Selected topics in the grammar of Français Tirailleur

A corpus study

Anton Harry Nordén

Stockholms universitet

Selected topics in the grammar of Français Tirailleur

A corpus study

Anton Harry Nordén

Abstract/Sammanfattning

This corpus-based study describes some grammatical and lexical features of Français Tirailleur (FT), a pidgin spoken in the French colonial army from the mid-1800's to the 1950's. By examining the largest corpus available of the language, this study aims to (1) discern hitherto undescribed or strengthen previous claims about grammatical and lexical features of FT, (2) compare these features with its lexifier language and (3) identify changes over time. The corpus has been manually part-of-speech tagged and all noun phrases have been marked up. The results include a description of the form and function of the FT noun phrase, covering (pro)nouns and their modifiers as well as noun phrases with an embedded prepositional phrase. Furthermore, the apparent diachronic development of the expression *même chose* is analyzed, along with examples of circumlocution. FT is shown to differ from French in several respects, e.g. in substituting the demonstrative determiners *ce(t)/cette* with *ça*, but no signs of substrate influence are found. Contrary to intution about the simplex nature of pidgins, FT appears to follow French in placing certain adjectives before the noun, while postposing others. There remain several interesting aspects to explore in the grammar of FT, among them the elusive, multi-functional items *ya* and *yena*. Our further understanding of pidgins would benefit from more data and cross-linguistic comparison.

Denna korpus-baserade studie beskriver några lexikala och grammatiska drag hos Français Tirailleur (FT), ett pidginspråk som talades i franska kolonialarmen från mitten på 1800- till 1950-talet. Genom att undersöka den största tillgängliga korpusen över språket söker denna studie (1) urskilja hittills obeskrivna drag eller styrka existerande hypoteser om språkets natur, (2) jämföra språket med dess lexifierare samt (3) identifiera eventuell diakron variation. Korpusen har ordklasstaggats manuellt och alla nominalfraser har märkts upp. Resultaten innefattar en beskrivning av nominalfrasens form och funktion, en analys av uttrycket *même chose* och dess historiska utveckling samt ett antal exempel på cirkumlokution. FT skiljer sig från franska i flera avseenden, men inga tecken på substratinfluenser hittades. Trots att pidginspråk brukar kännetecknas av avsevärd förenkling, tycks FT ha bevarat franskans relativt komplexa system med både för- och efterställda adjektiv. Det råder brist på data och tvärlingvistiska jämförelser mellan pidginspråk, men det återstår ännu flertalet intressanta frågor att undersöka i FT-korpusen.

Contents

List of abbreviations

1-3SG/PL	1st to 3rd person singular/plural
ACC	Accusative case
COP	Copula
FT	Français Tirailleur
DAT	Dative case
DEM	Demonstrative
DET	Determiner
DIST/PROX	Distal/proximal
MASC/FEM	Masculine/feminine
NOM	Nominative case
NP	Noun phrase
PREP	Preposition
POSS	Possessive
REL	Relative pronoun/relativizer

Presentation of examples

Language examples are presented as follows (cf. the fictitious example below. In the first row, "FrTir NUMBER" refers to the example's unique ID in the corpus. The following date indicates when the utterance was produced. The second row gives the text as written in the original source, with the element(s) of interest in bold, while as the third row gives a standardized version of the text. The standardized version is basically produced to facilitate text processing, and should not be subject to further interpretations. However, it is aligned with the morpheme glosses in the fourth row, leaving the original text untouched. In some cases, the morpheme gloss is simply a repetition of the element in the row above (cf. *ya* below). This means that we do not have sufficient knowledge to translate that individual element. Finally, the fifth row gives an approximate translation into English. All examples have been standardized, glossed and translated by Mikael Parkvall (although I have sometimes made minor edits for illustrative purposes).

(X)   (FrTir 0000, 2017)

Original	*Moi y a content bouillie*		
Stdzd	Moi	ya	content bouillie
Gloss	1SG	ya	like porridge

'I like porridge'

1. Introduction

This corpus-based study examines selected topics in the grammar and lexicon of Français Tirailleur, a pidgin which was spoken in the French colonial army during about 100 years (emerging circa 1857). The French recruited soldiers – sometimes by means of coercion – along a vast stretch of the West African coast, from Senegal to Benin, and inland to e.g. Mali and Burkina Faso, as their colonial empire expanded. In these ethno-linguistically diverse regiments, led by French officers, there arose a need for a medium of inter-ethnic communication. The language now known as Français Tirailleur (also known as e.g. *Petit-Nègre*, *Moi-ya-dit* or *Forofifon Naspa*) emerged as one of the solutions to this problem.

Français Tirailleur (henceforth FT) is documented in written form by over 100 authors, although it has received limited attention from linguists. The relative paucity of descriptive works is something that FT shares with many other pidgin languages. While there may be several reasons as to why pidgins have been disregarded by the scientific community, there are also good reasons to study them more closely. For instance, anyone interested in language typology or linguistic complexity will be sure to find them worthwhile.

Now, what is a pidgin language? Naturally, there are several competing answers to this question, each with somewhat different implications. In this paper, pidgins are characterized according to common practice among some influential scholars. A pidgin is often described as a language with reduced grammar and lexicon, created in a situation where people need to communicate with each other, often in a limited number of domains, but lack an existing common language (cf. e.g. Hall 1966: xii; Holm 2000: 5; Matras 2009: 277-278; Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 20). A pidgin often derives most of its lexicon from one of the languages spoken by the groups that are in contact with each other. The language from which most of the vocabulary is drawn is called the *lexifier (language)*. Some of the pidgin's structural features are usually also derived from one or more of the languages spoken by the groups in contact. Those languages other than the lexifier which have influenced – or may have influenced – the pidgin are called *substrate languages* or simply *substrates*.

The principal motivation of the present study is to add to the existing knowledge about FT, and thereby also to pidgins in general. What sets this study aside from most other works on FT is that we have access to the largest existing corpus available of the language. In the following section, FT is introduced from a socio-historical, linguistic and theoretical perspective.

2. Background

The background section is divided into three parts. The first one adresses the socio-history of FT, from the arrival of the French in West Africa to the employment of Africans in the colonial forces, and also some different views on the emergence and sociolinguistics of FT. The second part presents a number of earlier studies on FT and some prototypical features of pidgin languages. Finally, the third part relates some of the central questions within the field of contact linguistics to the present study.

2.1 Socio-history

2.1.1 The French in West Africa: from early trading to later imperalism

The relationship between the French and West Africa began, as far as its history is documented, sometime during the 14th century. During the 1300s, Canary Islands emerged as a pitstop for Europeans travelling down the coast (Thornton 1992: 29[1]), and by 1364, there is evidence[2] of Normans trading all the way from modern-day Rufisque (just outside of Dakar, Senegal) to the Sierra Leone river (Biondi 1987: 26). The distance between Senegal and Sierra Leone equals about 700 kilometers as the crow flies. About 200 years later, in the 1550s, there were Senegalese speaking French and people had gone back and forth between the continents in order to strengthen the connection (Kerr 1812).

From 1628 and onwards, the French repeatedly tried to settle at the mouth of the Senegal river, finally succeeding in establishing Saint-Louis on the island of Ndar in 1658 (Hargreaves 1969: 34). Saint-Louis in north-western Senegal along with the latter acquired Gorée Island, near Dakar, became central ports in the slave trade (Hargreaves 1969). Parkvall (1995a, b) and McWhorter (2000: 172ff) both discuss the possibility of Afro-genesis of some French creoles, proposing as their birthplace the French settlements in Senegal during the late 1600s. Thus, the French that was spoken in the settlements might have been both French *per se* and a French-lexified pidgin.

France continued being the main European power in the area, except for a period of British rule between 1758 and 1817 (Wilson 1999: 9-10). In 1848, slavery was officially prohibited – but in practice continued in the form of military recruitment (Hargreaves 1999: 100). It is around this time, i.e. the second half of the 19th century, that the first documented utterances in Français Tirailleur date back to. The next section provides some details on the French colonial forces with African recruits, the so-called *tirailleur sénégalais* (lit. "Senegalese sharpshooter, but in practice used for any French soldier from sub-Saharan Africa), by whom the language was developed and used.

However, we must first dwell on the relationship between the early and late periods of contact, and the implications it may have for our view of Français Tirailleur. While it appears to be true that (some) locals in Senegal spoke some type of French in the 17th century, there is to my knowledge not enough linguistic data to show any connection over time between the speech of the early Francophones and the later Français Tirailleur pidgin. Thus, the roots of Français Tirailleur remain somewhat obscured, possibly reaching far back, or possibly starting at a later point.

2.1.2 The tirailleur sénégalais

The first Tirailleur Sénégalais regiment of the French colonial army was officially created in 1857 (Echenberg 1991: 50), although African soldiers had been recruited by the French since long before (at least since 1765; Wilson 1999: 11). The sénégalais part of the name persisted even though it was only

---

[1] I have not consulted Thornton (1992), Biondi (1987), Kerr (1812) or Hargreaves (1969) myself, but merely cite them from Wilson (1999: 4-10).

[2] It may however be the case that this piece of evidence represents a myth rather than the truth (Parkvall, p. c.). It should therefore be taken with a grain of salt.

in the beginning that most African recruits came from Senegal. The last battles of the regiments were fought in Algeria during the late 1950's. The size of the corps varied greatly over time, beginning at around 500 soldiers in 1857 (Echenberg 1991: 7, 26). Until 1914, i.e. the first world war (WWI), the population of soldiers grew steadily, having reached more than 17 000 at this point. However, during WWI it quickly grew to encompass almost 200 000 individuals.

The ethnolinguistic backgrounds of the tirailleurs shifted over the years, although there were probably three especially prominent languages (presented in chronological order): Wolof, Bambara and Mooré (Parkvall, p. c.). Starting with Wolof (Niger-Congo, Northern Atlantic), it was presumably most important during the early years of the regiment, when large proportions of the soldiers originated in the vicinities of Senegal. This is based on the fact that Wolof is and was the biggest language of the region. Likewise, the other Northern Atlantic languages Fula and Serer, and the Mande languages Bambara and Soninke could also be considered for geographical reasons. There are also written accounts to support these estimations. Mangin (1910: 274-275; cited in Skirgård 2013: 16) claims that the first tirailleurs were mostly Yolofs[3] and Fulas, with Serer speakers joining in slightly later. In 1910, according to Mangin, Mandes were the most populous ethnic group. In 1911, Bambaras would have made up two thirds of the troops (Echenberg 1991: 14), possibly exerting a particular influence as a substrate language. An anonymous author (1916) (henceforth abbreviated Anon 1916) also suggests that Bambara was a common language among the troops at the time of their publication. Later, in 1926, especially many tirailleurs were Mooré speakers (Echenberg 1991: 77). Thus, we end up with three extra prominent languages, namely Wolof, Bambara and Mooré – each occupying its own stretch of time, one after the other – and a number of other Northern Atlantic and Mande languages (e.g. Fula, Serer and Soninke).

Parkvall (p. c.) argues that the recurring influx of new soldiers must have challenged the transmission of the language. One way of maintaining its structure was through explicit teaching. For instance, Baratier (1912: 22; cited in Avram 2016: 107) describes a lesson in FT, held in the 1890's, while Anon (1916) is an FT manual aimed at officers. The occasional renewal and geographical fragmentation of the troops may also have resulted in different dialects or varieties of FT.

The next subsection discusses some different views regarding the emergence of FT and by whom it was spoken.

2.1.3 Français Tirailleur – a pidgin or a colonial fabrication

In the previous section, it was pointed out that at least to some extent, FT was explicitly taught to officers and their subordinates. A more detailed account of the educational arrangements around FT is given by Avram (2016). Avram describes some of the many ideas, expressed in the late 19th century, of various kinds of "reduced" French, to be taught in the colonies (2016: 105ff.). But however consciously the French colonial adminstration may have tried to impose an artifical language on residents of their empire, there must have been an interplay between systematic constructs and more naturally emerging varieties. Chaudenson (2003: 54; cited in Avram 2016: 108) says the following about FT: "[it is] a slightly artificial pidgin, which has its origins in the approximate varieties produced by speakers in an exolingual situation and in didactic generalizations said to facilitate and accelerate the teaching of this minimal French".

Other scholars appear to disagree with the view exemplified by Chaudenson and Avram, i.e. that FT evolved out of an interplay between the French and the locals. Consider the following passage from Mufwene (2015: 352): "'Le français tirailleur', associated with African recruits in the French army since the 19th century, appears to be *a stereotypical creation of the French colonizers themselves. The recruits hardly spoke it*, though it has been kept in the French citizens' negative representation of Africans' inability to learn standard French competently (Vigouroux, 2013)." (italics added). In Mufwene's perspective, it seems that the role of the recruits in forming FT is significantly downplayed (cf. the parts in italic). Furthermore, Mufwene casts doubt on whether the recruits even spoke the language. Aboh (2015: 126) in a similar vein holds that "[…] even though *it* [FT] *is inaccurately associated with African soldiers in the French army*, [it] *was actually a colonial instrument developed and enhanced by the*

---

[3] Yolof is the name of the ethnic group, while Wolof stands for the language.

French colonial administration hoping to accomplish easy communication with African soldiers […]".
While it is true that there was a non-negligable amount of language policing involved, claiming that
recruits did not speak the language appears to be an overstatement. In the collection of texts used in the
present study, we can see numerous examples of African soldiers speaking FT, as well as a few instances
of civilian's and children's speech. In light of our linguistic evidence, we may therefore assume that FT
was indeed used among the tirailleur sénégalais. If they used it, they should reasonably also have
contributed to its evolution.

In the following section, an overview of earlier research on FT is presented, followed by a brief rendition
of some main features of FT.

2.2 Linguistic features

2.2.1 Previous studies of Français Tirailleur

The earliest descriptive work of FT is Delafosse (1904), and it describes the language as it was spoken
in Ivory Coast. Perhaps the most well-known work – although prescriptive rather than descriptive – is
that of an anonymous author (Anon 1916), directed towards officers in the French army. Most
descriptive works up until today have been based solely on Anon (1916), e.g. Manessy (1978), Houis
(1984), Wilson (1999) and Corne (1999). However, there are a few studies based on more data, among
them Avram (2016), who includes 14 additional sources, and Skirgård (2013), using material from 148
different documents written by 130 authors. The present study utilizes the same corpus as Skirgård, only
with a couple of more sources that have been added since 2013 (the corpus has been compiled by Mikael
Parkvall).

With Skirgård (2013) being the most comprehensive study of FT so far in terms of data, the present
study is an attempt to continue building onto her work. By looking at features that were not described
by Skirgård, or looking at her features from a different perspective, this study takes the analysis of FT
one step further. Thus, the analysis presented here concerns a number of selected topics. These selected
topics and their relation to Skirgård's and others' work are described below.

In order to delimit the scope of this study, it was decided that the grammatical description should only
cover the noun phrase. This is motivated partly because certain elements and structural traits of the noun
phrase (listed in the next paragraph) have not previously been investigated -- or have received limited
attention -- and partly because of time constraints. The investigation of lexical features was not
systematically constrained, but came to include those features that surfaced when reading the corpus
and were deemed to have some scientific interest, for example in the sense that they have been proposed
to be typical of pidgins in general (cf. section 2.2.2).

The features of the noun phrase in need of further description are as follows. Firstly, Skirgård (2013:
15) lists as one of the FT traits not investigated in her thesis the language's demonstratives. While
Skirgård does describe the set of personal pronouns in FT (2013: 40-43), it remains to be established
whether the demonstrative pronoun is *ça* 'this/these' (as claimed by e.g. Avram 2016: 117), and whether
there are more pronominal forms other than personal pronouns and demonstratives. Secondly, there is
no description of FT determiners, other than in works using much smaller corpora: Avram (2016: 116)
states that the only demonstrative determiners are preposed *ça* 'this/these' and postposed *y en a là*
'this/these'. With regard to articles, Avram (2016: 115-116) writes that there are none, neither definite
nor indefinite ones, but that in some cases the etymological article is agglutinated to the noun (e.g.
laroute 'road'). Skirgård (2013: 38-40) treats articles in FT from the perspective of gender marking, but
does not comment upon the question of their actual (non-)existence as a means for marking definiteness.
Thirdly, the order of adjective and noun and numeral and noun, respectively, is still not a resolved issue.
Skirgård (2013: 60) states that numerals appear to precede nouns, except in Anon (1916), where they
are postposed – but does not explicitly mention the case with adjectives and nouns. Avram (2016: 118)
claims that numerals most often are preposed, even so in Anon (1916), and that the order of adjective
and noun follows that in French (i.e. that certain adjectives are preposed, while others are postposed)
(2016: 117).

4

In the following section, some additional features of FT are presented, along with their relationship to features of pidgins in general.

2.2.2 Linguistic features of Français Tirailleur

Linguistic features that characterize pidgin languages are often stated as e.g. lack of verbal inflection, absence of case marking and few or no function words. Pidgin traits are actually easier to define negatively, in relation to their lexifiers, than positively, due to the scarcity of comparative pidgin studies (Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 32). From Parkvall & Bakkers (2013b) pidgin bibliography, it is clear that there are surprisingly few large-scale comparisons between pidgins and cross-linguistic generalizations about them. When it comes to works that suggest general properties of pidgins, Peter Bakker (1995) was the first to do this based on an extensive sample. More recent studies of this category are Philip Baker (2002) and Parkvall & Bakker (2013a), of which the latter is, to my knowledge, the largest to date in terms of its sample. A handful of the pidgin features described there are exemplified below with help from earlier works on FT.

Beginning in the area of function words, Anon (1916: 14; translated by Wilson 1999: 43) claims that these are very rare in FT. Wilson (1999: 93), having analyzed Anon (1916), concludes that there are four prepositions: *avec* 'with', *dans* 'in', *pour* 'for' (also working as a subjunction) and optional *sur* 'on'. Pidgins in general often have few adpositions, and several have only one (Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 33, 36). Coordination in FT is asyndetic, i.e. coordinating conjunctions are omitted (Wilson 1999: 93-94). Articles are non-existent, but the etymological article is occasionally agglutinated to the noun (Delafosse 1904: 265; Anon 1916: 7; Avram 2016: 115-116), like in several French-lexified creoles (Ladhams 2007: 1).

In terms of FT verbal morphology, there is no person, gender or number agreement, and the verb always takes the (etymologically) infinitive form (Anon 1916: 12 and Wilson 1999:39; cited in Skirgård 2013: 15; cf. also Avram 2016: 118ff.). Comparative studies of pidgin inflectional morphology (e.g. Roberts & Bresnan 2008; cited in Parkvall & Bakker 2013: 40) have shown that pidgins often lack the inflectional categories of the lexifier, but also that they may preserve them or even develop new ones.

The personal pronoun system in FT has generally dropped the case and gender distinctions present in French, although there is some variation (Anon 1916: 11; Wilson 1999: 37; Skirgård 2013: 40-42; Avram 2016: 117). According to Parkvall & Bakker (2013a: 37-38), pidgin personal pronoun sets are often more limited than those of their lexifiers.

FT lacks productive reduplication (Skirgård 2013: 57-59 and Avram 2016: 109-110 *contra* Corne 1999: 201). Interestingly, pidgins have in the past, probably on an intuitive basis, been associated with reduplication. However, from Bakker's (2003) cross-linguistic study, reduplication appears to be very rare in pidgins. As pidgins generally have small lexica, polysemy is very common (Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 33). For example, having very few adpositions (as mentioned above) means that these elements must be able to indicate a wide range of meanings. Related to polysemy are light verb constructions, i.e. verbal constructions with a semantically empty head forming a single meaning together with its heavier dependent (cf. Lehmann 2012: 473 and Juvonen 2016: 226). They may serve as a means to expand minimal lexica. Juvonen (2016) analyzes the semantics of constructions with light verbs meaning 'make' and/or 'do' in 30 different pidgin varieties. One of the languages investigated is FT with its light verb *faire* 'make, do'. The FT *faire* has also been described as a verbalizer, i.e. an element by which new verbs can be created. For instance, *faire manière* '(lit.) make manner' can mean several different things depending on what follows it: if followed by a verb, it means 'to try', and if followed by a noun, it means 'to use' (Wilson 1999: 86-87; cited in Skirgård 2013: 15).

Along with polysemy, multifunctionality is also common in pidgins (Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 34). Multifunctionality means using the same word as different parts-of-speech, e.g. using a noun as a verb. In other words, the same item may be used for both reference, predication or modification. In FT, this phenomenon can be exemplified by *content*, being used both as an adjective 'pleased' and a verb 'want', *lourd* meaning either 'heavy' or 'to press' (Avram 2016: 115) as well as *chapelet* 'rosary' being used as a verb 'pray' (FrTir 1682).

2.3 Theoretical perspectives

2.3.1 The study of contact languages

This section situates the present study within the wider field of contact linguistics, and points to a couple of general motivations as to why one should study pidgins. Firstly, let us return to the definition of a pidgin given in the introductory section (p. 1): "[…] a language with reduced grammar and lexicon, created in a situation where people need to communicate with each other, often in a limited number of domains, but lack an existing common language" (cf. e.g. Hall 1966: xii; Holm 2000: 5; Matras 2009: 277-278; Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 20). This definition is basically a fusion of earlier, commonly occuring characterizations. Likewise, Parkvall & Bakker (2013a: 21ff.) attempt – though in a more rigorous manner – to synthesize a definition out of influential earlier accounts. Features such as conventionality (as opposed to spontaneity), usage as a lingua franca, non-nativeness, domain-specificity and stability are deemed essential for a language to qualify as a pidgin in their view. In addition to these social criteria, it is proposed that while pidgins derive their vocabulary and some structural features from existing languages, pidgin lexica and grammars should be significantly reduced compared to the input languages. However, the authors assign primacy to social criteria above linguistic ones. In order to avoid circularity, it is necessary to start with an open mind with respect to the latter.

A central question for contact linguists is what sets contact languages apart from other languages. In a socio-historical sense, they are relatively easy to distinguish: they are the ones which have arisen out of language contact (Matras 2009: 275). Often, only those languages which have emerged suddenly, perhaps over one or two generations, are of interest to the discipline. If one considered much longer stretches of time, the notion of 'contact language' would be watered down. However, contact languages are harder to pinpoint in a linguistic sense. Especially with regard to pidgins, empirical research "[…] is still in its infancy" (Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 33). Thus, we still do not know whether pidgins (or creoles, for that part) constitute a typological class of their own. Stated differently, we need to know more about the relationship between a language's socio-history and its linguistic structure. Given more descriptions of pidgins, we are better suited to approach further questions: for instance, whether (some) creoles have developed out of pidgins (cf. e.g. Baker 2002, DeGraff 2003, McWhorter 2002 and Mufwene 2000), whether pidgins are less complex than other languages (e.g. Robert & Bresnan 2008, Bakker 2009) and how pidgins relate to second language acquisition and learner language (e.g. Goglia 2006, Siegel 2008). From the point of view of linguistic typology, the study of pidgins should be high priority, since every language description is added value.

3. Aims and research questions

By examining the largest corpus available of the language, this study aims to (1) discern hitherto undescribed or strengthen previous claims about grammatical and lexical features of FT, (2) compare these features with its lexifier language and (3) identify changes over time. For considerations of time and space, the analysis is limited to include the form and function of the noun phrase, the diachronic development of a single expression *même chose* and some examples of circumlocution and semantic extension.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What properties of the FT noun phrase can be discerned from the corpus?
2. How do these features relate to corresponding ones in the lexifier language?
3. Are there any grammatical or lexical changes over time?

4. Method

This section has five parts, the first one presenting the corpus in which this study is carried out. The second part describes an approach to data selection, while the third one lays the theoretical groundwork for cross-linguistic comparison. The fourth part describes how the corpus is annotated, and the fifth how the scope of the study has been delimited.

4.1 The corpus

The corpus contains texts from 148 different documents written by 130 authors. The texts have been compiled, standardized, glossed and translated by Mikael Parkvall. Individual utterances are annotated with metadata, stating the source and (where possible) date of production, speaker ethnicity and speaker gender. The sources range from e.g. letters (Dupratz 1864, Diarra 1927) and travel accounts (Barret 1888, Mandat-Grancey 1900) to manuals (Anon 1916) and journal articles (Cantilly 1909, Marie-Victoria 1921). The corpus is divided into strings of text, each of which corresponds to a single utterance, normally attributed to some speaker. In the prescriptive manual, the utterances are said to represent not the speech of individuals, but correct use of the language in general. Primarily, the strings of the corpus contain full clauses (see example a-b below) but sometimes only fragments of a sentence (example c-d) or single words (e-f). In an exceptional case, the source is a letter written wholly in FT (Diarra 1927), but otherwise the original texts are written in another language (most often French), with occasional examples in FT. Parkvall's translations are based both on what may be extracted from the FT examples themselves and on the context in which they occur in the original source. Some of the sources provide their own translations of the FT passages (e.g. Anon 1916), while others give various contextual clues.

(a) (FrTir 1070, 1911)
     Original   *Ça y en a pas cartouche, liét'nant, ça y a mon doigt*
     Stdzd   Ça   yena pas cartouche lieutenant ça   ya   mon   doigt
     Gloss   DEM yena NEG cartridge lieutenant DEM ya   1SG.POSS finger
                'That's no bullet, lieutenant, that's my finger'

(b) (FrTir 1123, 1956)
     Original   *Le Houeto y en a faire couillon.*
     Stdzd   Le   Houeto   yena   faire   couillon
     Gloss   le   voodoo.priest   yena   make/do   coward
                'The priest is doing something bad.'

(c) (FrTir 0622, 1917)
     Original   *Même chose Français*
     Stdzd   Mêmechose   Français
     Gloss   just.like   French
                'Just like Frenchmen 1917'

(d) (FrTir 0134, 1917)
     Original   *ton maison*
     Stdzd   ton   maison
     Gloss   2SG.POSS   house
                'your house'

(e) (FrTir 0810, 1920)
     Original   *femmes*
     Stdzd   femme
     Gloss   woman
                'women'

(f)   (FrTir 0633, 1916)
       Original   *Makou*
       Stdzd   Makou
       Gloss   silence
                   'silence'

Table 1 below illustrates the distribution of authors, publications and words over time, summarized per decade. A "word" is here defined as a string of letters surrounded by spaces. Table 1 shows how the largest amounts of data stem from the 1910's and the 1890's, accounting for 38 % and 23 % respectively of the total amount of data measured in number of words (the same tendency holds for the number of authors and publications).

Table 1. The number of words, authors and publications per decade.

Year	Words	Authors	Publications
1862–1869	176	5	5
1870–1879	217	5	5
1880–1889	678	13	18
1890–1899	2 545	36	44
1900–1909	994	20	22
1910–1919	4 164	44	51
1920–1929	1 068	10	10
1930–1939	652	11	12
1940–1949	496	11	11
1950–1956	32	3	3
Total	11 022	130	148

4.2 The study of dead languages and old texts

When trying to analyze an extinct and lesser-described language, left with only written sources to consult, it is important to be careful in the selection of which texts to use. In the case of FT, most previous studies have relied only on Anon (1916). Presumably, the inclusion of more than 100 additional sources can contribute greatly to our understanding of the language, and potentially also cast doubt on – or at least nuance – the role that Anon (1916) plays in truthfully representing it. However, equipped as we are with the possibility of further completing the picture, it is necessary to determine which parts that really fit in.

Baker & Winer (1999) present a number of ways to assess the reliability of old pidgin and creole texts. Texts may be subjected to certain "checks", both internal (i.e. pertaining to the texts themselves) and external checks (of the author) (1999: 105). Beginning with internal ones, a text can be checked for its consistency with older and newer texts, i.e. whether they exhibit the same features or not. The consistency of the text itself is also important. Here, grammatical features are probably more telling than lexical or phonetic ones. Another internal check is for complexity (1999: 106). A text with all simple forms is more dubious, while one with occasional complex structures is more promising. Given that the above checks have highlighted some suspicious feature(s) of a text, these can sometimes be explained by e.g. inter-speaker variation (1999: 105). However, it is also necessary to perform external checks, i.e. to evaluate the author of text. Two keywords are experience and competence: how long the author has resided in the relevant area (if at all!), and whether they are formally trained and/or have a "good ear" (1999: 105-106). Two other keywords are attitudes and motivation. Baker & Winer (1999: 107) remark that in principle, an author may provide accurate linguistic descriptions independently of their political or ideological attitudes. However, a certain motivation (or purpose) in writing a text may skew its contents in a certain direction. A final but central distinction is that between insiders and outsiders (1999:

103-104, 107). The former are generally better, not least because an insider writing for insiders cannot invent data without risking their credibility, while an outsider writing for outsiders can get away with a lot (1999: 107).

Although care has been taken in compiling the corpus, with respect to the above guidelines, it may happen that there remain several questionable texts. Therefore, the process of assessing the reliability of the sources continues along with further analysis.

4.3 Cross-linguistic comparison

In order to compare the grammatical features of FT with those of other languages, we must first establish their common ground. Which phenomena are actually commensurable across different languages? According to Croft (2016: 380), who may be said to represent a functional-typological perspective, "[…] cross-linguistic comparison is based on function; the grammatical form is the dependent variable in typological analysis". Thus, the independent variable – or the common ground – is a functional concept (usually labeled "comparative concept"). Much of the cross-linguistic comparison carried out since Greenberg's (1963) classic study on linguistic universals has rested on this notion (cf. Haspelmath 2010: 664).

Comparative concepts are designed to be universally applicable, so as to allow comparison across all known languages. As such, they must be defined by other universally applicable concepts: "universal conceptual-semantic concepts, general formal concepts, and other comparative concepts" (Haspelmath 2010: 665). Normally, comparative concepts combine semantic (or rather "functional"; cf. Croft 2016: 378) and formal concepts (Haspelmath 2010: 674). Consider the following comparative concept for 'adjective', given in Haspelmath (2010: 670): "An adjective is a lexeme that denotes a descriptive property and that can be used narrow the reference of a noun.". As noted by Haspelmath, this comparative concept contains two other comparative concepts "lexeme" and "noun", as well as two conceptual-semantic concepts 'property' and 'narrow the reference'.

Haspelmath (2010) distinguishes between comparative concepts and what he calls "descriptive categories". The latter are categories of particular languages, e.g. Adjectives, Verbs or Nouns in English versus their Russian counterparts. Descriptive categories are identified by different criteria in different languages, and are therefore not commensurable in the same way as comparative concepts are. From this, it follows that the definition of adjective given above is not the same thing as any language-specific word class called Adjective (Haspelmath 2010: 670). It may thus be the case that the words captured by the definition in language X are called Verbs in the descriptive tradition of that particular language. However, if one's interest lies in the behavior of 'adjectives', this does not matter.

4.4 Annotation and analysis

In addition to Parkvall's glosses and translations, the corpus has been manually part-of-speech tagged by me. Furthermore, all noun phrases have been marked up in order to show the order of elements therein. In assigning tags to each part-of-speech, attention was paid on the one hand to the existing translations, and on the other hand to my own analysis of the relationships among the words of a sentence. The analysis is based on semantic-functional considerations, with formal (morphosyntactic) properties left aside. For instance, an Adjective in the tagged corpus is a property word used to 'narrow the reference of a noun' (cf. Haspelmath 2010: 670; cited above). While this Adjective happens to fall under the scope of an existing comparative concept 'adjective' – and as such should be treated accordingly, at least in cross-linguistic comparison – other Adjectives are more hard to classify. When used predicatively, for instance, they could as well be argued to represent Verbs. However, to determine exactly the margins of each word class is beyond the scope of the present study. The part-of-speech tags are therefore somewhat preliminary.

During the process of part-of-speech tagging the corpus, where each language example was read one at a time, a number of potentially interesting lexical phenomena were also marked up. These examples seem to deviate from French, and are discussed in section 5.2.

In section 5.2.1, which describes the diachronic development of an expression, the approach is inspired by a technique used by, among others, Baker (1995). The idea is to infer the successive development of contact languages through comparing the amount of time passed from their emergence to the first known attestations of certain features (Baker 1995: 1). It may for example be interesting to look at the reduction versus the extension of elements in relation to the lexifier, i.e. whether – and if so, when – the contact language has "lost" or "gained" any features.

The corpus text file has been processed partly in Microsoft Word/Excel, and partly in the freeware corpus analysis program AntConc (Anthony, 2014). AntConc was used to produce word frequency lists, to read and sort concordances and to search for various expressions with wildcards. For instance, the query "*_DET", entered into the AntConc program, would return a concordance list of all words tagged as a determiner ("_DET" represents the part of speech tag assigned to determiners).

4.5 (De)limitations

As described in section 3, the analysis is limited to the noun phrase, the diachronic development of a single expression and a few examples of lexical phenomena typical of pidgins. While these are conscious delimitations, there are also a number of practical limitations in terms of what we may produce from the corpus material. Firstly, there is in principle no negative evidence (i.e. examples of ungrammatical expressions), so we cannot discern the exact distributional properties of morphemes, words, phrases et cetera. Ideally, a live speaker would help us in determining the margins of the language. However, there is still the possibility to make informed guesses. Negative evidence can to a certain extent be extracted from the corpus. For instance, given a hypothesis that element X is obligatory present in performing function Y, we can locate every instance Z in which function Y is performed – and then see whether X is indeed present in all those instances.

Another objective limitation pertains to the size and nature of the corpus. The corpus is not and cannot possibly be deliberately balanced to represent certain genres, registers, sex or age groups et cetera. There is only the available data, and it is certainly somewhat skewed. It follows from this that the generalizations that we make hold only for the data at hand, and not for some larger population. In deciding whether an element is the "primary" means of doing something, consideration has been taken with respect to relative frequency and distribution over time and sources.

5. Results and analysis

The results section is divided in two main parts. The first part (5.1) describes the form and function of the noun phrase, whereas the second part (5.2) deals with lexical restructuring. Comparisons between FT and French or between FT and its substrate languages are carried out in applicable cases. Section 5.2.1 analyzes the development of the expression *même chose* 'same thing' over time.

5.1 The noun phrase

The following description presents the most frequently occuring types of noun phrases (henceforth NP's) in the corpus. Most NP's consist of a single pronoun, making up more than 40 % of all NP's. Single nouns are the second most common type of NP, representing about 20 % of all NP's, followed by single proper nouns (circa 5 %). The remaining 35 % are NP's consisting of nouns with modifiers of different kinds, of which the most common are covered below. Section 5.1.1 treats the pronouns (personal, demonstrative, negative, total and relative pronouns), section 5.1.2 is devoted to nouns and their cooccurence with articles, determiners and numerals, while as section 5.1.3 describes noun phrases with an embedded prepositional phrase.

5.1.1 Pronouns

5.1.1.1 Personal pronouns

As claimed by Anon (1916: 11) and Wilson (1999: 37), and later confirmed by Skirgård (2013: 41-42) in the larger corpus, there is usually no marking of case or sex on personal pronouns in FT. The personal pronouns normally appear in what in French would be called the disjunctive form (there used for emphasis or contrast), e.g. *moi* '1SG.NOM/ACC/DAT'. In 3rd person singular, *lui* appears to cover both male, female and neuter referents (Skirgård 2013: 42; examples 19, 20) – although there are few examples referring to women in the corpus.

5.1.1.2 Demonstrative pronouns

When it comes to demonstrative pronouns, *ça* 'this, that' is clearly the dominant form, being used for proximal and distal singular referents. This is illustrated in examples 1 and 2 below.

(1)   (FrTir 0967, 1873)

Original	*Ça c'est case à gorille*				
Stdzd	Ça	cest	case	à	gorille
Gloss	DEM.DIST	COP	house	PREP	gorilla

          '**That**'s a gorilla nest'

(2)   (FrTir 0924, 1888)

Original	*Ça y en a petit Binger*			
Stdzd	Ça	yena	petit	Binger
Gloss	DEM.PROX	yena	small	Binger

          'This is Binger's child'

There are 8 instances of *ça* with a plural meaning, i.e. 'these, those' (example 3 and 4), as well as 8 cases of *ça* meaning 'they' (example 5 and 6).

(3)   (FrTir 0973, 1921)

Original	*Ça bon bertelles* [sic]		
Stdzd	Ça	bon	bretelle
Gloss	DEM.PL.PROX	good	braces

          'These are nice braces'

(4) (FrTir 1201, 1911)
Original *Ça y a fusils, mon lieutenant; nous y a tué beaucoup Sofas*
Stdzd   Ça   ya   fusil mon   lieutenant nous ya   tuer beaucoup Sofa
Gloss   DEM.PL.DIST ya   rifle 1SG.POSS lieutenant 1PL ya   kill much   Sofa
         'Those are rifles, lieutenant, we have killed lots of Sofas'

(5) (FrTir 0933, 1903)
Original *Ça y a pas civilisation*
Stdzd   Ça   ya   pas civilisation
Gloss   3PL ya   NEG civilisation
         'They don't have any civilisation'

(6) (FrTir 0942, 1927)
Original *Ça y a citouin français, ça y a comme boulan*
Stdzd   Ça   ya   citoyen français ça   ya   comme blanc
Gloss   3PL ya   citizen French   DEM ya   like/as white
         'They are French citizens, they are like whites'

However, it is not always clear, when interpreting a written source, whether a pronoun is 'demonstrative' or 'personal'. Thus, these 16 special cases are somewhat ambiguous between the two meanings 'these, those' and 'they'. In any case, these uses of *ça* deviate from the lexifier: *ça* cannot mean 'they' in French, and 'these, those' are expressed by inflected forms of *celui* and *celle* (e.g. *ceux-ci* 'DEM.PL.MASC-PROX', *celles-là* 'DEM.PL.FEM-DIST').

Ça is also employed as a demonstrative determiner (example 7 and 8), more often so than the sparsely occuring *ce(t)/cette* 'DET.MASC/DET.FEM' which would fill this function in the lexifier.

(7) (FrTir 0950, 1896)
Original *Ça sale sauvage Mabiala, lui n'a plus tuer blancs*
Stdzd   Ça   sale sauvage Mabiala lui n'a   plus   tuer blanc
Gloss   DET dirty savage Mabiala 3SG n'a   no.longer kill white
         'That dirty savage Mabiala is not going to kill any more whites.'

(8) (FrTir 0264, 1916)
Original *Si capitaine yena avec première section, toi donner lui **ça** papier*
Stdzd   Si capitaine yena avec first   section toi donner lui ça   papier
Gloss   if captain   yena with first   platoon 2SG give   3SG DEM paper
         'If the captain is with the first platoon, you give him this paper'

5.1.1.3 Negative pronouns

There are two negative pronouns, *rien* 'nothing' and *personne* 'nobody'. Their use does not seem to differ from that in French, as noted by Skirgård (2013: 37-38).

5.1.1.4 Total pronouns

The total pronouns *tout* 'everything, all', *tous* 'all' and *tout le monde* 'everyone' also appear to function like their French counterparts, with but one exception where *tous* means 'everybody' (example 9).

(9) (FrTir 0122, 1917)
Original ***Tous, ici, y a trop gentils pour Sénégalais***
Stdzd   Tout ici   ya   trop   gentil pour Sénégalais
Gloss   all here ya   much/too   kind   for Senegalese
         'Everybody here is so nice to the Senegalese'

5.1.1.5 Relative pronouns and relativization

Finally, two relative pronouns *qui* 'that, who/which', *que* 'that, whom/which' are attested in the corpus. Their use corresponds to French in that *qui* refers to the subject in the subordinate clause (example 10), while *que* refers to the direct object (example 11). However, it is possible that this distinction was neutralized in spoken language.

(10) (FrTir 0909, 1935)
  Original   *Ça, Lhote, c'est Allah **qui** a faire ça, parce que toi y a faire manger cochon à moi*
  Stdzd   Ça   Lhote   cest   Allah   qui   a   faire   ça   parceque   toi   ya
  Gloss   DEM   Lhote   COP   God   REL   a   do/make   dem   because   2SG   ya
             faire   manger   cochon   à   moi
             do/make   eat   pig   à   1SG
             'This, Lhote, is God's work, because you made me eat pork'

(11) (FrTir 0116, 1892)
  Original   *Tout ce **que** noir fait y a bon pour blanc.*
  Stdzd   Tout   ce   que   noir   faire   ya   bon   pour   blanc
  Gloss   all   DEM   REL   black   do/make   ya   good   for   white
             'Anything the blacks do is good for the whites'

Note, however, that there are several examples of relativization without overt marking, or with other strategies than *qui*/*que*. Example 12 shows zero marking, 13 shows marking with *yena* (previously noted by e.g. Wilson 1999: 89), and 14 with *ça*.

(12) (FrTir 0494, 1896)
  Original   *Moi, mon capitaine, fait le caporal des tirailleurs [ø] amenés avec nous*
  Stdzd   Moi   mon   capitaine   faire   le caporal   des   tirailleur   amenér
  Gloss   1SG   1SG.POSS   captain   do/make   le corporal des   tirailleur   bring
             avec   nous
             with   1PL
             '?I, captain, am the corporal of the tirailleurs [ø] you brought here'

(13) (FrTir 0309, 1916)
  Original   *Quand sentinelle ya crié "Halte-là", si homme **yena** passé ya arrêté, sentinelle ya appelé chef de poste*
  Stdzd   Quand   sentinelle   ya   crier   Halte-là   si homme   yena   passer   ya   arrêter
  Gloss   when   guard   ya   shout   stop-there if man   REL   pass   ya   stop
             sentinelle   ya   appeler   chef   de   poste
             guard   ya   call   chief de   post
             'After having shouted "Halte-là", if the approaching person [lit. 'man REL passing'] still not stops, the guard calls for his superordinate'

(14) (FrTir 0691, 1916)
  Original   *Lui ya besoin faire tout **ça** son chef yena dire, tout ça son chef yena commandé*
  Stdzd   Lui   ya besoin   faire   tout   ça   son   chef   yena   dire   tout   ça
  Gloss   3sg   ya need   do/make   all   REL   3SG.POSS   chief yena   say   all   DEM
             son   chef   yena   commander
             3SG.POSS   chief   yena   command
             'He must do exactly what his superordinate orders [lit. '[…] everything REL his superordinate says']'

5.1.2 Nouns

5.1.2.1 Articles

Articles are either non-existent or optional, with most speakers opting not to use them. Firstly, there are many instances where an article would be expected from the point of view of the lexifier, but where it does not appear (example 15, 16 and 17).

(15) (FrTir 0167, 1944: Indefinite article)
  Original   *Toi [ø] soldat, moi [ø] soldat*
  Stdzd   Toi   soldat   moi   soldat
  Gloss   2SG   soldier   1SG   soldier
             'You are **a** soldier, I am **a** soldier'

13

(16) (FrTir 0963, 1885: Definite article)
      Original   Ça [ø] gri-gri France
      Stdzd   Ça   grigri   France
      Gloss   DEM   talisman/charm   France
                  'That is **the** talisman of France [i.e. *le drapeau tricolore*]'

(17) (FrTir 0018, 1868: Partitive article)
      Original   *Y qu'à gagner tout plein* [ø] *mulot tiackbo*
      Stdzd   kV   gagner   tout plein mulâtre Tiagba
      Gloss   kV   have/get   all   full mulatto Tiagba
                  'Tiagba is full of mulattoes'

Secondly, in a few cases, the (etymological) article appears to be conventionally attached to the noun, forming a single morpheme. Anon (1916: 7) provides the example *mon latête* 'my head', where the "definite article" seems to be part of a single lexeme *latête* 'head'. This phenomenon occurs not only in Anon (1916), but also in earlier and later publications: *mon lapoule* (FrTir 0730, 1899), *ton lécole* (FrTir 0657, 1917), *cette laguerre* (FrTir 0852, 1917) and *ton latête* (FrTir 0366, 1944). Given the examples of zero articles above (15-17), together with the just-mentioned suggestive examples of articles following determiners, it seems that articles are either (1) optional or (2) non-existent, save for a few special cases.

Article agglutination is particularly common in French-based creoles, as opposed to other contact languages (see e.g. Ladhams 2007: 1). Given that FT lacks both indefinite and definite articles (which we have reason to assume), it belongs to the least common type in a sample of 76 contact languages (Haspelmath and the APiCS consortium 2013). However, in a sample of 620 (mostly non-contact) languages (Dryer 2013a), those with neither indefinite nor definite articles constitute the second most common type.

5.1.2.2 Determiners

As illustrated above (example 7-8, section 5.1.1.2), *ça* is the principal demonstrative determiner. There are two other prominent types of determiners, namely possessive (pronouns) and quantity determiners. The fourth attested type (interrogative *quel* 'which') has only 1 occurrence.

Among the possessive pronouns, each serves to express attributive possession together with the possessum (see Skirgård 2013: 43-44 for further details). However, *mon/ma* '1SG.POSS' is more often part of a vocative expression in line with *my dear* than it is used to indicate possession (example 18 and 19).

(18) (FrTir 0176, 1875)
      Original   *Toi n'a pas dire ça, **mon blanc***!
      Stdzd   Toi   napas   dire ça   mon   blanc
      Gloss   2SG   NEG   say   DEM 1SG.POSS   white
                  'Don't say that, white man'

(19) (FrTir 1111, 1908)
      Original   ***Mon lieutenant****, toi pas blessé, tout y a bon*
      Stdzd   Mon   lieutenant toi   pas   blesser tout ya   bon
      Gloss   1SG.POSS   sergeant   2SG NEG wound   all   ya   good
                  'Sergeant, you are not wounded, ?so everything's fine'

As for *mon*, it used in a vocative phrase 37 out of 72 times, while for *ma*, 8 out of 11 occurrences are vocative. Apart from distinguishing two uses of a possessive pronoun, this finding may tell us something about the prevailing speech registers or genres of the corpus. These address forms seem quite formal in nature, and their relatively frequent use might stem from the fact that many of the examples in the corpus were uttered in a military context.

The primary quantity determiners are *beaucoup* 'a lot of, many' (example 20 and 21) and *tout* 'all' (22 and 23). In contrast to French, *beaucoup* does not have to be followed by the preposition *de*, as in *Elle a beaucoup de courage/joyaux* 'She has a lot of courage/jewels' (Batchelor & Chebli-Saadi 2011: 530).

Only 4 out 41 instances of *beaucoup* come with *de*. The use of *tout* as a determiner does not appear to deviate from that in the lexifier.

(20) (FrTir 0311, 1888)
Original   *Quand noir il y en a mangé **beaucoup miel** […]*
Stdzd   Quand noir   yena manger beaucoup miel
Gloss   when   black   yena eat   much   honey
           'When blacks eat a lot of honey'

(21) (FrTir 1201, 1911)
Original   *Ça y a fusils, mon lieutenant; nous y a tué **beaucoup Sofas***
Stdzd   Ça   ya   fusil mon   lieutenant nous ya   tuer beaucoup Sofa
Gloss   DEM ya   rifle 1SG.POSS lieutenant 1PL ya   kill much   Sofa
           'Those are rifles, lieutenant, we have killed lots of Sofas'

(22) (FrTir1694, 1911)
Original   *Y en a voir **tout ça**?*
Stdzd   Yena   voir tout ça
Gloss   yena   see   all   DEM
           'You see all this?'

(23) (FrTir 0497, 1917)
Original   *Moi, avant retourner, y a moyen connaître manière pour faire **tous les fromages**, même chose en France*
Stdzd   Moi   avant   retourner   ya   moyen connaître manière   pour faire
Gloss   1SG before return   ya   be.able know   manner   for do/make
           tout   les   fromage   mêmechose   en   France
           all   les   cheese   just.like   en   France
           'Before returning, I can [=will?] learn how to make all sorts of cheese, just like in France'

As mentioned in section 2.2.1, Avram (2016: 116) states that there are two demonstrative determiners in FT: preposed *ça* and postposed *yena là*. As it turns out, the expression *y en a là* used as a demonstrative determiner only occurs in Anon (1916: 9): "*Ce*, *ces*, *cette* 'that, these, this' etc are to be consistently translated by *ça* or *y en a là*. E.g. *Ce tirailleur* 'this soldier': *ça tirailleur* 'this soldier' or *tirailleur y en a là* 'soldier who is there'." (English translation by Wilson 1999: 34). As Avram (2016) does not provide any example of its usage, we cannot be sure if his claim rests on any additional evidence. In comparing Avram's sources to those in Parkvall's corpus, it appears that he has included one more publication, namely one written by an anonymous author in 1918 (Anon 1918). Any evidence for *y en a là* used as a demonstrative determiner – in addition to the statement found in Anon (1916) – must thus be located either in Anon (1918), or in parts of the remaining publications shared by Parkvall and Avram that are somehow missing in Parkvall's corpus. While we cannot contradict Anon's (1916: 9) claim that *y en a là* was used as a demonstrative determiner, our data suggests that *ça* was more widespread in its use.

5.1.2.3 The order of adjectives and nouns

In FT, the order of adjectives and nouns adhers to the French norm: all adjectives except for a few chosen ones follow the noun. The adjectives that precede the noun are of two types, i.e. those that are very frequent and belong to certain semantic domains (e.g. *grand*, *bon*, *beau*, *même*, *première* etc.), or those that have different meanings depending on their placement (e.g. *sale* and *pauvre*). See examples 24-25 below.

(24) (FrTir 1093, 1918)
Original   *Oui, mais quand y a mort, y a gagné **grand repos***
Stdzd   Oui mais quand ya   mort ya   gagner   grand   repos
Gloss   yes   but   when   ya   dead ya   have/get   big   rest
           'Yes, but when I'm dead, I'll get a really good rest'

(25) (FrTir 1206, 1888)
Original   *Dieu bon pour otangani (blanc), pas pour **pauvre onombè** (noir)*
Stdzd   Dieu bon pour otangani   pas pour   pauvre onombè
Gloss   god   good for   white.person NEG for   poor   black.person
            'God is good for the whites, but not for the poor blacks'

There are a few notable cases where the French order is violated – although they are sparse enough to speak in favor of the hypothesis that the French customs prevail. Two possible examples stem from children in Gorée (26 and 27), and one from Cousturier (1920: 152), shown in example 28 below.

(26) (FrTir 0663, 1879)
Original   ***Madame belle**, jette cinquante centimes*
Stdzd   Madame   belle jette cinquante centime
Gloss   madam   belle jette fifty   penny
            'Beautiful lady [OR: you are beautiful], throw me 50 centimes!'

(27) (FrTir 0662, 1879)
Original   ***Madame jolie**, jette sous à moi*
Stdzd   Madame   joli jette sou   à   moi
Gloss   madam   nice jette penny à   1SG
            'Nice lady [OR: you are nice], throw me a penny!'

As indicated in Parkvall's translation, there are at least two possible interpretations of *belle* and *joli* in the examples above. They could be post-posed adjectives, which may represent an idiosyncratic feature among these children or how FT was actually spoken among larger groups of people. Alternatively, *belle* and *jolie* are predicative rather than attributive adjectives, and as such not relevant for the question of the order of adjectives and nouns.

(28) (FrTir 0107, 1917)
Original   *trois **verres petits**, **petits**, **petits***[4]
Stdzd   Trois   verre petit petit   petit
Gloss   three   glass small small   small
            'three very small glasses'

In example 28 above, the adjective *petit* is postposed to the noun *verres*. Again, as in example 26 and 27, one interpretation could be that *petit* functions predicatively rather than attributively. Another possibility could be that the deviant order stems from pragmatic motivations – perhaps *petit* is postposed for emphatic purposes.

5.1.2.4 The order of numerals and nouns

Numerals precede the noun in every source except Anon (1916), where numerals are postposed. Even in Anon, numerals are placed in front of the noun in two out of nine occurences in total (example 29 and 30; cf. Wilson 1999: 82-83).

(29) (FrTir 0330, 1916)
Original   *Puyer **deux mains** laterre, l'arme-à-plat*
Stdzd   Appuyer   deux   main   laterre
Gloss   support   two   hand   ground
            'Support yourself by two hands on the ground'

---

[4] This is one of the FT examples which constitutes only a fragment of a sentence (cf. section 4.1 and examples c-d). Example 33 however, which is presented on the following page, is an abbreviated version of the original example, a full sentence.

(30) (FrTir 0327, 1916)

Original   *Quand chef ya commandé "Feu de trois cartouches", tirailleur ya besoin tirer **trois cartouches***

Stdzd   Quand chef ya commander feu de trois cartouche tirailleur ya besoin

Gloss   when chief ya command fire PREP three bullet tirailleur ya need

tirer   trois   cartouche

shoot   three   cartridge

'When the firing of three bullets is ordered, three bullets should be fired'

As Skirgård (2013: 60) points out, postposed numerals are found in Bambara and most other West African languages as plotted on Dryer's (2013b) map. Wolof is a notable exception in placing the numeral first. However, as French also exhibits this order, it is difficult to claim that there would be a question of substrate influence. Examples 31 and 32 below illustrate preposed numerals – which appears to be the dominant pattern in FT – whereas example 33 and 34 exemplify postposed ones.

(31) (FrTir 1654, 1891)

Original   *Lieutenant y a gagner **trois balles**, Bandiougou y a gagner **trois balles***

Stdzd   Lieutenant ya gagner trois balle Bandiougou ya gagner

Gloss   lieutenant ya have/get three bullet Bandiougou ya have/get

trois   balle

three   bullet

'If you get shot by three bullets, so will I'

(32) (FrTir 0095, 1940)

Original   ***ven ã tèrmine, twa ãkor nganze***

Stdzd   vingt an terminer toi encore engager

Gloss   twenty year finish 2SG still/again enlist

'Then reenlist for another twenty years'

(33) (FrTir 0227, 1916)

Original   […] *travailler avec son **lamain deux**.*

Stdzd   travailler avec son lamain deux

Gloss   work with 3SG.POSS hand two

'work with his both hands'

(34) (FrTir 0912, 1916)

Original   *Çà yena **moutons trois***

Stdzd   Ça yena mouton trois

Gloss   DEM yena sheep three

'There are three sheep'

5.1.3 Prepositions

It is relatively common for a noun phrase to consist of a noun followed by a modifying prepositional phrase. Such noun phrases generally have the structure [NP N [PP PREP PRON]] or [NP N [PP PREP N]], e.g. *sucre pour moi* 'my sugar' or *fils de chef* 'the chief's son'. The most common function fulfilled by noun phrases of this type is attributive possession (see Skirgård 2013: 43ff. for a more detailed account of possession in FT). Other functions are marginally attested, such as 'of' in *tigre d'eau* 'serval of the waters' and what appears to be emphasis or comparison in *pirogues comme ça* 'canoes like that'.

It should be noted that in the expression of attributive possession with a pronominal possessor (e.g. *my sugar*), it is more common to use a possessive pronoun than a prepositional construction such as the above-mentioned *sucre pour moi* (as noted by Skirgård 2013: 44, table 17). When it comes to attributive possession with nominal possessor (e.g. *Noam's sugar*), a prepositional construction with *de* and juxtaposition (e.g. *petit Binger* 'Binger's child') occur the same number of times (ibid.).

5.2 Lexicon

5.2.1 *Même chose*: from 'same thing' to 'just.like'

In French, there is a construction used to express the (near-)equivalence of two entities X and Y: "X *est la même chose que* Y" 'X is the same thing as Y'. The first attestation of *même chose* 'same thing' in FT occurs in what appears to be a counterpart to the above construction, uttered by a Frenchman in the 1870's (example 35 below).

(35) (FrTir 0166, 1875)
    Original   *Toi tout à fait même chose comme singe!*
    Stdzd   Toi toutàfait   même   chose   comme singe
    Gloss   2SG completely same   thing   like/as monkey!
              'You are just like a monkey (lit. 'same thing like/as monkey')'

While Frenchmen obviously did speak FT, we cannot exclude the possibility that this example basically represents a calque of the French construction, drawn from this individual's French repertoire, but not available to other, non-French speakers. However, if we restrict ourselves only to *même chose*, there are 46 other instances of this collocation to indicate that these two words did indeed form part of FT. Some of these instances appear to follow a pattern similar to the French construction: *Allah même chose pour blanc et pour noir* 'God is the same (thing) for both blacks and whites' (FrTir 1055; Bambara speaker, 1890's); *Femme Coniaguiés y a même chose golo* 'Konyagi women are like monkeys' (FrTir 0812; mixed Fulbe/Bambara speaker, 1890's). But in the late 1890's, other examples start to appear – and in these, *même chose* seems to have taken on a different function. This is illustrated in examples 36 and 37 below, where *même chose* is more plausibly translated as 'just.like', rather than 'same thing'.

(36) (FrTir 0411, 1898)
    Original   *Nous suivre horaire, même chose Europe!*
    Stdzd   Nous   suivre horaire   mêmechose   Europe
    Gloss   1PL   follow   schedule just.like   Europe
              'We'll keep the schedule, just as in Europe!'

(37) (FrTir 1036, 1899)
    Original   *Anglais parler même chose Noirs*
    Stdzd   Anglais   parler   mêmechose   Noir
    Gloss   English   speak   just.like   black
              'The English speak like Black people'

This other function of *même chose* – which seems to be an extension compared to its use in French – keeps appearing in later sources. Example 38 is from 1917, while example 39 stems from 1935.

(38) (FrTir 0168, 1917)
    Original   *Toi sale même chose animaux*
    Stdzd   Toi sale mêmechose   animaux
    Gloss   2SG dirty just.like   animal
              'You're dirty like a pig'

(39) (FrTir 0031, 1935)
    Original   *Y en a faire cabinet même chose aman*
    Stdzd   Yena faire   cabinet mêmechose   aman
    Gloss   yena do/make toilet just.like   water
              'I got a diarrhoea [lit. 'I shat like water']'

The change in function of *même chose* could perhaps be stated as a transition from acting like a predicate nominal (i.e. *X is the same thing*), to introducing an adverbial clause which indicates the manner of the main clause predicate (i.e. *X verbs just like Y*).

In addition to the development over time as proposed above, *même chose* can play a slightly different role: when preceded by *faire* 'do/make', it appears to form part of a verbal expression together with the

light verb. Wilson (1999: 87) describes *faire mêmechose* as "a periphrastic means of circumventing gaps in vocabulary". Consider the following example, which is the same passage from Anon (1916) that Wilson analyzed:

(40) (FrTir 0683, 1916)

Original	*Lui ya pas **faire même chose ya froid**, **même chose ya peur**, lui ya visé tranquille, ya visé juste*								
Stdzd	Lui	ya	pas	faire	mêmechose	ya	froid	mêmechose	ya	peur
Gloss	3SG	ya	NEG	do/make	just.like	ya	cold	just.like	ya	fear
	lui	ya	viser	tranquil	ya	viser	juste			
	3SG	ya	aim	calm	ya	aim	just			
	'He does not shiver or shake, but aims correctly'									

The apparent lexical gap in FT where English has 'shiver' and 'shake' is here circumlocuted through an expression which literally means 'do same thing like cold/afraid'. A similar example was produced in Guinea in 1914: *lui faire même chose grand commandant* (FrTir 1638), which is rendered as 'he acted like a bigshot' in Parkvall's translation.

In the following section, more examples pertaining to the lexicon are presented.

5.2.2 Circumlocution and semantic extension

In example 40 above, it was illustrated how a lack of dedicated expressions for certain concepts can be overcome through circumlocution. Below, two additional examples of the same phenomenon are presented, followed by an example of semantic extension. In (41), a Senegalese asserts that 'it is not raining' by literally saying that it is not 'falling water':

(41) (FrTir 0440, 1917)

Original	*Non, commandant, y en a pas **tomber eau***					
Stdzd	Non	commandant	yena	pas	tomber	eau
Gloss	no	boss	yena	NEG	fall	eau
	'No, major, it's not raining'					

In French, the same meaning would most often be conveyed through the verb *pleuvoir* 'to rain': *il ne pleut pas* 'it is not raining'. There is but one other example relating to 'rain' in the corpus, and it involves the word *pluie*, which in French is a noun meaning 'rain': *yena pluie* 'it is raining' (FrTir 1090). It should be noted that, as the reader may have realized, it is perfectly normal in French as well as English to describe 'rain' as something which 'falls'. For instance, one could say in French that *la pluie est tombée* 'the rain fell'. However, the point of example 41 above is to demonstrate that the absence of a word like the French verb *pleuvoir* 'to rain' seems to have been circumlocuted with a more analytic expression *tomber eau* 'fall water' – an expression which in itself substitutes the word *pluie* 'rain' (which would be the Francophone's first choice) with *eau* 'water'. In this sense, example 41 suggests that FT had a small lexicon, but that the lack of dedicated words for certain concepts was overcome by means of circumlocution.

Example (42), presented below, illustrates a means of expressing that 'I have got a headache'. The French counterpart is given in (43).

(42) (FrTir 1703, 1931)

Original	*Moi, y a la tête y a **pas bon***					
Stdzd	Moi	ya	latête	ya	pas	bon
Gloss	1SG	ya	head	ya	NEG	good
	'I've got a headache'					

(43) (French, own example)

J'ai	*du*	***mal***	*à*	*la*	*tête*
1SG-have	PART	ache	PREP	DEF	head
'I've got a headache'					

As it is not entirely clear what *ya* means (cf. Skirgård 2013: 51ff.), it is difficult to give a literal translation of (42). However, it is quite clear that the role *mal* 'ache' plays in the French construction is taken over by *pas bon* 'not good' in the FT example. This may be interpreted as a strategy of circumventing a small lexicon – a lexicon in which less frequently evoked concepts such as 'ache' never lexicalize, since they can be circumlocuted via words for more frequent and general notions such as 'not' and 'good'. A cursory investigation of corresponding expressions in Wolof, Bambara and Mòoré suggests that these languages behave more like French and English than FT, i.e. that they have dedicated terms similar to 'ache', rather than an analytic expression 'not good'. Due to the cursory nature of this comparison, we may not entirely rule out substratal influence in this case, but from the preliminary evidence it does seem to be an invention on the part of FT.

Example 44 below is of a different nature. Here, it is not circumlocution which is at play, but rather a form of semantic extension of a word derived from the lexifier.

(44) (FrTir 0893, 1885)
      Original   *Capitaine, moi qu'a **teni mal** ici, là*
      Stdzd   Capitaine moi kV   tenir mal ici   là
      Gloss   captain,   1SG KV hold pain here there
                'Captain, it hurts here'

The speaker in 44 literally states that they 'hold pain'. In French, the same idea would be expressed with the verb *avoir* 'to have', i.e. literally 'have pain' (the same strategy holds for e.g. Swedish: *ha ont*). Interestingly, there is a French expression *se tenir mal* which means 'to misbehave; to act up' – although this is obviously not the intended meaning of example 44. It may rather be seen as an extension of the possible usages of *tenir* 'hold' in comparison to the lexifier. I have not been able to determine wherefrom the use of *tenir* in this sense originates, although it may come from substrate influence or linguistic universals.

6. Discussion

In this section, some further remarks on certain features analyzed in section 5 are presented, along with suggestions for future studies on FT.

Firstly, in relation to the examples of circumlocution (40-42; section 5.2), it remains to establish whether these expressions were widespread or merely represent singular, idiosyncratic utterances. Parkvall & Bakker (2013a: 34) note that in pidgins at large, there are examples of both improvised and conventionalized circumlocutions. Furthermore, it would be interesting to know from where the compensatory strategies originate, i.e. which are the factors that influence innovations of this sort? It should also be noted that FT – as well as other pidgins (Parkvall & Bakker 2013a: 35) – was probably specialized in certain semantic fields. Presumably, FT had relatively many terms relating to war and the like.

In section 5.1.2.3, it was claimed that FT has adopted the French habit of placing certain adjectives before, and others after the noun. Taken into consideration, this is quite peculiar. Why was this seemingly unnecessary complex system retained, while so many other features of the lexifier were dropped? It appears to be counter-intuitive, given that simplification is a central characteristic of pidgin languages. There are at least two possible explanations as to why FT retained this system. On the one hand, it could be that because many of the fronted adjectives are the most commonly used (e.g. *grand*, *bon*), it is perhaps not very demanding to keep picking them out. On the other hand, it might be that the source material is misleading – perhaps many of our examples were unconsciously edited in the mind of a francophone observer before being written down on paper. This issue cannot be resolved without more data and further comparison with other languages (e.g. with the corresponding case in several French-lexified creoles).

Concerning the question of data reliability (cf. section 4.2), there is still a lot of work to do in systematically comparing the different sources. For instance, do they all represent the same language? Are there dialects or other types of varieties? Can we discern any change over time? The anonymous manual (Anon 1916) is perhaps particularly worth of scrutiny. At the Eleventh Creolistics Workshop, which was held at Justus-Liebig-University Gieβen in March 2017, Rachel Selbach (University of Amsterdam) made an illustrative point regarding the possible impact of individual sources on our view of historical languages. In the case of Lingua Franca, Selbach pointed to the special status of Molière's *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* (1670). Molières well-known play contains a passage in Lingua Franca, which apparently influenced the structure of subsequent renditions of the language. Perhaps we have the mirror image of Molières play in Anon (1916); there is the possibility that our widespread manual's description of FT changed the way in which others described it later. We must also reflect on the nature of this change. It may be that sources like these reflect a "real" change, in the sense that they described how people really spoke (or even influenced the way they spoke), or alternatively, that the "change" only took place in written works plagiarizing a fallacious one.

The scope of the present study was, for considerations of time and space, limited to a description of the form and function of the noun phrase and to certain lexical features. However, there are many areas left to explore. In trying to understand the verb phrase, for example, one would need to grasp the role of the elusive, multifunctional elements *ya* and *yena* (cf. Skirgård 2013: 51 ff.). Other largely uncharted territories include e.g. nominal and verbal morphology, tense-aspect-modality or properties of the lexicon. In the following section, the findings of this study are summarized.

7. Conclusions

Based on the present study, we can conclude the following about the structure of FT:

- The principal demonstrative pronoun is *ça*, which is used for both proximal and distal singular referents. Possibly, *ça* also covers plural referents and/or indicates 3PL (section 5.1.1.2).

- There are three total pronouns *tout*, *tous* and *tout le monde* whose use does not appear differ from that in French (section 5.1.1.4).

- There are two (or one) relative pronoun(s) *qui* and *que* (section 5.1.1.5). They refer, as in French, to the subject and the object of the subordinate clause respectively. Possibly, the distinction between *qui/que* was only upheld in writing, being neutralized in oral production. Relative clauses may also be introduced by e.g. ø, *yena* or *ça* (although no exhaustive analysis of relativization has been performed).

- Articles are either non-existent or optional, with most speakers opting not to use them. Occasionally, articles are agglutinated with the noun, forming a single morpheme with it (section 5.1.2.1).

- The dominant demonstrative determiner is *ça*, which has replaced the French items *ce(t)/cette* (section 5.1.1.2).

- The possessive pronoun *mon* can be used to introduce a vocative phrase, consisting of the pronoun and an address term, e.g. *mon lieutenant* (section 5.1.2.2).

- There are two primary quantity determiners *beaucoup* and *tout*. In contrast to French, *beaucoup* may precede the noun without an intervening preposition *de* (section 5.1.2.2).

- The order of adjectives and nouns follows the French pattern in that certain adjectives are placed in front, while others are postposed to the noun (section 5.1.2.3).

- Numerals precede the noun, like in French, in all sources except Anon (1916) (section 5.1.2.4).

- The expression *même chose* 'same thing' changed in meaning to 'just.like' and can, used in this sense, introduce an adverbial clause which indicates the manner of the main clause predicate (section 5.2.1).

- There are examples where an apparent lack of dedicated expressions for certain concepts are overcome by means of circumlocution, e.g. by saying *it is falling water* instead of *it is raining* (section 5.2.2).

Although it has been demonstrated that FT differs from its lexifier with regard to several features, it remains to establish whether these traits are due to substrate influence, linguistic universals or some other factors. There are still more areas to explore in the grammar of FT, for instance the range of functions of the multifunctional items *ya* and *yena* (cf. section 6). Our understanding of FT and of pidgins in general would benefit from more data and more cross-linguistic comparative studies.

References

Aboh, E. (2015). *The Emergence of Hybrid Grammars: Language Contact and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anon (1916). *Le français tel que le parlent nos tirailleurs Sénégalais*. Paris: Imprimerie Militaire Universelle L. Fournier.

Anon (1918). *Méthode d'enseignement du français tel que le parlent les sénégalais*. Paris: Imprimerie Militaire Universelle.

Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc* (Version 3.4.4) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from http://www.laurenceanthony.net/

Avram, A. (2016). Kolonial-Deutsch and Français Tirailleur. In Schmidt-Brücken, D., Schuster, S. & Wienberg, M (Eds.) Aspects of (Post)Colonial Linguistics. Current Perspectives and New Approaches (pp. 101-130). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Baker, P. (1995). Some Developmental Inferences from Historial Studies of Pidgins and Creoles. In Arends, J. *Early Stages of Creolization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Baker, P. & Winer, L. (1999). Separating the wheat from the chaff: How far can we rely on old Pidgin and Creole texts? In Baker, P. & Bruyn, A. (Eds.) *St Kitts and the Atlantic Creoles. The texts of Samuel Augustus Mathews in Perspective* (pp. 103-122). London: University of Westminster Press.

Baker, P. (2002). No creolisation without prior pidginisation. *Te Reo: Journal of the Linguistic Society of New Zealand*, 44, 31-50.

Bakker, P. (1995). Pidgins. In: Arends, J. Muysken, P. and Smith, N (Eds.) *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction* (pp. 25-39). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bakker, P. (2003). The absence of reduplication in pidgins. In: Kouwenberg, S. (Ed.) *Twice as meaningful: Reduplication in pidgins, creoles and other contact languages* (pp. 37-46). Westminster Creolistics Series 8. London: Battlebridge.

Bakker, P. (2009). Phonological complexity in pidgins. Paper based on the Seventh Creolistics Workshop held at the University of Giessen in Giessen, Germany, 6-8 April 2006. In Faraclas, N. & Klein, T. (Eds.) *Simplicity and complexity in creoles and pidgins* (pp. 7-27). Westminster Creolistics Series 10. London: Battlebridge.

Baratier, A. (1912). *Épopées Africaines*. Paris: Arthème Fayarde.

Barret, P. (1888). *L'Afrique occidentale: la nature et l'homme noir*, volume 2. Paris: Challamel.

Batchelor, R. E. & Chebli-Saadi, M. (2011). *A Reference Grammar of French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biondi, J-P. (1987). *Saint-Louis du Sénégal: mémoires d'un métissage*. Paris: Denoël.

Cantilly, L. de. (1909). En pleine brousse Malgache. *Revue du Madagascar*, 11(1), 243–249.

Chaudenson, R. 2003. *La créolisation: théorie, applications, implications*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Corne, C. 1999. *From French to Creole. The development of new vernaculars in the French colonial world*. London: University of Westminster Press.

Cousturier, L. (1920). *Des inconnus chez moi*. Paris: Éditions de la Sirène.

Croft, W. (2016). Comparative concepts and language-specific categories: Theory and practice. *Linguistic Typology*, 20(2), 377-393.

DeGraff, M. (2003). Against Creole Exceptionalism. *Language*, 79(2), 391-410.

Delafosse, M. (1904). *Vocabulaires comparatifs de plus de 60 langues ou dialectes parlés à la Côte d'Ivoire et dans les régions limitrophes aves des notes linguistiques et ethnologiques, une bibliographie et une carte*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Diarra, B. (1927). Réponse d'un ancien tirailleur sénégalais à M. Paul Boncour sur sa loi militaire. *La Race Nègre*, 1.

Dryer, M. S. (2013a). Definite Articles. In Dryer, M. S. & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available from http://wals.info/chapter/37, Accessed on 2017-05-22.

Dryer, M. S. (2013b). Order of Numeral and Noun. In Dryer, M. S. & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available from http://wals.info/chapter/89, Accessed on 2017-05-22.

Dupratz [no first name] (1864). Lettre du P. Dupratz. *Annales de l'Oeuvre pontificale de la Sainte-Enfance*, 6, 393-401. Paris: Bureau central de la Ste.-Enfance.

Echenberg, M. (1990). Race, Ethnicity, and Social Class in the French Colonial Army: The Black African Tirailleurs, 1857-1958. In Dreisziger, N. F. (Ed.) *Ethnic Armies. Polyethnic Armed Forces from the Time of the Habsburgs to the Age of the Superpowers* (pp 50-68). Waterloo: Wilfried Laurier University Press.

Goglia, F. (2006). *Communicative strategies in the Italian of Igbo-Nigerian immigrants in Padova (Italy): a contact linguistic approach* [PhD dissertation]. University of Manchester.

Greenberg, J. H. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Greenberg, J. H. (Ed.) *Universals of grammar* (pp. 73-113). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hall, R. A. (1966). *Pidgin and creole languages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hargreaves, J. D. (1969). *France and West Africa: an anthology of Historical Documents*. London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd.

Haspelmath, M. (2010). Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language*, 86(3), 663-687.

Haspelmath, M. & the APiCS Consortium (2013). Definite articles. In Michaelis, S. M., Maurer, P., Haspelmath, M. & Huber, M. (Eds.) *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available from http://apics-online.info/parameters/28, Accessed on 2017-05-22.

Holm, J. (2000). *An introduction to pidgins and creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Houis, M. (1984). Une variété idéologique du français: le langage tirailleur. *Afrique et Langage*, 21, 5-17.

Juvonen, P. (2016). Making do with minimal lexica. Light verb constructions with make/do in pidgin lexica. In Juvonen, P. & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (Eds.) *The Lexical Typology of Semantic Shifts* (pp. 223-248). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kerr, Robert. 1812. *General History and Collection of Voyages and Travels Arranged in Systematic Order*, vol. 7. Edinburgh: George Ramsay and Company.

Ladhams, J. (2012). Article Agglutination and the African Contribution to the Portuguese-based Creoles. In Bartens, A. & Baker, P. (Eds.) *Black Through White. African Words and Calques Which Survived Slavery in Creoles and Transplanted European Languages*. London: Battlebridge.

Lehmann, C. 2012. Converse categorization strategies. *Linguistics* 50(3), 467-494.

McWhorter, J. (2000). *The Missing Spanish Creoles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mandat-Grancey, E. de. (1900). *Au Congo (1898). Impressions d'un touriste*. Paris: Librairie Plon.

Manessy, G. (1984). Français-tirailleur et français d'Afrique. *Cahiers de l'Institut Linguistique de Louvain*, 9(3/4), 113–126.

Mangin, C. (1910). *La Force Noire*. À travers le monde 41. Paris: Hachette.

Marie-Victoria, S. 1921. Les petits sénégalais à Biskra. *Les missions catholiques: Bulletin hebdomadaire de l'Œuvre de la propagation de la foi*, 53.

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McWhorter, J. H. (2002). The rest of the story: Restoring pidginization to creole genesis theory. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 17, 1-48.

Mufwene, S. S. (2000). Creolization is a social, not a structural, process. In Neumann-Holzschuh, I. & Schneider, E. (Eds.) *Degrees of restructuring in creole languages* (pp. 65-84). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mufwene, S. S. (2015). The Emergence of Creoles and Language Change. In Bonvillain, N. (Ed.) *The Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 345-368). London: Routledge.

Parkvall, M. (1995a). *A dual approach to creole genesis* [Master's thesis]. Stockholm University.

Parkvall, M. (1995b). The role of St. Kitts in a new scenario of French Creole genesis. In Baker, P. *From Contact to Creole and Beyond* (pp. 41-62). London: Battlebridge.

Parkvall, M. & Bakker, P. (2013a). Pidgins. In Bakker, P. & Matras, Y. (Eds.) *Contact Languages. A comprehensive guide* (pp 15-64). Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Parkvall, M. & Bakker, P. (2013b). Pidgins. In *Oxford bibliographies: Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, S. & Bresnan, J. (2008). Retained inflectional morphology in pidgins: A typological study. *Linguistic Typology*, 12, 269-302.

Siegel, J. (2008). Pidgins/Creoles, and Second Language Acquisition. In Kouwenberg, S. & Singler, J. W. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies* (pp. 189-218). West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing.

Skirgård, H. (2013). *Français Tirailleur Pidgin – a corpus study* [Master's thesis]. Stockholm University.

Thornton, J. K. (1992). *Africa and Africans in the making of the Atlantic world, 1400-1680*. Cambridge University Press.

Vigouroux, C. B. (2013). Francophonie. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 42, 379-397.

Wilson, M. (1999). *Français-Tirailleur: The Pidgin French of France's African Troops, 1916* [Master's thesis]. Auckland: University of Auckland.