latin, where pronominal non-

emphatic subjects can normally be dropped, and in addition some intermediate types. There is, however, a third type, which is not very well represented in Europe but which appears to be quite frequent in various other parts of the world. This is the kind of system where a pronominal subject is required in all sentences, irrespective of whether there is an additional lexical subject or not: in other words, among the counterparts of (1 a—d), only (c—d) are grammatical.

(1) a. **Runs.*
     b. *John runs.*
     c. *He runs.*
     d. *John he runs.*

One problem when trying to find good examples of this type of placeholder constraint is that it is often quite difficult to see whether the morphemes that I am here referring to as "pronominal subjects" are really pronouns or, rather, agreement affixes. One interesting system within our geographical domain, viz. Genoese, is described by Vattuone (1975). He states the constraint as follows (1975: 349): "In Genoese finite 3rd person verbal forms normally must be preceded by a nominative clitic ('u' for m. sg., 'a' for f. sg., 'i' for pl.). This clitic and the verb either both agree with the relational subject ... or neither agrees." For example, 'The neighbours are coming' would be

(2)   *I vežiŋ   i vĕnu*
        neighbours   come

(where *i* has the dual function of clitic and definite article). It should be clear from this description that the clitic is separate from the morphological agreement between verb and subject. What I want to claim here is that Genoese illustrates a separate type of placeholder constraint, or if we like, another possible value of the Pro-Drop parameter: "Every finite (3rd person) clause must contain a pronominal subject". In this perspective, the correct formulation of the constraint in English or Swedish would be "Every finite clause must contain a pronominal subject unless there is a lexical subject". One argument in favour of treating the constraints in Genoese and Germanic as basically of the same nature is that we find "dummy" subjects in roughly the same kinds of constructions, cf.

(3)   *U čöve* 'It is raining'

(4)   *U vĕže na dona* 'There comes a woman'

Such dummy subjects are also found, interestingly enough, in another (non-European) language with a constraint similar to that of Genoese, viz.

Sotho (a Bantu language spoken in Lesotho and South Africa). In Sotho, every finite verb is preceded by a 'subject concord'. In impersonal constructions including, e. g., impersonal passives, the subject concord is *go*:

(5)   *Go botšididi ka ntlê* 'It is cold outside'

(6)   *Go a jewa* 'There is being eaten here'

As in Genoese, there is an opposition between 'normal' subject-predicate constructions with agreement and a construction corresponding to *there*-insertion cases in English, cf.

(7)   *Ba agilê mô Basotho* The Sothos live here'

(8)   *Go agilê Basotho mô* 'There live Sothos here'

(examples from Northern Sotho [Ziervogel et al. 1979]). In both these languages, then, impersonal subject clitics show up according to rules very similar to those governing the use of dummy subjects in the West European languages. Notice also that Genoese obeys the general tendency for first and second person pronouns to be more easily droppable than third person pronouns (manifested e. g. in Finnish and Russian). A theory that treats the Genoese-Sotho type of placeholder constraint as radically different from that of West European languages thus seems to run the risk of missing significant generalizations.

Notice that the Genoese-Sotho type is much less well suited to the systematic use of word order as a syntactic device, since the position of the clitic relative to the verb is constant. It is not surprising that there are no word-order differences between declaratives and questions in Genoese (the relative order of the lexical subject and the verb is due to differences in information structure or FSP according to Vattuone). I have no statistics, but it seems that of the two kinds of placeholder constraints, the Genoese-Sotho type is more widespread among the languages of the world than the Germanic one. If this is correct, it strengthens the impression we have already formed that the West European languages are somewhat special from the syntactic point of view and that we have something that looks like a conspiracy of factors that favour the use of word order as a device for distinguishing clause types. Further possible accomplices in this conspiracy might be e. g. other "placeholder constraints" than the surface subject constraint, such as the obligatoriness of the finite verb, which seems to be directly related to the presence of an overt copula. I shall briefly mention some other properties of European languages which seem to conspire to give them their particular typological profile.

It has been noted that the West European way of expressing possession, viz. using a transitive verb (*have*) where the owner is the subject and the possessee the direct object, is a relatively infrequent construction (see, e. g., Clark 1978). Two points can be made here. One concerns the existence of periphrastic Perfect constructions based on a possessive construction like the English *I have run*. Whereas there is at least one example of such a construction which is based on a different kind of possessive construction (in some North Russian dialects), the majority of the attested examples of possessive-based Perfects are of the *have*-type and indeed from Europe. We thus see here another example of two presumably connected traits that are quite frequent in Europe but less so in most other parts of the world. The other point relating to the European *have* construction is a more general one. One recent historical development in West Europe is the decrease of constructions in which the most salient animate participant is not given subject status. I am thinking of examples such as 'I dream' which used to be constructed as 'Me dreams' in earlier dialects of Germanic. As far as I know, the West European languages are quite liberal in allowing non-agentive subjects as compared to many other languages in the world. It seems to me — or to use more idiomatic Standard Average European — I think that the use of a transitive verb in possessive constructions should be seen in the light of this general tendency.

To conclude: the grammatical systems of European languages can only be properly understood if looked at in a larger typological perspective. At the same time, stressing the "exotic" features of the European or West European languages may have a positive effect on the development of linguistic theory in general in at least two ways: first, it is a necessary antidote to the pervasive European bias in all branches of linguistic research, second, it may contribute to our understanding of the ways in which "marked" grammatical constructions develop.

References

Adams, Marianne
    1987   "From Old French to the theory of pro-drop", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 1—32.

Beckman, Natanael
    1934   *Västeuropeisk syntax. Några nybildningar i nordiska och andra västeuropeiska språk.* [West European Syntax — Some Innovative Constructions in the Nordic and other West European Languages.] Göteborg: Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift.

Bell, Alan
    1978   "Language samples", in: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), Volume 1, 123—146.

Clark, Eve
    1978   "Locationals: Existential, locative, and possessive constructions", in: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), Volume 4, 85—126.

Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.)
    1978   *Universals of Human Language*. Volumes 1—4. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hammarberg, Björn — Åke Viberg
    1977   "The place-holder constraint, language typology, and the teaching of Swedish to immigrants", *Studia Linguistica* 31: 106—131.

Ultan, Russell
    1978   "Some general characteristics of interrogative systems", in: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), Volume 4, 211—248.

Vattuone, Bart
    1975   "Notes on Genoese syntax. Kernel "VOS" strings and theme-rheme structures", *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica ed Applicata* 4: 335—378.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee
    1956   *Language, Thought, and Reality*. New York: MIT Press/Wiley.

Ziervogel, D. — D. P. Lombard — P. K. Mokgogong (eds.)
    1979   *A Handbook of the Northern Sotho Language*. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik.

Typological contrasts between pidgin and creole languages in relation to their European language superstrates

Suzanne Romaine

Introduction

I will argue here that the question of the typological affiliation of pidgins and creoles in relation to their European language superstrates is of significance for the study of the typology of the European languages. In section 1 I will examine a number of features of pidgin and creole grammars in order to establish that their origin is problematic. That is, they may be due to substrate or superstrate influence or they may be attributable to universal constraints. This has some general implications for the study of typology which I will discuss in section 2.

The question of the genetic and typological relationship between pidgins and creoles and their lexifier languages has been a long-standing preoccupation of creolists. Hall (1966: 58) maintained that "all varieties of Pidgin English and creoles that have grown out of them have an underlying identity of structure with English, and similarly for the French-based, Spanish-based pidgins and creoles ... they still maintain a basically Indo-European pattern". He postulated a life cycle beginning with the spontaneous generation of a pidgin followed by its evolution to a creole. Baker and Corne (1982: 5), on the other hand, say that the "view that all Indian Ocean Creole French languages belong to the same semantactic tradition results on the one hand from a Eurocentric analysis of the facts, and on the other from a concept of language which appears to confuse etymology with function".

Many creolists would agree with Valdman's view of Haitian Creole when he says (1986: 520) that it "can in no way be considered genetically related to its base language", i.e. French. However, the question of what the typological relationship is between a creole and its base language is still unanswered. Hall again took a conservative view on this matter. He was one of the strongest proponents of the family tree model in accounting for the historical relationships among various pidgins and creoles. He maintained that in existing pidgins and creoles the contribution of the superstrate was

always greater than that of the various substrata. Thus, he concluded (1966: 118) that the ancestral form of any given group of related pidgins and creoles could be reconstructed and that this reconstructed "proto-pidgin" would show a reasonable correspondence to certain features of the source language.

Creolists such as Bickerton (1981) have emphasized the discontinuity between a newly emergent creole and the antecedent pidgin. This is based largely on the fact that creoles share a great many semantactic similarities which cannot be traced to their pidgin ancestors. In Bickerton's view, these newly crated features must be the result of innate language universals contained in what he calls the bioprogram. In the kind of pidginization and creolization discussed by Bickerton, the links between lexifier language and pidgin/creole are severed early and influence from the lexifier is seen to be limited to the lexical inventory. However, in virtually all pidgin/creole languages influence from the lexifier language persists, often throughout the linguistic development of the descendant languages.

1. Some features of pidgin and creole grammars

Bickerton (1981: Ch. 2) has identified twelve features which he believes to characterize creole grammars (see also Taylor 1971: 294 for twelve features, some of which are different):

    i. movement rules
    ii. articles
   iii. tense-modality-aspect systems
   iv. realized and unrealized complements
    v. relativization and subject-copying
   vi. negation
  vii. existential and purposive
 viii. copula
   ix. adjectives as verbs
    x. questions
   xi. question words
  xii. passive equivalents

Mühlhäusler (1986 a: Ch. 5) identifies 9 features which are characteristic of pidgins:

    i. SVO word order
    ii. invariant word order for questions and statements

  iii. sentence-external qualifiers
  iv. lack of number in nouns
   v. pronoun systems
  vi. prepositions
 vii. lack of derivational depth
viii. bimorphemic wh-questions words
  ix. anaphoric pronouns.

Of these, six are considered to be criterial features of creoles by either Bickerton, Markey (1982) or others. Mühlhäusler (1986a) cites x and xi (i. e. questions and question words) in Bickerton's list as characteristic features of pidgins which apparently had no input model. In other words, much the same solutions tend to recur wherever pidginization occurs regardless of the lexifier and substratum languages involved. Their presence in creoles illustrates the problem in drawing a sharp boundary between pidgins and creoles and also indicates that there can be some continuity in development from pidgin to creole. That is, creoles may have inherited these features from a prior pidgin stage, rather than re-invented them independently.

1.1. Questions and question words

If we look at questions and question words in pidgins and creoles, we can see that the problem is even more complicated than that of deciding whether these features are independent innovations or inheritances from a prior pidgin stage. We cannot rule out superstrate and substrate influences. With regard to questions, Bickerton states (1981: 70) that no creole shows any difference in syntactic structure between questions and statements. If a creole has special question particles, they are sentence-final and optional. Thus, in Guyanese Creole sentence (1) is not formally distinguishable as an interrogative or a declarative.[1] The difference between the two sentence types is marked by intonation.

(1)   *i bai di eg dem.*
       'He bought the eggs/Did he buy the eggs?'

This becomes an even more interesting and salient typological feature of creoles when taken in conjunction with the fact that most creoles tend to have SVO word order. Greenberg (1963: 81) proposes an implicational universal to the effect that if a language has sentence-external question particles, these tend to occur initially in prepositional languages (e. g. SVO),

but sentence-finally in postpositional (e. g. SOV) languages. The creole prototype thus violates this expectation.[2]

I will turn now to question words. In many creoles, question words are bimorphemic. The first morpheme is generally derived from a superstrate word, e. g. Guyanese Creole *wisaid* 'where' (< 'which side'), and similarly Haitian Creole, *ki kote* 'where' (< *qui côté* 'which side'). Other forms include Cameroons Creole *wetin* 'what' (< 'what thing'), Guyanese Creole *wa mek* 'why' (< 'what makes'), and Haitian Creole *lakoz ki* 'why' (< *la cause que* 'the reason that'), *ki fer* 'why' (< *qui faire* 'what makes').

The same kinds of structures can be found in many pidgins. Tok Pisin, for example, has *wanem* 'what/which' (< 'what name') and *husat* 'who' (< 'who's that'). Pidgins based on African languages also have similar forms, e. g. Kenya Pidgin *saa gani* 'when' (< 'hour which'), Swahili *sababu gani* 'why' (< 'reason which'), and Fanagalo *ipi skati* 'when' (< 'where time') (see Heine 1973). Taylor (1977: 171) notes that these bimorphemic constructions are found in many African languages and thus suggests an African origin for them. However, in experimentally created pidgins (see Schumann 1986) bimorphemic expressions emerged spontaneously for question words too, where African substratum cannot have been a factor. In Farsi pidgin, for example, *che so'al* 'why' (< 'what ask') and *che vaqt* 'when' (< 'what time') were created.

A number of these bimorphemic constructions in pidgins and creoles may have been taken over from the related superstrate languages. English, for example, has *what time* 'when', *what way* 'where/how'. So it would not be correct to say that there was no model in the superstrate for these constructions in creoles. Similarly, in the case of sentence-final question words, while it is true that there were no models in some of the superstrate languages, it is not true for all. It is well within the norms of colloquial French and English for a question word to occur at the end of the sentence, as examples (2) and (3) show:

(2)   *Les très longues dents du loup qui s'accrochent dans les habits dans la peau, on les appelle comment?*
      'These very long teeth of the wolf, that get hold of clothes and skin, they are called what?'

(3)   *You're going where?*

It is of course a separate issue that (2) is condemned by schoolteachers (see, e. g., Dannequin 1977: 76, from whom example [2] is taken), and that neither (2) nor (3) would be found in the written language. Posner (1983:

201) also notes the use of *wh in situ* questions of this type in colloquial French, but suspects they are of recent origin. It is also well within the spoken norms of all the European languages to use prosody in conjunction with ordinary declarative word order for questions.

Thus, in the case of question words and questions there are three sources for the similarities between creoles (and also pidgins): superstrate, substrate and universals. Posner (1985: 170) makes explicit at least one of the points of my examples: namely, that non-standard or popular colloquial varieties of languages show more of the so-called bioprogram features in grammar than do their standards (on the closeness between joual and creole see Wittmann 1973, and also Chaudenson 1979: 101–102 on *français avancé* and creole). Given the nature of contact between indigenous peoples and their European colonizers, it is also likely that it was this kind of language which formed the input to pidgins and creoles.

This is all too often overlooked in comparisons between pidgins and creoles and their superstrates. Typological comparisons focus their attention on standard written varieties. Not all varieties of a language, however, share the same typological or parametric affiliations. Thus, languages like Chinese, Japanese etc. are defined as having *wh- in situ* for simple interrogatives, while in English such structures are allegedly ruled out (see, e. g. Chomsky 1986: 53).

Thus, it cannot be overlooked that the absence of passives in creoles and pidgins must reflect at least in part the lack of models in some of the superstrate varieties to which speakers are exposed. It is well known that full agented passives are infrequent in colloquial English speech. Moreover, at least in the European languages concerned, the passive is characterized by more morphological complexity than the active, and complexity tends to be eliminated in pidginization.

Some of the developments in Haitian Creole are only a step removed from documented Canadian and Belgian French usages (see Posner 1983: 195–8). Posner goes on to say, however, that in cases where Romance creoles have substantially the same lexicon as a related patois, they can be considered members of the Romance "family", however marginally. Nevertheless, the issue is whether they are of the same "type". Her view (1985: 172) is that the two most salient criteria for distinguishing creole from patois, namely verbal inflection and noun gender, place these two varieties into different morphological types even though they remain by lexical-phonetic criteria members of the same family. Indeed Posner's view is that creolization involves typological change. I will next look at some of the sources for some features of verbal systems in creoles and pidgins.

1.2. Some features of verbal systems

Bickerton's (1981) most substantial claims about bioprogram grammar concern tense, mood and aspect (see his and also Mühlhäusler's feature iii above). This is not the place for a detailed discussion of these categories in creoles (see Romaine 1988: Ch. 7). My point here will be to illustrate that the same three possible sources can account for at least some of the properties of pidgin/creole verb systems: namely, substrate, superstrate and universals.

Although Hall maintained that the contribution of the superstrate to pidgins and creoles was always greater than that of the various substrata, his views elsewhere on Haitian Creole contradict this assumption. He comments (1966: 109) that "the entire inflectional system of the Haitian creole verb with its loss of tense and person- and number-endings and its use of aspectual prefixes, is straight African".

While there is no doubt that the verbal systems of many French-based creoles are strikingly different when compared to that of modern standard French, the latter should not be used as a yardstick of comparison, as I have already indicated. Comhaire-Sylvain (1936: 106) argues that it is impossible to account for the verbal system of Haitian Creole in terms of normal evolutive change from French; however, she then mentions a large number of periphrastic constructions with aspectual meaning found in vernacular varieties of French. Valdman (1977: 181) notes that analyticity in the expression of verbal categories and the absence of person-number inflection are not alien to certain types of overseas French (see also Posner 1983). Therefore, appeal need not be made to any special process of decreolization to account for the presence of these features in creoles.

In his analysis of the Réunion verbal system, Corne (in Baker and Corne 1982) claims that the morphosyntax and semantics derive mainly from seventeenth century varieties of French, and that the primary semantic distinctions are temporal, with aspect and modality functioning in a secondary role. Réunion has a relatively complex verbal morphology in which the copula carries markers of tense and aspect, as in French. Unlike French, however, *êt(re)*, the copula, does not function as an auxiliary. There are nevertheless some important creole features which distinguish it from French, such as the use of *fin(i)* plus past participle/adjective to mark the completive in stative predicates, e. g. *li fini fatige* 'he has become tired' (Baker and Corne 1982: 17). Corne (1982: 101 n. 3), however, raises the possibility of Bantu substratum in connection with the equivalent marker *fin/in/n* in Isle de France Creole since it does not seem in any sense other than an etymological one to be a

natural development of any variety of French. This marker and its semantic function are shared by other Indian Ocean creoles.

We can note here, too, a similarity of structural origin and function in the completive marker, *pinis*, found, for example, in Tok Pisin (e. g. *mi painim pinis* 'I found it'), and other English-based pidgins and creoles. Otherwise, in Isle de France Creole, by contrast with Réunion Creole, the predicate system is mainly aspectually oriented with tense playing a secondary role. All distinctions of tense and aspect are marked by preposed particles, which, according to Bickerton (1981), is a characteristically creole way of organizing the verb.

1.3. The comparative construction in pidgins and creoles

Bickerton (1981) does not include the comparative as part of the creole prototype. Markey (1982) has claimed that, generally speaking, creole comparatives are readily identifiable as input-specific. Nevertheless, a number of creoles have a primary or secondary option of forming a comparative construction whose main characteristic is that the noun which serves as the standard of comparison is the direct object of a transitive verb whose meaning is 'surpass or exceed'. For example, in Cameroon Pidgin English, the comparative constructions in (4) and (5) are found:

(4)   *i pas mi fo big.*
       'He is bigger than I.'

(5)   *i big pas Bill.*
       'He is bigger than Bill.'

Reflexes of English *pass* are used in Jamaican Creole, Krio, Gullah and Sranan. Some French and Portuguese-based creoles have a similar construction based on the lexeme meaning 'pass' (see Valkhoff 1966: 101–102 on the *pasa* comparative in the Portuguese-based Creole Principe). For example, Haitian Creole has *bel/pi bel/pi bel pase tout* 'beautiful/more beautiful/more beautiful passed all' (cf. standard French: *beau/plus beau/le plus beau*). In Sranan the two types of comparative construction illustrated in (6) and (7) are found (see Voorhoeve 1962):

(6)   *Hugo can lon moro betre leki Rudi.*
       Hugo can run more better like Rudi
       'Hugo can run better than Rudi.'

(7)   *A koni pasa mi.*
he smart surpass me
'He is smarter than I.'

The so-called exceed comparative (see Stassen 1985 for this term and discussion of the type) has been clearly modelled on the serial verb construction. Thus, it has been argued that the exceed comparative is a West African substratum feature (see, e.g., Hall 1966: 82 and Gilman 1972).[3] It can be found in the West African languages Ewe, Yoruba, Twi and Igbo (cf. Twi *ketwa sene me* [small surpass me] 'smaller than I'). Modern Sranan has largely discarded this construction in favor of the *leki*-comparative, a borrowing from the *like*-construction in English.

Whatever the source of the construction, it would not be surprising to find it occurring independently in pidgins or creoles because it represents a weakly grammaticalized and transparent means of expressing the notion of comparison. Seuren and Wekker (1986) suggest that creole languages in general will tend to have a smaller set of secondary grammatical constructions.

1.4. Pronouns in pidgins and creoles

Some predictions about the shape of pidgin and creole grammars may fall out from the nature of principles and parameters in universal grammar as defined, for example, by Chomsky (1981). In fact, Bickerton has increasingly tended to frame the bioprogram in terms of the unmarked parametric settings (see Macedo 1986 and also Muysken 1981 on tense, mood and aspect in creoles and predictions of markedness). This would of course involve a claim quite different from the one put forward by Posner. In Bickerton's view creoles would reflect a kind of retrograde evolutionary movement to a maximally unmarked state, while in Posner's they would represent "advanced movement" in the same direction as so-called "advanced" varieties of non-creole varieties.

"Advancement" need not necessarily complicate a language, although standardization often does (see Romaine 1984). In this connection Dahl's remarks (this volume) about Standard Average European languages serve to remind us that the standard written varieties of any language are artificial and reflect tendencies which Bickerton would attribute to cultural rather than natural grammar. (Whether this notion of evolutionary progress in typology is a coherent one cannot be discussed here, see also Ramat and Bernini [this volume] for a discussion of the notion of typological drift).

Nevertheless, unmarked parametric settings may well account for certain properties of pidgin pronoun systems. Many jargons and stable pidgins, for instance, are pro-drop languages. Mühlhäusler (1986 a: 158) cites the example in (8) from Pacific Jargon English from 1840:

(8)   *Now got plenty money; no good work.*
       'Now I have lots of money so I do not need to work'.

We would predict that if speakers were following the rules of their native language in inventing a pidgin they would follow the parameter setting in that language. Thus, in the case of speakers of pro-drop languages, we would expect that parameter to remain in force. Then the absence of pronouns in the resulting pidgin could be said to be due to substratum influence. Much the same argument applies to other cases of second language acquisition. White (1985), for example, has found that native speakers of Spanish (a pro-drop language) learning English transfer this parameter. In the case of Pacific Jargon English we cannot argue superstrate influence because English is a non-pro-drop language. I do not know what the status of this parameter is in the numerous Oceanic substrate languages. A similar case is reported by Mufwene (1987) for Kituba in Zaire. Kikongo, the lexifier, is a pro-drop-language, while Kituba is not.

It is interesting, however, that in other cases of second language acquisition Meisel (1983: 202) claims that deletion of pronouns can be found irrespective of the first language backgrounds of the speakers. This suggests that pro-drop constitutes the unmarked case. Hyams (1983) has argued this for first-language acquisition.

2. Discussion

My examples have shown that at present there is considerable uncertainty about the role lexifier languages and substrate influence, as opposed to universals, play in the various phases of the grammatical development of pidgins and creoles. Hall stressed the idea of what we might call typological neutralization. He argued that pidgin grammar represents a common core between the grammars of the languages in contact. Givón (1979) has suggested that only those substratum features which are compatible with universal grammar can be preserved, but there are instances where substratum features surface which violate this. The phonological systems of Chinook

Jargon and Pitcairn/Norfolk Creole are cases in point (see Romaine 1988: 64).

Once we admit that creoles subsequently develop in the same kinds of ways and are subject to the same kinds of constraints as natural languages, then the validity of creole as a synchronic type is called into question (see e. g. Givón 1979: 19—22 and Mufwene 1986). Those who argue for the distinctiveness of creoles generally make appeal to their special history and the catastrophic nature of the changes undergone (see e. g. Green 1987). In his discussion of whether Afrikaans is a creole, Markey (1982: 170) observes that to label creoles as contact languages is vacuous because all languages are in some sense the product of contact. Likewise, to call all languages "creoles" is equally fatuous. However, subsequent changes remove the traces of creole history and erode their linguistic distinctiveness.

Kihm (1983) goes so far as to say that the term 'creole' has no meaning in linguistic typology since linguists have failed to demonstrate that creoles develop differently from other languages. Part of the problem in all typological exercises lies in the choice of features taken to characterize the prototype, and another part lies in certain assumptions behind linguistic typology. It is important to bear in mind with regard to the latter that there are no absolutes in typology. None of the properties I have discussed here are unique to creoles or pidgins. Static typologies are of very little use when dealing with languages which change as rapidly as pidgins and creoles (see Mühlhäusler 1986 b on adjective-noun ordering).

Surface similarity of form is no guarantee for a common genetic origin, or for the semantic equivalence of systems. Neither can commonality of structure be equated with sameness of function. Sankoff (1984: 104) has observed that recourse to either substrate or universals has generally been little more than an exercise in pattern matching. Some claims for substratum influence have been motivated by what Dillard (1970) and others have referred to as "the cafeteria principle", i.e., the idea that creoles were mixtures of various rules from different regional varieties of British English. In other words, features were randomly picked out and attributed to substratum influence without regard for how they might have been borrowed or incorporated into the pidgin or creole in question. Welmers (1973), Manessy (1977) and others have emphasized the fact that the so-called "African substratum" is typologically diverse, and that combinations of substratum languages varied from place to place. If substratum influence was at all significant in creolization, how could such diversity of origin lead to uniformity in structure?

More specifically, Sankoff argues that in order for any particular syntactic structure to surface and be sustained, it must prove to function as a viable

discourse strategy. She says therefore that discursive practices are better candidates for areal features than specific features of morphology and syntax. In many areas the typological uniformity of creoles may be the result of syntactic convergence of optimal discursive strategies. A case in point is the development of certain strategies of relativization in some of the English and French-based creoles (see Romaine 1984 and 1988: Ch. 6). Posner (1985: 180—182), for example, has discussed the use of *la* to demarcate relative clauses in certain French-based creoles. (*La* is the definite NP marker derived from the French locative particle *là* 'there'). It can be used as a postposed deictic like Tok Pisin *ia*. (Compare Tok Pisin *dispela meri ia* 'this woman', and Haitian Creole *fam blāS la* 'the white woman'.) *Ia* is now used as a relativizer in Tok Pisin (see Sankoff — Brown 1976).

From what Posner says, it appears that French-based creoles represent various stages in the grammaticalization of this construction. It appears to be unknown in Louisiana and the Indian Ocean Creoles. It is optional in Martinique and Guadeloupe, but general in Haitian Creole. Lefebvre (1982: 37) claims that *la* is obligatory in restrictive relative clauses in Haitian Creole as in (9).

(9) *tab   la   [m   te   aste   a]*
     table determiner   I   tense   buy   determiner
     'The table that I bought'

It is interesting that this development has progressed further in Haitian since the latter has less contact with superstrate varieties of French than other French-based creoles. It is not, therefore, surprising that some of these same traits should turn up in non-standard spoken varieties, where there is less pressure to counteract natural developmental tendencies.

My own sympathies lie very much with an approach to typology which is based on grammaticalization and classifies languages/varieties according to the extent to which and the sequence in which certain construction types, syntactic parameters and discourse functions are grammaticalized cross-linguistically (see, for example, König, this volume).

Notes

1. This property of pidgins and creoles is attributed by Kay and Sankoff (1974: 66) to the fact that pidgins are derivationally shallower than natural languages, and thus reflect universal deep structure more directly.
2. Another interesting violation is noted by Mühlhäusler (1986a: 159) for Samoan Plantation Pidgin. It does not follow the universal tendency for languages to make fewer distinctions in marked categories like the plural than in unmarked ones.

3. Gilman (1972: 178—9) points out that in seventeenth and eighteenth century French and English the verbs *passer/pass* were occasionally found to express comparative notions. For example, in Samuel Johnson's dictionary from 1775 we find an example from Ben Jonson quoted: *But in my royal subject, I pass thee*. From the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, we find: *Le Prince Jésus ... qui passait en beauté les vierges es les anges* 'The prince Jesus who surpassed in beauty the virgins and angels'.

References

Baker, Philip — Chris Corne
 1982   *Isle de France Creole. Affinities and Origins*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Bickerton, Derek
 1981   *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Chaudenson, Robert
 1979   *Les Créoles français*. Paris: Nathan.

Chomsky, Noam
 1981   "Principles and parameters in syntactic theory", in: Norbert Hornstein — David Lightfoot (eds.), *Explanation in Linguistics. The Logical Problem of Language Acquisition*. London: Longman, 32—75.
 1986   *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Comhaire-Sylvain, Suzanne
 1936   *Le créole haïtien: morphologie et syntaxe*. Port-au-Prince and Wetteren: Imprimerie de Meester.

Dannequin, Claudine
 1977   *Les Enfants Bâillonnés*. Paris: CEDIC, Diffusion Nathan.

Dillard, Joe
 1970   "Principles in the history of American English — Paradox, virginity and cafeteria", *Florida FL Reporter* 8.

Gilman, Charles
 1972   *The Comparative Structure in French, English and Cameroonian Pidgin English: An Exercise in Linguistic Comparison*. Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University.

Givón, Talmy
 1979   "Prolegomena to any sane creology", in: Ian Hancock — Edgar Polomé — Morris Goodman — Bernd Heine (eds.), *Readings in Creole Studies*. Ghent: E. Story-Scientia PVBA, 3—35.

Green, John N.
 1987   "Romance Creoles", in: Martin B. Harris — Nigel B. Vincent (eds.), *The Romance Languages*. London: Croom Helm.

Greenberg, Joseph
 1963   "Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements", in: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 58—90.

Hall, Robert A.
   1953   *Haitian Creole: Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary.* (American Folklore Society, Memoir
            No. 43.) Philadelphia.
   1966   *Pidgin and Creole Languages.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Heine, Bernd
   1973   *Pidginsprachen im Bantu-Bereich.* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Hyams, Nina
   1986   *Language Acquisition and the Theory of Parameters.* Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Kay, Paul — Gillian Sankoff
   1974   "A language-universals approach to pidgins and creoles", in: David DeCamp —
            Ian F. Hancock (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles.* Washington, DC: Georgetown Univer-
            sity Press, 61—72.

Kihm, Alain
   1983   "De l'intérêt d'étudier des créoles, ou qu'ont-ils d'especial?" *Espace créole* 5: 75—
            100.

Lefebvre, Claire
   1982   "L'expansion d'une catégorie grammaticale", in: Claire Lefebvre — H. Magloire-
            Holly — N. Piou (eds.), *Syntaxe de l'Haïtien.* Ann Arbor: Karoma, 21—63.

Macedo, Donald P.
   1986   "The role of core grammar in pidgin development", *Language Learning* 36: 65—
            75.

Manessy, Gabriel
   1977   "Processes of pidginization in African languages", in: Albert Valdman (ed.), *Pidgin
            and Creole Linguistics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 129—154.

Markey, Thomas
   1982   "Afrikaans: Creole or non-creole?", *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 49:
            169—207.

Meisel, Jürgen
   1983   "Transfer as a second-language strategy", *Language and Communication* 3: 11—46.

Mufwene, Salikoko
   1986   "The universalist and substrate hypotheses complement one another", in: Pieter
            Muysken — Norval Smith (eds.), *Substrata vs. Universals in Creole Genesis.* Am-
            sterdam: John Benjamins, 129—162.
   1987   Formal evidence of pidginization/creolization in Kituba. [Paper presented at the
            18th Conference on African Linguistics. University of Montreal.]

Mühlhäusler, Peter
   1986 a   *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.
   1986 b   "Bonnet blanc et blanc bonnet: Adjective-noun order, substratum and language
            universals", in: Pieter Muysken — Norval Smith (eds.), *Substrata vs. Universals in
            Creole Genesis.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 41—55.

Muysken, Pieter
    1981   "Creole tense/mood/aspect systems: the unmarked case?", in: Pieter Muysken
                (ed.), *Generative Studies on Creole Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris, 181—199.

Posner, Rebecca
    1983   "The origins and affinities of French Creoles: New Perspectives", *Language and
                Communication* 3: 191—202.
    1985   "Creolization as typological change. Some examples from Romance syntax",
                Diachronica II: 2: 167—188.

Romaine, Suzanne
    1984   "Relative clauses in child language, pidgins and creoles", *Australian Journal of
                Linguistics* 4: 257—281.
    1988   *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.

Sankoff, Gillian
    1984   "Substrate and universals in the Tok Pisin verb phrase", in: Deborah Schiffrin
                (ed.), *Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*. Washington, DC:
                Georgetown University Press, 104—120.

Sankoff, Gillian — Penelope Brown
    1976   "The origins of syntax in discourse", *Language* 52: 631—666.

Schumann, John
    1986   Experimentally created pidgins. [Presentation at the Colloquium on Pidgins and
                Creoles: Issues in Language Acquisition and Education. University of Hawaii at
                Manoa, August 1—2, 1986. Honolulu, Hawaii.]

Seuren, Pieter — Herman Wekker
    1986   "Semantic transparency as a factor in creole genesis", in: Pieter Muysken —
                Norval Smith (eds.), *Universals vs. Substrata in Creole Genesis*. Amsterdam: John
                Benjamins, 57—71.

Stassen, Leon
    1985   *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Taylor, Douglas
    1971   "Grammatical and lexical affinities of creoles", in: Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization
                and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 293—299.
    1977   *Languages of the West Indies*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Valdman, Albert
    1977   "Creolization: Elaboration in the development of Creole French dialects", in:
                Albert Valdman (ed.), *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana Univer-
                sity Press, 155—189.
    1986   "Applied linguistics and language planning: A case study", in: Joshua Fishman
                — Andrée Tabouret-Keller — Michael Clyne — Bh. Krishnamurti —
                M. Abdulaziz (eds.), *The Fergusonian Impact. Vol. I.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter,
                517—536.

Valkhoff, Maurice F.
    1966   *Studies in Portuguese and Creole: With Special Reference to South Africa*. Johannesburg:
                Witwatersrand University.

Voorhoeve, Jan
   1962   *Sranan Syntax*. Amsterdam.

Welmers, W. E.
   1973   *African Language Structures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

White, Lydia
   1985   "The 'pro-drop' parameter in adult second language acquisition", *Language Learning* 35: 47—63.

Wittmann, H.
   1973   "Le joual, c'est-tu un creole?", *La Linguistique* 9.2: 83—93.

Area influence versus typological drift in Western Europe: the case of negation*

Paolo Ramat — Giuliano Bernini

1. The study of the languages spoken in Europe (as defined by geography) in terms of areal typology and *Sprachbünde* in a frame derived from classical Balkan linguistics (since Sandfeld 1930; see also Banfi 1985 for a recent survey), and from the — perhaps more convincing — results of investigations on the Indian subcontinent (Masica 1976 among others) and on Central America (Campbell et al. 1986), necessarily involves assessing two crucial conditions of language contact. On the one hand the historical-cultural, and hence sociolinguistic likelihood of mutual influence between the languages in question; on the other hand the merely linguistic likelihood — i. e. in terms of structure compatibility — of *Sprachbund* formation.[1]

This second point, in turn, relates directly to the field of language universals and linguistic typology, in particular the universals — or rather tendencies — constraining linguistic borrowing proposed by Moravcsik 1978 (cf. also Bynon 1977: 253—255; Comrie 1981 b: 202—203). Likelihood of borrowing depends on the language component involved, ranging highest for lexicon, lower for syntax, lower again for morphology and for phonology. This ordering of language components according to likelihood of borrowing turns out to be a true *implicational hierarchy*, providing the criteria for the evaluation of a supposed *Sprachbund*. Thus the various contact phenomena can be assigned a different specific weight according to the language component(s) involved. For example, spreading of a lexeme from one language to another will be of lesser importance than, say, spreading of a particular feature of phonology.

In addition, the above hierarchy marks out the path that borrowed items necessarily follow when passing from source to adoptive language, i. e. from lexicon either to phonology or to syntax and morphology. As a straightforward example, we can take the borrowing of a new morpheme for number;

---

this implies antecedent borrowing of lexical items containing it, as illustrated by the adoption of the plural morpheme *-im* in Yidd. *doktójrim* 'doctors' (sing. *dóktor*) only after loans of lexical items (from Hebrew) such as *gibójrim* 'strong men', sing. *gíber* (cf. Weinreich 1953 [1974]: 46). Similarly, borrowing of a word formation suffix, e. g. *-aggio* found in It. *lavaggio* 'washing', *ingrassaggio* 'greasing', presupposes earlier French loans into Italian as *viaggio* 'voyage', *coraggio* 'courage', and also Old It. *domaggio* 'damage' (thirteenth century). Indeed, word formation suffixes, which never occur as free morphemes in a language and will always occur as part of lexical items, are an important area of transition from grammar to lexicon, and here the relevance of the above implicational hierarchy becomes particularly apparent.[2]

2.   Bearing in mind the likelihood of borrowing mentioned above and the specific weight that the proposed hierarchy allows us to assign to contact phenomena, we can now ask whether it is possible to identify, within the larger set of features resulting from language contact, a smaller set of features generally relevant for the characterization of a *Sprachbund*. We may also ask whether the examples of convergence processes which one can observe in different languages should all count as "tokens" on a simply statistical level or could perhaps be ascribed to some major underlying principles as their "types".

In the classic case of the Balkan *Sprachbund* it seems that some of the typical phenomena ("balkanisms") could indeed be ascribed to a common denominator. Periphrastic future (as in Gk. *thà gráphō* < *thélei hína gráphō*, lit. 'it wants that I write'); substitution of the infinitive by a subordinate clause containing a finite verb (as in Rom. *se preface că plânge* 'he pretends to be crying', lit. 'that he is crying'); analytical comparative of adjectives (as in Alb. *më bukur* 'more beautiful', *shumë bukur* 'most beautiful'); formation of numerals from 'eleven' through 'nineteen' (as in Bulg. *edin-na-deset*, lit. 'one-on-ten'); postposed articles partly substituting inflection (as in Rom. *codru-lui* 'of the wood', *codri-lor* 'of the woods')[3] all show the tendency to a transition from synthetic to an analytic type (cf. Ramat 1988 a). Here it might be better to speak of "language types in contact" (or better still "typological contact") instead of "language contact". On closer inspection, however, this example could appear less convincing, since some of the "balkanisms" mentioned above are not limited to the Balkan area (periphrastic future, analytical comparison and articles are also shared by Romance and Germanic languages) and other features traditionally considered as typical of the Balkan *Sprachbund* seem to run counter to the proposed typological tendency, as shown, e. g., by coalescence of genitive and dative and of locative (*ubi*) and directive (*quo*)

and by retention of a separate vocative case (see again Banfi 1985). Nonetheless, the specificness of the Balkan convergence area is constituted by the co-occurrence of a set of features; each of them may in principle be shared by other, non-Balkan languages (see also Lazard's observations concerning the actant features of so-called Standard Average European, this volume).

Indeed, all the various *Sprachbünde* proposed to date for Europe since Kopitar and Miklosich, followed by the Prague structuralists (Jakobson, Havránek, cf. Bahner 1986) up to the list of "europemes" supplied by Haarmann (1976 b: 105), do not seem to be characterized by particular internal consistency. This observation raises again the question posed at the beginning of this section about a possible set of features allowing the characterization of a *Sprachbund*. To take a simple example, is simultaneous presence of mono-tonicity and of opposition of palatalized and non-palatalized consonants a sufficient criterion for characterizing a "Euro-Asian *Sprachbund*" as claimed by Haarmann (1976 a: 28 ff.)?[4]

The obvious answer to this question is that definition of a *Sprachbund* must center on features belonging to the components which are more borrowing-proof, that is to say geographically neighboring languages are more likely to participate in a *Sprachbund* the more morphological and phonological features they share. However these area-defining features should also meet two additional requisites; they should not be exclusively surface features, as, e. g., a plural morph compared to the category of plural; and they should possess a certain degree of markedness — in terms of "linguistic naturalness" — that would make at least doubtful the chance of their independent development. In this respect, isoglosses mapping the presence of clicks in the Bantu languages of Southern Africa (borrowed from neighboring Khoisan languages, cf. Maingard 1934), are more powerful evidence than, say, presence of nasalized vowels resulting from previous sequences of vowel + nasal consonant.

This mention of modalities of diffusion seems to point to a possible unification of both areal contacts and typological drifts. The identification of a *Sprachbund*, for which a formal and sufficiently rigorous definition is still lacking (how many and of what kind should the relevant convergences be?),[5] cannot be based solely on the observation of convergence phenomena, but must take into account their progressive development within a certain historical-cultural setting. It is clear that under this point of view European languages constitute a particularly suitable research field since their forms, contacts and mutual influences are attested over centuries, not to say millennia (cf., in this volume, König — van der Auwera on the evolution of absolute constructions).

3. Coming now to the problem of defining a European *Sprachbund* (or Standard Average European, as proposed by Décsy (1973), using only linguistic parameters — leaving aside, therefore, the ethno-anthropological considerations proposed by Whorf (1941) who originally introduced the notion; cf. also Mioni 1986: 106), one of the most interesting and useful linguistic features for both empirical investigation and theoretical speculation turns out to be *postverbal* and/or *discontinuous expression of sentence negation*.

The development of this type of negative construction is well documented throughout the history of both the Romance and the Germanic languages. It is a new morpho-syntactic feature that did not originate from any kind of superlectal influence, it being totally absent from both Latin and Greek. It is, therefore, a feature most suitable for testing the opposed hypotheses of common innovation of geographically neighboring but otherwise different languages and of independent development within similar typological drifts, allowing us to base our conclusions on a solid body of philological data.

By way of contrast let us consider for a while the analytic conjugation of the verb in Celtic languages and Basque examined in this volume by McKenna: the trend to shift from inflection to periphrastic forms using some kind of auxiliary (e. g. Manx *níom teacht* 'I shall do coming' instead of *tigim* 'I will come') is by no means restricted to Celtic and Basque (cf. *i(x) tue schloafe* 'I sleep', lit. 'I do sleep', in the Walser dialect of Gressoney, Aosta; Old Pol. *będą czynić* 'they will make', lit. 'they are able to make' (Andersen 1987: 27) etc.). It reflects a general, "natural" trend of morphology towards iconic, transparent forms, easy to be analyzed. Therefore a correspondence in this domain is less significant than a correspondence among marked constructs such as discontinuous/postverbal negations.[6]

4. Diffusion of discontinuous and/or postverbal negations across the languages of Europe appears as a *continuum* with a core area and three surrounding fringe areas.[7]

The core area comprises the following languages:[8]

(1)   High Ger. (TVX/SOV)
      Ich *sehe* das Haus **nicht**
      'I do not see the house'.

(2)   Low Ger. (TVX/SOV)
      Dat *is* **niht** allens Botter wat [...]
      'It is not all butter what [...]' (Sanders 1982: 205).

(3)   Yid. (TVX/SVO)
       Far vos *zogt* ir **ništ** oyf prost yidiš az [...]
       'Why don't you say in clear Yiddish that [...]' (Hutterer 1975: 360).

(4)   Dutch (TVX/SOV)
       Morgen *gaan* we **niet** naar school
       'Tomorrow we do not go to school'

(5)   Frisian (TVX/SOV)
       Jan *is* der **net**
       'Jan is not here'.

(6)   Sursilvan Romansh (TSVX)
       Questa schlateina *ven* **buc** ad ir giù
       'This family name shall not be lost' (Schwegler 1983: 310).

(7)   Lombard of Bergamo (for Gallo-Italic, TSVX)
       Se no la somènza la *tàca* **mìa**
       'Otherwise the seed won't grow'.

(8)   Occitan (TSVX)
       Jan *manjo* **pas** de peissoun
       'Jan does not eat fish'.

Beside these languages, all of which show postverbal negative patterns, the core area also comprises the following languages with discontinuous negative constructions, partly giving rise to postverbal negations after loss of the first element of the original construction, as, e. g., in both colloquial French and Welsh:

(9)   Sursilvan Romansh (cf. also above, TSVX)
       Ke co **nu** *fatschi* **britch**
       'That I do not do this' (Schwegler 1983: 309).

(10)   French (TSVX)
       Je **ne** *sais* **pas** (colloquial: Je *sais* **pas**)
       'I do not know'

(11)   Pyrenean Catalan (TSVX)
       No *sé* **cap**
       'I do not know' (Schwegler, 1988: 24).

(12)   Aragonese (TSVX)
       No la *tastaràs* **brenca** ista coca
       'You won't taste this cake (at all)' (Schwegler, 1988: 24).

(13)   Breton (SVO/VSO)
      N' her *gouient* **ket**
      NEG it   they-knew NEG
      'They did not know it'

(14)   Welsh (VSO)
      Nid *yw* 'r bachgen **ddim** yn hoffi coffi
      NEG   is   the boy   NEG   in like coffee
      'The boy does not like coffee'[9]

This core area is surrounded by three fringe areas: the first one comprises English and the Nordic languages and shows a more or less marked tendency, depending on the language involved, towards re-establishing preverbal negative forms, cf.:

(15)   English (SVO)
      I *did* **not** hear him vs. I **never** *heard* him.

(cf. also substandard: '... but she **don't** *care*', where generalized *don't* functions as a preverbal negative particle).[10]

(16)   Swedish (for all Nordic languages, TVX)
      Han *kunde* **inte** komma 'He could not come' vs.
      Det var synd, att han **inte** *kunde* komma
      'It was bad, that he could not come'.

The second one comprises Italian and Catalan and is characterized by discontinuous constructions with emphatic value alternating with the "regular" non-emphatic preverbal constructions, cf.:

(17)   Italian (TSVX)
      Non *fa* (**mica**) freddo qui
      'It is not cold (at all) here'.[11]

(18)   Catalan (TSVX)
      Joan **no** *menja* (**pas**) peix
      'John does not eat fish'.

The third fringe area comprises all of the varieties of Arabic spoken on the coast of North Africa and on Malta, together with Palestine, Lebanon and North Yemen, which possess a discontinuous and a preverbal construction in partially complementary distribution, whereby the latter is a derivation of the former (Bernini 1987):[12]