
Pragmatic Markers in Kwéyòl Donmnik, French, & English: Language Contact & Creole Emergence through the Lens of Powerful Little Words

Joy P. G. Peltier



Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

DOI: 10.4000/11p9w

ISSN: 2607-8988

Publisher

Laboratoire Parole et Langage

Electronic reference

Joy P. G. Peltier, "Pragmatic Markers in Kwéyòl Donmnik, French, & English: Language Contact & Creole Emergence through the Lens of Powerful Little Words", *Études créoles* [Online], 41 | 1-2 | 2024, Online since 09 April 2024, connection on 22 May 2024. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/11p9w>

This text was automatically generated on May 22, 2024.



The text only may be used under licence CC BY-NC-ND 4.0. All other elements (illustrations, imported files) are "All rights reserved", unless otherwise stated.

Pragmatic Markers in Kwéyòl Donmnik, French, & English: Language Contact & Creole Emergence through the Lens of Powerful Little Words

Joy P. G. Peltier

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to: the members of the Kwéyòl Donmnik language community who contributed the data analyzed in this research; Sylvia Henderson for transcribing and translating the corpus data; the Dominica Overseas Nationals Association for their help with participant recruitment and recording space; Marlyse Baptista, Sarah G. Thomason, Diana L. Ranson, Susan Gelman, and anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions; and audiences at various discussion groups and conferences for their insightful questions and feedback.

1. Introduction

- 1 Pragmatic markers (PMs) (also called *discourse markers* (e.g., Schiffrin, 1987; Blakemore, 2002), among other names) are multifunctional words or phrases that express a person's attitudes and cognitive states and coordinate discourse (for more on defining PMs, see Section 3.1). In this corpus-based study, I compare the discourse-pragmatic functions and distributional features of a selection of PMs in Kwéyòl Donmnik, an understudied and endangered Creole language, French, Kwéyòl's lexifier, and English, the non-lexifier colonial source language with which Kwéyòl has been in intense contact for over 200 years¹. The selected PMs are listed below (for details, see Section 3.3).² The aim of the study was to assess how the traits of the colonial source language (CSL) PMs may have influenced the properties the Kwéyòl PMs display, providing

insight into language contact and Creole emergence through the lens of these powerful *little words* or *petits mots* (Bouchard, 2000; Bolden, 2006).

Tab. 1, Selected PMs

KWÉYÒL PMs	FRENCH COUNTERPARTS (ETYMA)	ENGLISH COUNTERPARTS
<i>konsa</i> ‘so’	<i>(ou) comme ça</i> ‘(or) like that’	<i>so</i>
<i>èben</i> ‘well’	<i>(eh) ben</i> ‘well’	<i>well</i>
<i>papa/Bondyé</i> ‘father/God’	<i>bon dieu</i> ‘good God’ and other similar expressions (e.g., <i>mon dieu</i> ‘my God’)	<i>oh my God</i> and other similar expressions (e.g., <i>gosh</i>)
<i>la</i> ‘there’	<i>là</i> ‘there’	<i>here/there</i>

2. Kwéyòl Donmnik & Creole Emergence

2.1. Sociohistorical Context

- 2 As highlighted by researchers like Weinreich (1953), Thomason & Kaufman (1988), and Mufwene (2001, 2008), sociohistorical context is critical to the unfolding of language contact phenomena. The circumstances surrounding the emergence of Kwéyòl Donmnik, a Lesser Antillean French lexifier Creole of the Caribbean island of Dominica, involves a layered history of contact with two CSLs, making the interplay between Kwéyòl, French, and English an intriguing context for exploring mechanisms of language contact and emergence.
- 3 Unlike “the prosperous sugar islands of Barbados, Antigua, St. Kitts, Guadeloupe and Martinique [which] were far more attractive to the [enslavers]” (Honychurch, 1995: 53), Dominica’s small size and mountainous terrain was not conducive to sprawling plantations. Instead, early French settlements were small-scale, allowing for intense contact and facilitating the lexifier’s lasting linguistic influences. By 1745, about half of the 3,032 documented inhabitants of Dominica were enslaved (Honychurch, 1995: 54). Most were Caribbean born and transshipped from other islands (Honychurch, 1995: 53), perhaps bringing with them other Creole varieties. Meanwhile, the indigenous Kalinago, users of an Arawakan language, became increasingly isolated to “the rough, rocky north-east quarter” of the island (Honychurch, 1995: 50) where other people of color are known to have encountered and lived among them (Honychurch, 1995: 64; Taylor, 1977: 25). By 1778, “...the island’s population consisted of 1,574 whites, most of them French, 574 free mulattos and blacks, and 14,309 [enslaved people]” (Honychurch, 1995: 87). More diachronic research is needed, but it is reasonable to presume that Kwéyòl began to develop in earnest over the course of the 18th century as more colonizers and enslaved and escaped people of color arrived on the island.
- 4 Dominica changed hands between the French and the British several times but remained primarily under British rule from 1763 until Dominica’s independence in

1978, a layering of colonial influences that shifted the linguistic landscape. Over time, English has become the foremost colonial language with which Kwéyòl coexists and is the language of Dominica's government, education, and commerce. Most Kwéyòl users are elders; "the language is losing fluent speakers and is no longer spoken as a first language by the majority of Dominican children; by most measures, then, [Kwéyòl] would be considered an endangered language" (Paugh, 2012: 9). Nearly all remaining users are bilingual (typically in English), and today, many are spread across an English-dominant diaspora, including the United Kingdom and the United States. English influence extends beyond lexical borrowings to changes in the Creole's sound system, such as the introduction of word-final *tch* [tʃ] and *dj* [dʒ] and word-initial *r* (Christie, 2003: 26). Contact is so intense that Kokoy, an English lexifier Creole, has emerged on the island (Christie, 2003: 30; Aceto, 2010). Given this sociohistorical context, it is unsurprising that while PMs of French origin pervade Kwéyòl speech, they are used alongside English markers like *well* and *so*.

2.2. Mechanisms of Language Contact & Emergence: Congruence

- 5 As Section 2.1 illustrates, Creole emergence can involve several languages, and creolists debate how Creole genesis proceeds. As summarized by Baptista (2020: 160), Whinnom (1956, 1965) suggests that all Creoles originate from a single linguistic ancestor, while Bickerton (1981, 1984, 2014) argues that Creoles are rooted in language universals and thus display similar grammatical features regardless of their source languages (SLs). Others propose that a particular SL has the most significant impact on a Creole's grammar (e.g., Chaudenson, 2001, 2003; Lefebvre, 1998). However, many "would agree that Creoles mix properties of their source languages" (Baptista, 2020: 161), and researchers seek to understand how this process unfolds.
- 6 One prominent proposal is from Mufwene's (2001, 2008; also see Aboh 2009, 2015) biological model of language evolution: the diverse pool of linguistic features supplied by the various SLs that make up a Creole's linguistic ecology compete for selection, or inclusion in the emerging grammar. Baptista (2020) suggests that preexisting congruence plays a critical role in this process: "the similarities (congruent features) that speakers perceive between the languages in contact are favored to participate in the emergence and development of a new language" (Baptista, 2020: 161). These perceived similarities may be in form, function, and/or syntactic distribution. For example, the form, functions, and preverbal positioning of *ka*, the negative marker in Cabo Verdean Creole (CVC) and Guinea-Bissau Creole (GBC), retain traits shared by Portuguese *nunca* 'never' and negators in the Creoles' African SLs, such as Mandinka *buka* (Baptista, 2020: 173-174). Given that social factors like language users' attitudes are "a powerful force in promoting or inhibiting change" (Baptista, 2020: 162 summarizing Thomason, 2001), Baptista's (2020: 162) "goal is NOT to propose a predictive, deterministic model of language emergence and contact-induced change", and she "consider[s] congruence to be just one of many mechanisms involved in Creole formation—but an important one".
- 7 Some linguists may refer to congruence as *convergence*. However, congruence should not be confused with *areal convergence*: "long-term coexistence [that] can lead languages to CONVERGE with each other, ultimately leading to the rise of congruent features among them (see Joseph 1983, 2010)" (Baptista, 2020: 163). Both phenomena

have been explored by numerous researchers (e.g., Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 2008; Aboh & DeGraff, 2014, 2017); for a detailed discussion, see Baptista (2020: 163-166). To my knowledge, research on congruence and other mechanisms involved in Creole emergence does not examine PMs. However, our understanding of language emergence must also take into account the discourse-pragmatic domain; their dynamic multifunctionality and flexibility with respect to syntactic distribution make PMs a promising site for such research.

2.3. Two Contact Situations

- 8 There is also a need for more research into how contributions from a non-lexifier CSL are integrated into a Creole language. Research on Kwéyòl is well-suited to this as there are two CSL contact situations involved in its development: (a) contact with the French lexifier from the start of Kwéyòl's emergence and (b) contact with English, a second (and now dominant) CSL, that began early in Kwéyòl's emergence. Anticipating that mechanisms like congruence likely played a role in both of these overlapping contact situations, I expected to find that congruencies between its CSL counterparts are reflected in a Kwéyòl PM's properties. Given that Creole languages can also develop innovations that "evolve independently from [their SLs]" (Baptista 2020: 161), I also expected to find facets of a PM's usage in the Creole that are distinct from its CSL counterparts. Future work will investigate whether the properties of PMs in SLs that are not as well documented, such as the Kalinago language, may have contributed to the traits of Kwéyòl's PMs.

3. Pragmatic Markers

3.1. Defining Pragmatic Markers

- 9 Though I discuss specific spoken languages in this manuscript, PMs are found in both spoken and signed languages (e.g., Hoza, 2011).³ Many markers "regularly fill the initial slot in conversational turns", but they can vary widely with respect to both their distributional features and their roles in discourse. Thus, the boundary between PMs and other classes of pragmatic items, like interjections, "is at best muddy" (Norrick, 2009: 869). Many PMs, like *well*, can express the utterer's emotions—a trait attributed to interjections. Conversely, interjections like *oh* can organize the discourse flow (see Fox Tree & Schrock, 1999; Aijmer, 1987)—a property of PMs. As a working definition, I take PMs to be "any of the several types of elements...with various pragmatic/discourse functions, making an independent contribution and/or relating the following sequence to the dynamic context" (Norrick, 2009: 869).
- 10 Researchers have also proposed several theories to capture how PMs are interpreted and integrated into discourse (e.g., Schiffrin, 1987; Blakemore, 2002; see Aijmer, 2013 for an overview). One promising proposal suggests that "parts of a word's meaning are evoked, activated or materialised, foregrounded or backgrounded, *in different ways in the different contexts*, in which it is exploited" (Norén & Linell, 2007: 390 cited by Aijmer, 2013: 12). A user's mental representation of a marker is organized around a limited set of core, conventionalized meanings that permit "less conventionalised (or ad hoc) meanings to be created in the communication situation" (Aijmer, 2013: 13). So long as

they are compatible with these *meaning potentials* (Norén & Linell, 2007), “new functions can be created in the interaction” (Aijmer, 2013: 12).

- 11 This approach aligns with research by Cuenca (2008: 1382-1385), whose work on English *well* suggests that PMs are *radial categories*: semantic networks of interrelated senses and within which some functions are more closely or more peripherally related to the PM’s core meanings, or *prototype foci*. This approach also allows a PM’s functions to expand while still maintaining semantic links to the lexical item from which the PM originates. For example, English *well*, whose lexical parent is the adverb *well*, and French *ben* (often combined with *eh* to form *eh ben*, Kwéyòl *èben*’s etymon), whose lexical parent is the adverb *bien* ‘well’, retain semantic links to evaluation and acceptance: both introduce undesirable responses, like disagreement, and convey concession or begrudging acceptance (see Section 5.1). Notice, however, that French *ben* [bẽ] does not retain the diphthong present in the adverb *bien* [bjẽ]; like many PMs, it is phonologically “a reduced form” (Barnes, 1995: 816) compared to its item of origin.

3.2. Pragmatic Borrowing

- 12 For work on PMs that centers on language contact, I turned to the literature on borrowing. Though much of this research focuses on the transfer of lexical items, languages in contact may also display *pragmatic borrowing*: “the incorporation of pragmatic and discourse features of a source language (SL) into a recipient language (RL)” (Andersen, 2014: 17). Andersen’s (2014) approach to analyzing pragmatic borrowings proved a useful framework for examining how discourse-pragmatic contributions from Kwéyòl’s CSLs have been integrated into the Creole. Much like investigating a potential case of congruence requires closely examining the form, function, and distribution of a linguistic feature in a Creole (the RL) and its SLs, Andersen (2014: 18) proposes that researchers determine the “degree of parallelism” (Andersen, 2014: 23) between the properties of a pragmatic item in the SL and the RL. This allows scholars to “detect pragmatic functions that have been transferred, functions that are not transferred and new functions that may have emerged *post hoc* in the RL” (Andersen, 2014: 23).
- 13 Andersen (2014: 23-24) recommends the researcher (A) assess the distributional features (“discourse-structural and syntagmatic aspects”) of the SL and RL markers, (B) inventory the PMs’ functions to determine whether *functional stability* (“no observable change in the pragmatic function of the marker”) or *adaptation* (a narrowing, broadening, or shift in function) has taken place during integration into the RL, and (C) “take into account sociolinguistic aspects and consider relevant demographic predictors and factors such as register and style”. Step C is beyond the scope of this investigation, but Steps A and B form the basis for this study’s methodology (see Section 4.3).
- 14 Other researchers define borrowing differently. For instance, van Coetsem (1988) contrasts *borrowing*, “the transfer of linguistic materials from [an SL] into [an RL] via the agency of speakers for whom the latter is the linguistically dominant language” (Winford, 2020: 12 summarizing van Coetsem, 1988), with *imposition*, “a process by which the speaker transfers features of her linguistically dominant language (as SL) into her version of the recipient language (RL)” (Winford, 2020: 8 summarizing van Coetsem, 1988). However, in contact situations like the one investigated here, it is

unclear which language those who used Kwéyòl (the RL) were dominant in when material from the CSLs was incorporated. For example, early in Kwéyòl's history, English would presumably have been a non-dominant language for users of the emerging Creole. Now, most Kwéyòl users are English-dominant. Though use of items like *so* and *well* as PMs in English likely preceded contact with Kwéyòl, it is unclear when they developed the functions they now perform or when they began to influence Kwéyòl's PM inventory (see Section 4.4 for further discussion). That Andersen's (2014) approach does not place dominance restrictions on borrowing makes it particularly adaptable to the current study.

3.3. Pragmatic Markers in French Lexifier Creoles

- 15 In the corpus data sources used for this study (see Section 4.1 for details), there were several pragmatic items attested: *o* 'oh'; *a* 'ah'; *pis* 'because'; *bon* 'well'; *mé* 'but'; *manman* 'mother'; the invariant tag *ennit* 'isn't it' (see Pichler 2021 for a discussion of this tag's development in London English and its potential origins); *konsa* 'so', *èben* 'well'; *papa* 'father (God)'; *Bondyé* 'God'; and *la* 'there'. Although Creole PMs are understudied, similar markers are found in other French lexifier varieties. St. Lucian features items like *Bondyé* 'good Lord!', *Bondous* 'my God!', *dakò* 'okay, agreed', *bon* 'well', and *awa* 'oh no!' (Frank, 2020). Colot & Ludwig (2013, citing Ludwig & Pfänder, 2003) describe use of *la* 'there' as a *deictic discourse marker* in Martinican and Guadeloupean (also members of the Lesser Antillean family), and work by Chady (2021) explores the Mauritian extension particle *sipa ki* 'whether'.
- 16 Since there were many, I chose to analyze a subset of the PMs present in the Kwéyòl data sources. First, I chose *konsa* 'so' and *èben* 'well' because of their frequency and because their English counterparts *so* and *well* also surface in the data; I coded these English tokens as well, curious whether they were used differently in the Creole. I included *Bondyé* 'God' and *papa* 'father (God)' because of their religious content, which is a cultural artifact of the Lesser Antilles' colonial history. I analyzed them together due to their similar functions and their potential for cooccurrence as *papa Bondyé* 'father God'. While there are no tokens of this collocation in the data, it surfaces in a footnote by the London Corpus transcriber/translator (see Section 4.1 for more on the London Corpus) and was mentioned to me during interviews with Kwéyòl users (Peltier, 2022). Another familial PM, *manman* 'mother', surfaced in the data, but whether it shares similar religious undertones is a topic for future research. Finally, I included *la* 'there' in this study to determine whether it functions as a PM in Kwéyòl.

4. Methodology

4.1. Data Sources

- 17 I analyzed data from three sources:
 - The **London Corpus (LC)**, comprised of fieldwork data I collected in 2018, contains 90 minutes of three dyads of Kwéyòl-English bilinguals using Kwéyòl: one man and five women between 58 and 82 years of age. Five were Dominica born; the sixth, born in the UK to Dominican immigrants, spent her formative years in Dominica. Participants completed four tasks: dialogue, responding to a silent film called *The Pear Story*, narrating Mayer and

Mayer's (1975) wordless picture book *One Frog Too Many*, and a pattern-building task (Cooperrider et al., 2014, 2018). A Kwéyòl-English bilingual translated/transcribed the data. Participants were issued codes made up of their initials, gender identity (f = female, m = male), and age. For three samples of this corpus data, including audio recordings and transcripts, please visit :

18 This media file cannot be displayed. Please refer to the online document <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

19 This media file cannot be displayed. Please refer to the online document <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

20 This media file cannot be displayed. Please refer to the online document <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

21 This media file cannot be displayed. Please refer to the online document <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

22 This media file cannot be displayed. Please refer to the online document <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

23 This media file cannot be displayed. Please refer to the online document <http://journals.openedition.org/etudescreoles/1450>

- The **Corpus Créole (CC)** (Ludwig et al., 2001), a collection of Creole conversations, includes one interview and one radio segment in Kwéyòl, both of which took place in Dominica in 1986.
 - The **Ma' Bernard Folktales (MBF)**, my name for a trio of Kwéyòl folktales contributed by a user named Ma' Bernard, were documented by Douglas Taylor (1977).
- 24 There are orthographic differences across the data sources. For example, in the MBF transcriptions, which were written before Kwéyòl's standardized writing system was developed, nasal vowels are indicated by a tilde (e.g., *èbẽ* 'well') rather than an *n* (e.g., *èben*). In the CC, there is variation such that words containing a *w* (e.g., *apwézan* 'presently') are sometimes written with an *r* (e.g., *aprézan*).

4.2. Identifying Tokens

- 25 After importing the data into *Atlas.ti* qualitative data analysis software, I labeled the properties of each PM token by assigning to it searchable tags called *Codes*. Since *èben* 'well', *well*, and so do not have lexical counterparts in Kwéyòl, locating them was simple, and I verified that tokens of *papa/Bondyé* 'father/God' were being used secularly. Isolating tokens of *konsa* 'so' required excluding instances of *kon sa* 'like that', its lexical, non-PM counterpart. I verified that each token was indeed functioning as a PM and not

as a phrase in which *sa* ‘that’ indicated an intra- or extralinguistic referent (e.g., *yon bagay kon sa* ‘a thing like that’).

- 26 To isolate relevant tokens of *la*, I first excluded instances of the definite determiner, distinguishable based on its post-nominal position (e.g., *liv-la* ‘the book’) and its allomorphic morphophonological patterns: in Kwéyòl, the determiner /la/ is realized as [la] after a consonant and [a] post-vocally (e.g., *moso papyé-a* ‘the piece of paper’). This determiner undergoes similar morphophonological changes in other French lexifier Creoles, such as Haitian (Déprez, 2007: 270 citing Joseph, 1989; Lefebvre, 1998: 79). I also ruled out instances of *la* ‘there’ that provided locational information or occurred in existential constructions (*la ni...* ‘there is/are...’).
- 27 These homophonous *la* morphemes contrast with instances like the one bolded in (1) below. Here, the utterer asks her daughter to take a cardboard box to the house of a man who recently died. No location of death is referenced in the discourse, suggesting that *la* performs another discourse-pragmatic function. This example resembles instances documented in Guadeloupean and Martinican in which a noun phrase containing definite *la* (*nonm-la* ‘the man’) is followed by a relative clause also ending in *la* (*ki mò la* ‘who died [there]’). The second *la* has been called a *deictic discourse marker* (Colot & Ludwig, 2013), and I hypothesized that this *la*, which also surfaces in contexts other than relative clauses (see (44) and (45) in Section 5.6), might be a PM in Kwéyòl as well.

(1) (Dialogue, LC, Edf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

<i>Dèmen,</i>	<i>O,</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>sav</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>vlé</i>	<i>'w</i>	<i>fè?</i>
Tomorrow	oh	2SG	know	what	1SG	ANT	want	2SG	do
‘Tomorrow, oh, you know what I wanted you to do?’									

<i>Pou</i>	<i>'w</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>mennen</i>	<i>an,</i>	<i>an,</i>	<i>an</i>	<i>katon</i>	<i>koté</i>
for	2SG	ANT	bring	INDF	INDF	INDF	carton/cardboard box	by
For you to bring a, a, a carton/cardboard box by								

<i>nonm-la</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>mò</i>	<i>la.</i>
man-DEF	who	died	PM
the man who died [there].’			

4.3 Analysis

- 28 First, I assigned Codes to each token (e.g., “Placement: Initial”) based on Andersen’s (2014: 23) list of distributional features, or “discourse-structural and syntagmatic aspects”:

Utterance Placement: Does the marker occur utterance-initially/medially/finally?

Scope: Does it take into its scope a full proposition or a propositional constituent?

Orientation: Does it point forward or backward in the discourse, qualifying upcoming or preceding material?

Degree of Syntactic Integration: Is it used as a free-standing device, or is it to some degree syntactically integrated?

Collocational Features: To what extent is the marker a constituent of a fixed or semi-fixed phrase or collocation?

(Adapted from Andersen, 2014: 23)

- 29 Keeping in mind that a single PM token can perform multiple functions, I then took notes (*Comments* in Atlas.ti) on each token, documenting my initial impressions of how the utterer used the PM to mark junctures in the discourse or to convey attitudinal/cognitive states. I used those Comments to group the tokens into functional categories, assigning each function a Code (e.g., “Function: Self-Repair”). Next, I compared the coding results with descriptions of the markers’ CSL counterparts in the literature to (a) identify instances where congruence may have favored a PM to display certain properties in the Creole and (b) determine whether integration of the CSL PMs into Kwéyòl had resulted in

Functional Stability: No observable change in the pragmatic function of the marker in the SL and RL; the marker is associated with the same type of speech act, user attitude, and/or illocutionary force in both the SL and RL

or in a subtype of **Functional Adaptation:**

Functional Narrowing: Loss of some function of the marker in the transition from the SL to the RL, or transfer of only one function of the multifunctional SL marker

Functional Broadening: Acquisition of a new pragmatic function in the RL not observed in the SL

Functional Shift: Loss of some function of the marker in the transition from the SL to the RL combined with acquisition of a new pragmatic function in the RL, or modification of an existing pragmatic function in the transition from the SL to the RL

(Adapted from Andersen, 2014: 24)

4.4. Limitations

- 30 No corpus-based analysis is exhaustive. While some of the PMs were more plentiful (30 tokens of *èben* ‘well’), others were less so (six of *papa* ‘father (God)’), and the Kwéyòl markers may perform functions that were not attested in the data. Likewise, the CSL markers may perform functions that were not reported in the literature or that have developed since past studies were conducted. Use of the PMs discussed here may also vary geographically or socially in ways that are beyond the scope of this study.
- 31 Another limiting factor is the scarcity of diachronic information, making it unclear when the Kwéyòl and CSL PMs emerged and developed their various functions. For instance, it is possible that Kwéyòl *èben* ‘well’ was being used as a self-repair device prior to intense contact with English *well* (which also facilitates self-repairs), having already incorporated this function from its lexifier etymon (*eh*) *ben* earlier in the

Creole's emergence. It is even possible, if unlikely, that Kwéyòl *èben* developed this function independently, as “it is generally difficult to decide whether an innovation is due to pragmatic borrowing [here, integration into the Creole RL] or a parallel development in two or more languages” (Andersen, 2014: 21).

- 32 However, consider that multiple causes may contribute to the linguistic outcomes of language contact (Thomason, 2008: 47); both Kwéyòl-internal innovations and external contributions from one or both CSLs can have led a Kwéyòl PM to develop certain traits. For example, even if *èben* had already acquired its self-repair function from the lexifier, use of *èben* to perform this function may have later been reinforced (i.e., increased in prominence and frequency of use) by the growing dominance of English *well*. Also, though the only relevant historical work of which I am aware is limited to the English PMs, it does suggest that these items were performing some PM functions prior to Kwéyòl's emergence. Use of *well* as an emphatic attention-getting device extends back to Old English (Jucker, 1997: 91; Marcus, 2009: 215), and use of *so* as an “introductory particle” is attested as early as the 1590s (Harper, n.d.). Though explicit use of *g-words* (expressions containing *God*) in secular contexts has increased in recent decades, euphemistic versions have been in use since the Middle Ages (Tagliamonte & Jankowski, 2019: 213). Despite its limitations, this study provides rich insights that can inform further research into the emergence and development of Creole varieties at the discourse-pragmatic level, particularly in cases involving linguistic contributions from both a lexifier and a non-lexifier CSL.

5. Results

5.1. Kwéyòl *Èben*

- 33 Of the 30 tokens of *èben*, seven collocated with other pragmatic elements like *a* ‘ah’, *o* ‘oh,’ *so*, *oké* ‘okay’, and *apwésa* ‘afterwards’. Usually, *èben* was utterance-initial (25 tokens), as in (2), though there were also -medial (three tokens, see (3)) and free-standing instances (four tokens, see (4)). This aligns with the French etymon (*eh*) *ben* ‘well’ and English counterpart *well*, which can also occur utterance-initially, -medially, or as free-standing utterances.

(2) (Book Narration, LC, EDf82, gloss mine)

<i>Èben</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>sé,</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>“story”-la</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>fèt</i>	<i>la.</i>
PM	DEM	is	DEM	is	story-DEF	that	happened	there
‘Well, that is, that is the story that happened there.’								

(3) (Book Narration, LC, EDf82, gloss mine)

<i>I</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>sanm,</i>	<i>tiwé</i>	<i>yon</i>	<i>“frog”</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>anlè,</i>	<i>èben</i>	<i>yonn,</i>	<i>dé</i>	<i>“frog”,</i>
3SG	PROG	seem,	take.off	INDF	frog	LOC	on.top,	PM	one,	two	frog,

'It seems, take off a frog there on top, **well** one, two frogs,

sété	dé.
was	two
it was two.'	

(4) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	Zò	ka	sizé	la	èvè	bwè?
	2PL	PROG	sit	there	and	drink
'You sit there and drink?'						

B:	Èben!
	PM
	'Well!'

A:	Èvè	tout	sé	moun-la?
	with	all	PL	person-DEF
'With all the people?'				

- 34 French (*eh*) *ben* builds coherence between discourse chunks at points of discontinuity (Barnes, 1995; Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001) and indicates an orientation shift in the discourse's deictic center (Barnes, 1995). English *well*, too, is a coherence builder and orientation shifter (Barnes, 1995; Schiffrin, 1987). Thus, these PMs both mark major textual junctures: topic changes and introducing new or unexpected content (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001: 44 and Barnes, 1995: 817 regarding (*eh*) *ben*; Jucker, 1997: 97; Beeching, 2011: 99; and Cuenca, 2008: 1388 about *well*), relaunching abandoned topics (Cuenca, 2008: 1388 for *well*; Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001: 44 for (*eh*) *ben*), facilitating self-repairs and utterance reformulations (Barnes, 1995: 814 with respect to both markers;

Cuenca, 2008: 1388 about *well*), and introducing quoted utterances or *reported discourse* (Barnes, 1995: 817 about *(eh) ben* and Schifffrin, 1987: 685 about *well*).

- 35 Kwéyòl *èben* facilitates navigation of textual junctures as well. In (5), *èben* introduces a new topic: the beginning of the second Ma' Bernard folktale. In (6), a character in the first folktale has just received advice from a soothsayer about freeing his wife from a zombie's grasp. Here, *èben* highlights the transition into the next scene: the husband embarking on his quest. This marker can also introduce surprising, unexpected information. In (7), this function is realized sarcastically. A widower has followed a soothsayer's instructions to transform his dog into a woman; the marker highlights that it is in fact *not* a surprise that the lonely man happily accepted her as his partner, an effect underscored by *non* 'no, of course'.

(5) (Taylor, 1977: 240, MBF #2, gloss mine)

<i>Ebē,</i>	<i>sete</i>	<i>yō</i>	<i>vye</i>	<i>kô</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>zāfā,</i>	<i>epi</i>
PM	there.was	INDF	old	body	who	NEG	ANT	have	child	and
'Well, there was an old fellow who was childless, and										

madam-li	vini	mô.
wife-3SG.POSS	came	dead
his wife died.'		

(6) (Taylor, 1977: 236, 238, MBF #1, gloss mine)

<i>Ebē,</i>	<i>mahwi-a</i>	<i>pwā</i>	<i>sjimē</i>	<i>-y;</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ale,</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ale.</i>
PM	husband-DEF	took	way	3SG.POSS	3SG	went	3SG	went
'Well, the husband set out on his way: he went on and on.'								

(7) (Taylor, 1977: 239, 240, MBF #2, gloss mine)

<i>Ebē,</i>	<i>nôm-la</i>	<i>pwā-y</i>	<i>pu</i>	<i>fê</i>	<i>mun-li</i>	<i>nô.</i>
PM	man-DEF	took-3SG	to	make	mate-3SG.POSS	no
'Well, the man took her as his mate, to be sure!'						

- 36 Like (*eh*) *ben* and *well*, *èben* can be used to revisit abandoned or interrupted topics. In (8), Interlocutor A is interrupted while instructing Interlocutor B to give a widow a cardboard box. After reminding B of the woman's name, A returns to giving instructions; *èben* marks this shift. *Èben* is also similar to its CSL counterparts in that it can facilitate self-repairs and reformulations. This was illustrated in (3) above.

(8) (Dialogue, LC, Edf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	<i>Am,</i>	<i>non,</i>	<i>pli</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>mété</i>	<i>katon-la</i>
	um	no	more	late	1SG	FUT	put	cardboard box-DEF
	'Um, no, later I will put the cardboard box							

	<i>andidan</i>	<i>lapòt</i>	<i>madanm-la</i>	<i>ba</i>	<i>'y.</i>		
	in	door	woman-DEF	for	3SG		
	In the wife's door for her.'						

B:	<i>Ki</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>ankò?</i>
	what	name	3SG.POSS	again
	'What's her name again?'			

A:	<i>S.</i>
	<i>S</i>
	<i>'S.'</i>

[...]

A:	<i>Mé</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>"remember"</i>	<i>non,</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>fanm-la.</i>
	but	is	2SG	who	said	2SG	NEG	that	remember	name	name	woman-DEF

	'But it's you who said you cannot remember that woman's name.'
--	--

B:	<i>Wi,</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>chonjé.</i>
	yes	1SG	FUT	remember
	'Yes, I will remember.'			

A:	<i>Oké.</i>
	okay
	'Okay.'

B:	<i>Chonje,</i>	<i>chonjé,</i>	<i>wi.</i>
	remember	remember	yes
	'Remember, Remember, yes.'		

A:	<i>Èben</i>	<i>lè</i>	<i>'w</i>	<i>alé</i>	<i>la,</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>di,</i>	<i>am,</i>	<i>"my</i>	<i>condolences".</i>
	PM	when	2SG	go	there	tell	S	1SG	said	erm	1SG.POSS	condolences
	'Well when you go there, tell S I said, erm, my condolences.'											

- 37 Both *well* and (*eh*) *ben* can soften the impact of undesirable responses, such as replies that are indirect, inadequate, or delayed or that express disagreement (Barnes, 1995: 816; Beeching, 2011: 99; Jucker, 1997: 97; and Cuenca, 2008: 1380 regarding *well*; Barnes, 1995: 816 and Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001: 45 about (*eh*) *ben*). They can also express concession or partial agreement/acceptance (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001: 47 about (*eh*) *ben*; Beeching, 2011: 99 with respect to *well*). Similarly, *èben* introduces undesirable responses and indicates begrudging agreement/acceptance. In (9), after Interlocutor A reminds Interlocutor B that B's car is not in any condition to drive to the widow's house, *èben* introduces B's undesirable response: that A will have to make the delivery herself on foot. A's next utterance, also introduced by *èben*, expresses her unhappy acceptance of this.

(9) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	So,	<i>kouman</i>	'w	<i>kè</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>alé</i>	<i>la?</i>	<i>Ou</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>
	so	how	2SG	FUT	be.able	go	there	2SG	NEG	can
'So, how will you be able to go there? You can't										

	<i>mété</i>	<i>motoka</i>	'w	<i>asou</i>	<i>chimen-la.</i>
	put	car	2SG.POSS	on	road-DEF
put your car on the road.'					

B:	Èben	<i>ou</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>maché</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>menm.</i>
	PM	2SG	FUT	have	for	walk	there	2SG	self
'Well you will have to walk there yourself.'									

A:	Èben	<i>sé</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>fè;</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>alé</i>
	PM	is	that	what	1SG	have	to.do	1SG	self	FUT	go
'Well that is what I have to do; I myself will go											

	<i>la.</i>	<i>Mon</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>"mind".</i>
	there	1SG	not	mind
there. I don't mind.'				

- 38 Though their functions overlap, there are differences between the two CSL markers. Only (*eh*) *ben* is associated with underscoring comparisons and contrasts (Hansen, 1998: 288) and with introducing illustrative examples or other elaborative information (Hansen, 1998: 289; Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001: 44). Kwéyòl *èben* performs both of these functions. In (10), a Kalinago chief uses *èben* to underscore a comparison between how

he and his staff were once paid annually and the monthly pay system that was instituted later in his term. In (11), the same interviewee has been telling the interviewer about the treaty that granted the Kalinago their territory. *Èben* indicates that he is about to elaborate on a related side-topic: the signing process by which the treaty was approved.

(10) (Interview, CC, gloss and translation mine)

[...] mè	lè	mwen	menm	té	rantré [...]	chef	kwayib
but	when	1SG	self	ANT	become	chief	carib
'...but when I myself became [...] Kalinago chief							

yo	té	ban	nou	on	ti	lajan	pa	(adan)	lanné [...]
3PL	ANT	give	2PL	INDF	little	money	per	in	year
they gave us a little money per (in a) year [...]									

<i>èben</i>	dépi	aprés	yo	désann	yo	té	ka	ban	nou	on
PM	since	after.that	3PL	decided	3PL	ANT	PROG	give	1PL	INDF
well since then they decided they gave us a										

ti	lamoné	pa	mwa
little	money	per	month
little money per month'			

(11) (Interview, CC, gloss and translation mine)

<i>Èben</i>	sé	biten-sala	i	té	ni	menm	WITNESS	té	ka
PM	PL	thing-DEM	there	ANT	have	even	witness	ANT	PROG
'Well there were even witnesses who were									

siyé	anba	a	yo	komki	THEN	yo	siyé	on	on	kontra
sign	below	ah	3PL	like	then	3PL	sign	INDF	INDF	contract
signing below on those things like they sign a contract'										

- 39 Likewise, only *well* introduces closing remarks that bring an end to the discourse (Cuenca, 2008: 1388); expresses emotional—often negative—reactions like indignation, disappointment, or sadness (Beeching, 2011: 98 citing Corr  ard et al., 2007); mitigates face-threatening utterances (Jucker, 1997: 97; Beeching, 2011: 99); and signals a desire to hold or reclaim the floor, such as by “fill[ing] interactional silences” (Jucker, 1997: 97).
- 40 Like *well*, *  ben* introduces concluding remarks, as shown in (2) above in which a fieldwork participant ends her picture book narration. Example (4) above illustrates how this marker can also express emotional reactions. There, the utterer insists she and her husband do in fact take a bottle of wine to London Fields to enjoy together. Beyond underscoring the surprising nature of this revelation, *  ben* expresses the utterer’s frustration at her interlocutor’s skepticism. *  ben* can even indicate that the utterer has not yet completed their contribution, as illustrated in (8) above. There, Interlocutor A is not finished giving Interlocutor B instructions but is interrupted when B asks for the widow’s name. To facilitate her return to the contribution she was making and regain control of the floor, A uses *  ben*.
- 41 Kw  y  l *  ben* does perform functions that are not reported in the literature for either CSL counterpart. For instance, when introducing a face-threatening utterance, *  ben* does not have *well*’s mitigating effect. Rather, it emphasizes the pointedness of an uncomfortable or insulting question, as shown in (12). This is reinforced by the utterance-final tag *then*.

(12) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	Ok��.	“So”,	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>kwi��y��</i>	<i>yo?</i>
	okay	so	1SG	have	for	call	3PL
	‘OK. So, I have to call them?’						

B:	<i>Wi.</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>mon,</i>	<i>o,</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>kwi��y��</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>kon</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>��v��</i>	<i>’w.</i>
	yes	3SG	said	1SG	or	3SG	said	1SG	for	call	3PL	as	1SG	with	2SG
	‘Yes. She told me, or, she told me to call them as I’m with you.’														

A:	Èben,	<i>poutji</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>sa</i>	"then"?
	PM	why	2SG	NEG	done	that	then
	'Well, why haven't you done that then?'						

- 42 *Èben* also has a result-marking function demonstrated in (13). Here, *èben* highlights that, because of the gradual arrival of Kalinago individuals to the scene of a conflict with the police, the courtyard became full of people.

(13) (Interview, CC, gloss and translation mine)

[...]yo	<i>komansé</i>	<i>vini</i>	<i>yonn</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>yonn</i>
3PL	started	come	one	by	one
'[...] they started to come one by one					

43

èben	<i>lè</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>vini</i>	<i>yonn</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>yonn</i>	<i>aprézan</i>	<i>lakou-a</i>	<i>koumansé</i>	<i>plen</i>
PM	when	3PL	came	one	by	one	then	courtyard-DEF	became	full
well when they came one by one then the courtyard became full'										

- 44 Finally, *èben* can signal that the utterer is waiting for their interlocutor to take the floor. In (14), the Kalinago chief has answered the interviewer's previous question, and *èben* to indicates that he is awaiting the next.

(14) (Interview, CC, gloss and translation mine)

A:	Èben
	PM
	'Well'

B:	<i>Èskè</i>	<i>aprézan</i>	[...]yo	<i>ka</i>	<i>mandé</i>	<i>w</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>avi?</i>
	Is.it.that	now	3PL	PROG	ask	2SG	2SG.POSS	opinion

	'These days, [...] do they ask you your opinion?'
--	---

- 45 Kwéyòl *èben*, like *well* and (*eh*) *ben*, can provide discourse-pragmatic information about the utterance that follows it (forward orientation), as it does when introducing a new topic; respond to the preceding discourse chunk (backward orientation), such as when it indicates partial or begrudging acceptance of what was just uttered; or highlight a relationship between preceding and upcoming information, a combined forward/backward orientation it displays when highlighting a contrast or comparison. Also, like its CSL counterparts, *èben* tends to take within its scope the full propositional content of the utterance(s) it modifies. For example, when introducing a new topic, it indicates that the content conveyed by the entire utterance it precedes constitutes the start of new material. An exception is when *èben* facilitates a mid-utterance self-repair; then, the PM modifies only the repaired portion of the utterance.

5.2 *Well* in Kwéyòl

- 46 Two of the five tokens of English *well* were accompanied by other PMs: o 'oh' and *an han* 'uh huh'. The features of *well* in the corpus aligned closely with those reported for *well* in the literature: it was usually in initial (see (15) below) or medial position (see (16)). However, examples like (17) are best categorized as free-standing; here, *well* and o 'oh' form one stand-alone collocation.

(15) (Silent Film Discussion, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine)

Èvè,	" well "	[...] <i>pon</i>	<i>panyen-a</i> .
And	PM	take	basket-DEF
'And, well [...] take the basket.'			

(16) (Dialogue, LC, SLm82 & FMLf80, gloss mine)

A:	<i>I</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>lè</i>	<i>wè</i>	..., <i>i</i>	<i>lé</i>	<i>palé</i>	<i>ba</i>	<i>'w.</i>
	3SG	said	3SG	wants	see	3SG	wants	talk	to	2SG
	'She said she wants to see ..., she wants to talk to you.'									

B:	<i>An</i>	<i>han!</i>	" Well ",	<i>nou</i>	<i>palé.</i>
	<i>ah</i>	<i>ha</i>	PM	1PL	spoke
	'Ah ha! Well , we spoke.'				

(17) (Book Narration, LC, SLm82, gloss mine)

O,	"well".	I	ka	alé.
oh	PM	3SG	PROG	go
'Oh, well. He is going.'				

- 47 One token's function was unclear because the utterer was interrupted mid-sentence, but the others displayed known capacities of English *well* (see Section 5.1). In (17) above, the utterer has reached a point in the picture book's plot where a frog has been reprimanded by his owner and is depicted walking away. *Well*, combined with *oh*, expresses sadness and a resigned acceptance of the frog's decision to leave. Meanwhile, in (16) above, *well* introduces an undesirable response that contradicts and corrects the addressee: Interlocutor B tells Interlocutor A that she had already spoken with the person A said wanted to talk to her. The corpus tokens also reflected English *well*'s tendency to modify the entire propositional content of the utterances it accompanies and its ability to take on forward, backward, or forward/backward orientation. The results of this analysis of *èben* 'well' and *well* in the Kwéyòl data sources are summarized in the table below.

Tab. 2, Property comparison table for Kwéyòl *èben* 'well' and English *well* as they arise in the Kwéyòl data sources analyzed, as well as for French (*eh*) *ben* 'well' and English *well* as discussed in the literature

	ÈBEN	(EH) BEN	WELL	WELL (IN CORPORA)
Utterance Placement:	Initial	Initial	Initial	Initial
	Medial	Medial	Medial	Medial
			Final	
	Free	Free	Free	Free
Degree of Integration:	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated
	Free	Free	Free	Free
Orientation:	Forward	Forward	Forward	Forward
	Backward	Backward	Backward	Backward
	Forward/ Backward	Forward/ Backward	Forward/ Backward	Forward/ Backward
Scope:	Full Proposition	Full Proposition	Full Proposition	Full Proposition
	Constituent	Constituent	Constituent	

Discourse-Pragmatic Functions:	New Topic	New Topic	New Topic	
	Abandoned Topic	Abandoned Topic	Abandoned Topic	
	Self-Repair	Self-Repair	Self-Repair	
		Reported Discourse	Reported Discourse	
	Undesirable Response	Undesirable Response	Undesirable Response	Undesirable Response
	Concession	Concession	Concession	Concession
	Contrast	Contrast		
	Elaboration	Elaboration		
	Concluding Remark		Concluding Remark	
	Emotional Reaction		Emotional Reaction	Emotional Reaction
	Face-Threat			
			Face-Threat Mitigator	
	Floor-Holding		Floor-Holding	
	Result			
	Floor-Ceding			

5.3. Kwéyòl Konsa

- 48 *Konsa* ‘so’ (30 tokens) is derived from French *comme ça* ‘like that’; when used as a PM, *comme ça* often collocates with *ou* ‘or’ to form *ou comme ça* ‘or like that’ (see Béguelin & Corminboeuf, 2017 for an analysis of *ou comme ça*). Only one token surfaced alongside another pragmatic element (English *alright*) and all but one free-standing example (see (18)) were integrated into an utterance in either initial (24 tokens, see (19)), medial (four tokens, see (20)), or final position (one token, see (21)). While this positioning aligns with English *so*, which is typically utterance-initial but can also surface as utterance-medial, -final, or free, French PM (*ou*) *comme ça* tends not to occur in initial position.

(18) (Dialogue, LC, Edf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	Èvè	jòdi	mwen	isit-la	èvè	'w,	èvè	dèmen	mon
	and	today	1SG	here-DEF	with	2SG	and	tomorrow	1SG
	'And today I'm here with you, and tomorrow I								

	ni	pou	alé,	am,	fizyo.
	have	for	go	erm	physiotherapy
	have to go, erm, to physio[therapy].'				

B:	Wi,	èvè...
	yes	and
	'Yes, and...'	

A:	Konsa...
	PM
	'So...'

B:	Fizyo-la	ké	wédé	'w.
	Physiotherapist-DEF	FUT	help	2SG
	'The physio will help you.'			

(19) (Book Narration, LC, HMMf63, gloss mine)

Sa	pa	bon.	Konsa	mwen	ka	di	'w:	pa	fè	sa	ankò.
that	not	good	PM	1SG	PROG	say	2SG	not	do	that	again

'That's not good. So I'm telling you: don't do that again.'
--

(20) (Book Narration, LC, HMMf63, gloss mine)

Mé	toutmoun	ka	gadé,	mé	gwo	"frog"-la	pa	enmen	sa,
but	everyone	PROF	look	but	big	frog-DEF	NEG	like	that
'But everyone is looking, but the big frog does not like that,									

é	konsa	mon	doubout	èvè	mon	ka	gadé	yo,	pou	vwè	sa
and	PM	1SG	stood	and	1SG	PROG	look	them	for	see	what
and so I stood and I was looking at them, to see what											

yo	ka	fè.
3PL	PROG	do
they are doing.'		

(21) (Interview, CC, gloss and translation mine)

<i>pis</i>	<i>nonm</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>séré</i>	<i>toupatou</i>	<i>an</i>	<i>bwa</i>	<i>toupatou</i>	<i>konsa.</i>
thus	men	ANT	PROG	hide	everywhere	in	tree	everywhere	PM
'thus the men hid everywhere, in the trees, everywhere so. '									

- 49 (*Ou*) *comme ça* '(or) like that', has been most closely examined in Swiss French and functions as a hedge or list extension particle indicating uncertainty or approximation (Corminboeuf, 2016; Béguelin & Corminboeuf, 2017). Meanwhile, *so* highlights inferential, resultative connections (Schiffrin, 1987; Buysse, 2014; Bolden, 2009; Blakemore, 1988; 2002) and (re)launches topics that are "pending" (Bolden, 2008: 306) or otherwise tied to the utterer's communicative objective. Despite these differences, the two CSL markers overlap functionally. (*Ou*) *comme ça* can introduce reported discourse (Béguelin & Corminboeuf, 2017: 13-15) and facilitate self-repairs (Béguelin & Corminboeuf, 2017: 13-15; Corminboeuf, 2016: 9), and my search of the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) uncovered examples of *so* performing both of

these functions as well. Surprisingly, I did not find examples of *konsa* performing either function in the data.

- 50 When used to “indicat[e] to the hearer that some kind of inferential connection between...two propositions needs to be made” (Bolden, 2009: 976 summarizing Blakemore, 1988, 2002), so often introduces a result or other conclusion that follows from the preceding discourse. However, the portion following the marker can be elided or implicit, leaving it to the addressee to infer the result or conclusion. Inference and elided information are also central to a function of (*ou*) *comme ça*, which can be used to express confidence that the addressee is able to infer the rest of an incomplete enumeration or to acknowledge the existence of other relevant examples that the utterer could mention if they chose to provide a list (Béguelin & Corminboeuf, 2017: 11-12).
- 51 This congruent ability to suggest an inferential connection is reflected in Kwéyòl *konsa*, whose inference-marking function closely resembles *so*’s. Notice in (22) how *konsa* indicates that, because the utterer anticipates many people will attend a Kwéyòl cultural event, she will go as a vendor. Like (*ou*) *comme ça*, *konsa* can also be used to mark the elision or intentional incompleteness of a list, as in (21) above; rather than list every place Kalinago men hid from the police, the chief gives an example, emphasizes the men were *toupatou* ‘everywhere’, and ends his utterance with *konsa*.

(22) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 4:50-4:55]

<i>La</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>anpil</i>	<i>moun</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>vann</i>	<i>biten.</i>
there	FUT	have	a.lot	person	PROG	sell	thing
‘There will be a lot of people selling things.’							

<i>Konsa,</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>’y</i>	<i>fe</i>	<i>’y.</i>
PM	1SG	PROG	3SG	do	3SG
Therefore, I’m going to do it.’					

- 52 *So* and (*ou*) *comme ça* are also similar in their floor-holding capabilities (Buysse, 2014: 83; Bolden, 2009: 97 summarizing Local & Walker, 2005). English users employ *so* to indicate that, despite “a digression or an aside” (Buysse, 2014: 83), they wish to continue speaking. (*Ou*) *comme ça*, meanwhile, is a *ponctuant* ‘puntuator’ (Corminboeuf, 2016: 5); it indicates that the utterer’s contribution is not yet finished by *punctuating* or *segmenting* utterances into digestible portions, such as intonational groupings (Corminboeuf, 2016: 10) or crucial chunks of information (Dostie, 2007: 54).
- 53 *Konsa* displayed both floor-holding functions. In (23), the Kalinago chief uses *konsa* to return to his central narrative (how the police illegally arrested the wife of a Kalinago merchant) after digressing into an aside. In (24), *konsa* punctuates the utterer’s

narration of the actions of a farmworker in the silent film; the farmworker is tempted to eat a pear but acts with integrity and returns it to the basket.

(23) (Interview, CC, gloss and translation mine)

A:	[...] <i>madanm-la</i>	<i>tousèl</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>HANDCUFF</i>	<i>madanm-la</i>
	wife-DEF	alone	ANT	there	3PL	handcuffed	wife-DEF
	'[...] only the wife was there. They handcuffed the wife.'						

B:	<i>wé</i>
	yes
	'Yes'

54

A:	<i>épi</i>	<i>yo</i>	[...] <i>monté</i>	<i>jik</i>	<i>anho</i>	<i>koté</i>	<i>mouché</i>	<i>JAMES</i>
	and	3PL	climbed	to	up	by	mister	James
	'And they [...] climbed up to Mister James' place							

55

<i>ola</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>vann</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>biten-la</i>	<i>osi</i>	<i>mouché</i>	<i>JAMES</i>
where	3PL	PROG	sell	PL	thing-DEF	also	Mister	James
where they were also selling the merchandise. Mister James,								

56

<i>mouché</i>	<i>Pyè</i>	<i>tousa</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>vann</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>biten-la</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>lisans</i>
mister	Pierre	all	ANT	PROG	sell	PL	thing-DEF	without	permit
Mister Pierre, all of them were selling the merchandise without a permit,									

<i>mé</i>	<i>sété</i>	<i>pli</i>	<i>gran</i>	<i>boutik-la</i>	<i>sété</i>	<i>isi</i>
but	was	most	big	store-DEF	was	here
but the biggest shop was here.						

konsa	yo	HANDCUFF	madanm-la [...]
PM	3PL	handcuffed	wife-DEF
So they handcuffed the wife...			

(24) (Silent Film Discussion, LC, Edf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	Konsa,	<i>i</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>vlé</i>	<i>yonn</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>yo.</i>
	PM	3SG	ANT	want	one	of	3PL
'So, he wanted one of them.							

Konsa,	<i>i</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>alé</i>	<i>nétwayé</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>manjé</i>	<i>'y.</i>
PM	3SG	ANT	PROG	go	clean	for	eat	3SG
So, he was going to clean to eat it.'								

B:	<i>Oké.</i>
	okay
	'Okay.'

A:	<i>I</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>konmsidi</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>té...</i>	<i>moun-la</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>an</i>
	3SG	acted	like	3SG	ANT	person-DEF	ANT	have	INDF
'He acted as if he had..., the person had a									

"conscience".	Konsa	<i>i</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>pwan</i>	<i>'y.</i>
conscience	PM	3SG	said	3SG	NEG	PROG	3SG	take	3SG
conscience. So he said he's not going to take it.									

B:	<i>Oké.</i>
	okay
	'Okay.'

A:	Konsa,	<i>i</i>	<i>mété</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>viwé</i>	<i>andidan</i>	<i>"basket"-la,</i>	<i>èvè</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>viwé</i>	<i>twaway.</i>
	PM	3SG	put	3SG	back	in	basket-DEF	and	3SG	returned	work
'So, he put it back in the basket, and he went back to work.'											

- 57 (Ou) *comme ça* also performs functions that are not reported in the literature for *so*, such as indicating that a quantity or figure is approximate or imprecise (Béguelin & Corminboeuf, 2017: 10) or introducing a request for confirmation (Corminboeuf, 2016: 4). It can even stand alone as an evasive, uncooperative response (Corminboeuf, 2016: 5). Of these three functions, I found Kwéyòl *konsa* to perform the second. In (25), Interlocutor A uses *konsa* to begin her request for confirmation that her inference is correct and that Interlocutor B is not going to work.

(25) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	<i>Bonjour.</i>
	good.day
	'Hello'

B:	<i>Bonjour</i>	<i>manm'.</i>	<i>Sa</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>fèt?</i>
	good.day	mother	What	PROG	happen

	'Hello mother. What's happening?'
--	-----------------------------------

A:	<i>Sa</i>	<i>'w</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>jòdi?</i>
	what	2G	PROG	do	today
	'What are you doing today?'				

B:	<i>Mon</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>konnèt,</i>	<i>non.</i>
	1SG	myself	NEG	even	know,	no
	'I myself don't even know, no.'					

A:	<i>Konsa,</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>ka,</i>	<i>am,</i>	<i>twavay?</i>
	PM	2SG	NEG	PROG	um	work
	'So, you're not going to work?'					

B:	<i>Wi,</i>	<i>pli</i>	<i>ta.</i>
	yes	more	late
	'Yes, later.'		

B:	<i>Mon</i>	<i>menm,</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>twavay</i>	<i>jòdi</i>	<i>pis...</i>
	1SG	self	1SG	not	PROG	work	today	because
	'I myself, I am not working today because...'							

A:	<i>Ou</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>byen.</i>
	2SG	NEG	well
	'You are not well.'		

B:	<i>Mon</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>byen.</i>
	1sg	NEG	well
	'I am not well.'		

- 58 A similar but distinct function of *so* that *konsa* also performs is acting as a “marker of connection” (Howe, 1991: 93 cited by Bolden, 2008: 306). *So* suggests familiarity or common ground between interlocutors, introducing some aspect of their shared knowledge that “highlight[s] the speaker’s involvement in the addressee’s life world” (Bolden, 2006 cited by Bolden, 2008: 306). In (25) above, Interlocutor A asking about B’s work plans is rooted in the interlocutors’ shared knowledge that B has not been well lately.
- 59 *So* also launches new or abandoned topics, particularly ones that are central to the utterer’s agenda (Bolden, 2009: 996; Bolden, 2008: 3012), and can be “deployed as a stand-alone unit to prompt the addressee to produce the next relevant action” (Bolden, 2008: 306 summarizing Raymond, 2004), such as taking their turn to speak (Buyse, 2014: 31). Kwéyòl *konsa* only resembled *so*’s agenda-(re)launching uses when employed as a floor-holding device that transitioned the discourse back to the central topic (see (23)). However, *konsa* does perform the “turn-transition prompt” function reported by Buyse (2014: 30) for *so*. In (18) above, a Kwéyòl user utters *konsa* then trails off, inviting the addressee to speak.
- 60 *Konsa*’s orientation is usually forward/backward given that, like *so*, it highlights inferred connections between preceding and subsequent content. Possible exceptions are when it indicates the incompleteness of a list like French (*ou*) *comme ça* (backward orientation) or prompts a turn transition like *so* (forward orientation). Except when *konsa* indicates incompleteness of a list and thus modifies only a portion of the utterance, this marker, like *so*, takes within its scope the entirety of the propositional content of the utterance(s) adjacent to it. For example, when marking an inferential connection, *konsa* indicates that the full content of the following utterance (the conclusion, result, outcome, etc.) can be inferred from preceding content.

5.4. *So* in Kwéyòl

- 61 *So* (39 tokens) featured prominently in the corpus data. Ten tokens surfaced alongside other pragmatic elements, including *bon* ‘well’, *oké* ‘okay’, *èben* ‘well’, *wi* ‘yes’, and *apwézan* ‘presently’. *So* was almost always integrated into a larger utterance whose

entire content it modified (37 tokens) and was either utterance-initial (30 tokens, see (26)), -medial (seven tokens, see (27)), or free-standing (two tokens, see (28)).

(26) (Dialogue, LC, SMF59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 3:57-4:00]

“So”	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>wèsté</i>	<i>yonn</i>	<i>koté.</i>
PM	1SG	have	for	stay	one	place
‘So I have to stay in one place.’						

(27) (Book Narration, LC, Edf82, gloss mine)

<i>Sa</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>tonbé</i>	<i>èvè</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>malonnèt-la,</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>swiv</i>	<i>yo</i>
that	which	PROG	fall	and	do	ungrateful-DEF	3SG	PROG	follow	3PL
‘The one that is falling and the ungrateful one, it is following them										

<i>apwézan,</i>	“so”,	<i>apwézan,</i>	<i>tibway-la</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>chyen</i>	<i>’y,</i>
now	PM	now	boy-DEF	has	dog	3SG.POSS
now, so, right now the boy has his dog,						

“tortoise”-li,	<i>èvè</i>	<i>dé</i>	“frog”-la,	<i>èvè</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>pati.</i>
tortoise-3SG.POSS	and	two	frog-DEF	and	3PL	left
his tortoise, and the two frogs, and they left.’						

(28) (Book Narration, LC, PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.04e5ltc7>, 2:09-2:21]

<i>I</i>	<i>ni,</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>asiz</i>	<i>kon</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>yon</i>	<i>biten</i>	<i>èvè</i>	<i>yo</i>
3SG	has	3SG	PROG	sit	like	3SG	did	INDF	thing	and	3PL
‘It has, it is sitting like it did something and they are											

<i>pa</i>	<i>kontan</i>	<i>sa.</i>	<i>“So”.</i>
NEG	happy	that	PM
not happy about that. <i>So.</i>			

- 62 Some of the functions *so* performed aligned with those reported in the literature on English *so* (see Section 5.3). It often indicated inferential connections between propositions, as it does in (29) between the fact that both Interlocutor A and her friend D have a background in jewelry-making and their decision to attend an event as vendors. Thus, the tokens of *so* in the data were usually oriented forward and backward simultaneously. *So* was also used once with a forward orientation to raise a new topic; see (30), in which Interlocutor A introduces a new subject after a lull.

(29) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 1:15-1:30]

A:	<i>Am,</i>	<i>mé</i>	<i>zanmi-mwen</i>	<i>D,</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>vann,</i>	<i>am,</i>	<i>tibwen</i>
	Ah	but	friend-1SG.POSS	D	3SG	ANT	PROG	sell	erm	some
	'Ah, but my friend D, she was selling, erm, some									

A:	<i>bijou</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>kwéyé</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>akay-li.</i>
	jewelry	which	3SG	ANT	make	3SG	self	house-3SG.POSS
	jewelry which she made herself at home.							

A:	<i>I</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>yon</i>	<i>kous</i>	<i>andan</i>	<i>kouman</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>kwéyé</i>	<i>bijou...</i>
	1SG	ANT	do	INDF	course	on	how	to	make	jewelry
	I did a course on how to create jewelry...									

B:	<i>A!</i>	<i>bijou?</i>
	Ah	jewellery
	'Ah! Jewellery?'	

A:	Èvè	'y	té	ka	vann	yo,	"so"	nou	té	alé	asanm	pou	fè	sa.
	and	3SG	ANT	PROG	sell	3PL	PM	2PL	ANT	go	together	for	do	that
	'And she was selling them, so we went together to do that.'													

(30) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf6, gloss mine)

A:	Oké.
	okay
	'Okay.'

B:	Sa	dòt ...
	what	else
	'What more...'	

A:	Oké,	"so"	C	lakay?
	okay	PM	C	home
	'OK, so is C at home?'			

B:	Wi.	O!	C	ba	mon	yon,	an	"phone number"	pou...
	yes	oh	C	gave	1SG	INDF	INDF	phone number	to
	'Yes. O! C gave me a, a phone number for...'								

A:	Pou	ba	mwen.
	for	give	1SG

	'To give me.'
--	---------------

B:	<i>Pou</i>	<i>ba</i>	<i>'w.</i>	<i>"Yeah",</i>	<i>am,</i>	<i>kont</i>	<i>plas-la</i>	<i>ou</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>vlé.</i>
	for	give	2SG	yeah	erm	about	place-DEF	2SG	ANT	want
	'To give you. Yeah, erm, about the place you wanted.'									

A:	<i>Oké.</i>	<i>"So",</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>kwiyé</i>	<i>yo?</i>
	okay	PM	1SG	have	for	call	3PL
	'OK. So, I have to call them?'						

B:	<i>Wi. [...]</i>
	yes
	'Yes. [...]

- 63 So was used in contexts that hinged upon shared knowledge and common ground between the interlocutors (a function documented in the literature). However, often these tokens also introduced implicit or explicit requests for confirmation that the utterer and addressee had drawn the same inferential connection (a function of *konsa* and its etymon (*ou*) *comme ça*). In (30) above and in (31), *so* introduces utterances that index the interlocutors' shared knowledge: that C was supposed to pass along a phone number to Interlocutor B for Interlocutor A to call about an event venue in (30) and who all was expected to attend an event on Sunday in (31). In (30), *so* also introduces questions that explicitly request a response; in (31), *so* introduces a statement, and the request for confirmation is more implicit.

(31) (Dialogue, LC, SLm82 & FMLf80, gloss mine)

A:	<i>Mé</i>	<i>nou</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>wè</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>dimanch.</i>
	but	1PL	FUT	see	3SG	Sunday
	'But we will see him on Sunday.'					

B:	<i>Nou</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>wè</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>dimanch.</i>
	1PL	FUT	see	3SG	Sunday
	'We will see him on Sunday.'				

A:	<i>I</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>vini</i>	<i>dimanch</i>	<i>"because"</i>	<i>lé</i>	<i>dimanch</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>tan</i>
	3SG	FUT	come	Sunday	because	on	Sunday	that	is	time
	'He will come on Sunday because Sundays are the times									

<i>i</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>vini</i>	<i>ési.</i>
3SG	PROG	come	here
	he comes here.'		

B:	<i>Wi,</i>	<i>wi,</i>	<i>wi.</i>
	yes	yes	yes
	'Yes, yes, yes.'		

A:	<i>So,</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>nou</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>(tèlifonn)</i>	<i>apwézan.</i>
	PM	is	A	1PL	have	for	call	now
	'So, it's A we have to telephone now.'							

B:	<i>A.</i>
	<i>A</i>

	'A.'
--	------

- 64 So also performed another function reported for English *so*: maintaining control of the floor by relaunching the utterer's topic of interest after a digression or interruption. However, it also displayed the 'punctuator' floor-holding pattern performed by *konsa* and its etymon (*ou*) *comme ça*. Notice in (32) below how the utterer marks each juncture in his account with *so* (and later *èvè* 'and'), indicating that there is more content to come and demarcating crucial chunks of information.

(32) (Dialogue, LC, SLm82 & FMLf80, gloss mine)

<i>I</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>fonmi</i>	<i>an</i>	<i>kay-la,</i>
3SG	said	there	are	ant	in	house-DEF
'She said there are ants in the house,						

<i>"so"</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>netwayé</i>	<i>'y.</i>
PM	1SG	said	for	tell	R	for	clean	3SG
so I said to tell R to clean it.								

<i>"So"</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>èspéwé</i>	<i>lè</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>(tèlifonn)</i>	<i>ankò</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>sav</i>
PM	1SG	PROG	wait	when	3SG	FUT	telephone	again	for	know
So I am waiting for when she will telephone again to know										

<i>sa</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>fèt.</i>	<i>Èvè</i>	<i>yè,</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>(tèlifonn)</i>	<i>nou.</i>	<i>"Is</i>	<i>it?"</i>
that	which	happened	and	yesterday	R	telephoned	2PL	is	it
what has happened. And yesterday, R telephoned us. Is it?									

- 65 The results of this analysis of *konsa* 'so' and *so* in the Kwéyòl data sources are summarized in the table below.

Tab. 3, Property comparison table for Kwéyòl *konsa* 'so' and English *so* as they arise in the Kwéyòl data sources analyzed, as well as for French (*ou*) *comme ça* '(or) like that' and English *so* as discussed in the literature

	KONSA	(OU) COMME ÇA	SO	SO (in corpora)
Utterance Placement:	Initial	Initial	Initial	Initial
	Medial	Medial	Medial	Medial
	Final	Final	Final	
	Free	Free	Free	Free
Degree of Integration:	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated
	Free	Free	Free	Free
Orientation:	Backward	Backward	Backward	Backward
	Forward/ Backward	Forward/ Backward	Forward/ Backward	Forward/ Backward
Scope:	Full Proposition	Full Proposition	Full Proposition	Full Proposition
	Constituent	Constituent	Constituent	Constituent
Discourse-Pragmatic Functions:		Reported Discourse	Reported Discourse	
		Self-Repair	Self-Repair	
	Inference		(Elided) Inference	Inference
	Elided or Incomplete List	Elided or Incomplete List		
	Floor-Holding		Floor-Holding	Floor-Holding
	Punctuator	Punctuator		Punctuator
		Approximation		
	Confirmation Request	Confirmation Request		Confirmation Request
		Uncooperative Response		
			Common Ground	Common Ground
			New Topic	New Topic

	Abandoned Topic		Abandoned Topic	
			Agenda Launch	
	Turn-Transition Prompt		Turn-Transition Prompt	

5.5. Kwéyòl *Papa/Bondyé*

66 *Bondyé* ‘God’ and *papa* ‘father/God’ were relatively infrequent: just three tokens of *Bondyé* ‘God’ and six of *papa* ‘father/God’. These markers sometimes collocated with other pragmatic elements, such as *é(la)* ‘and/ah’, *a* ‘ah’, *non* ‘no’, and *wé* ‘yes’, and were either free-standing (see (33)) or utterance-initial (see (34)). This aligns with similar markers in French, like *mon Dieu* ‘my God’, but contrasts with English g-words like *oh my God*, which can assume any position.

(33) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 4:02-4:12]

<i>La</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>bèl</i>	<i>sòlèy.</i>	<i>Éla</i>	<i>papa!</i>
there	is	beautiful	sun	ah	PM
‘There is beautiful sunshine. Ah papa!					

<i>Kon</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>Donmnik,</i>	<i>èvè</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>alé</i>	<i>dèwò,</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>mété</i>
like	1SG	Dominica	and	1SG	have	for	go	outside	for	put
As if I’m in Dominica, and I have to go outside, to put										

<i>sòlèy</i>	<i>asi</i>	<i>vijay-mwen.</i>
sun	on	face-1SG.POSS
some sunshine on my face.’		

(34) (Book Narration, LC, HMMf63, gloss mine)

<i>A!</i>	<i>Bondyé,</i>	<i>Bondyé,</i>	<i>kité</i>	<i>nou</i>	<i>sòti.</i>
-----------	----------------	----------------	-------------	------------	--------------

ah	PM	PM	let	1PL	leave
'Ah! God, God , let us get out.'					

- 67 *Bondyé* 'God' is derived from French *bon Dieu* 'good God'. *Papa* is a familiar, informal way of saying *father* in both French and English, but Dominica was colonized by Roman Catholic and Protestant Christians, and expressions like *Father God* and *Papa God* are also used in prayer in many Christian traditions. This is reflected in a footnote by the LC transcriber/translator: "Although the word "papa" means "father", it is often used as an exclamation in all sorts of situations where it does not mean "father", to give a phrase more emphasis. Sometimes the word "papa" is used to refer to "God". For example: "Wi papa", or "Wi Papa Bondyé" (i.e. "Yes, God the Father")."
- 68 Phrases like *bon Dieu* 'good God' (*Bondyé*'s etymon) and *nom de Dieu* 'name of God' may still be perceived as blasphemous by French users in secular contexts (Olivier, 2000: 163). However, PMs of religious origins in both CSLs, including English *oh my God* and *gosh* and French *mon Dieu* 'my God', are used to express emotional reactions (frustration, surprise, apprehension, etc.), realization, and the processing of new information, as well as emotional involvement in the form of concern or emotional attachment (Tagliamonte & Jankowski, 2019: 214 for *oh my God*; Downing & Caro, 2019: 101-3 about *gosh*; Olivier, 2000: 171 about *mon Dieu*). These functions were displayed by *Bondyé* and *papa*. In (35), *papa* is repeated, expressing Interlocutor B's surprise and concern upon realizing that, though a group of children trapped in a cave had been found alive, the rescue process would be arduous.

(35) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 7:56-8:27]

A:	Yon	lòt	biten	mwen	tann.	É,	yo	tapé,	am,	biten;
	INDF	other	thing	1SG	heard	and	3PL	found	erm	thing
'Another thing I heard. And, they found, erm,										

A:	yo	alé	an	kav,	"cave"-la.	Yo,	yo,	am,	sa	yo	di?
	3PL	went	in	cave	cave-DEF	3PL	3PL	erm	what	3PL	say
they went into cave, the cave. They, they, erm, what did they say?"											

B:	O!	Sé	zanfan-a?
	oh	PL	child-DEF

	'Oh! The children?'
--	---------------------

A:	<i>Zanfan-a.</i>	<i>Ki</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>dispawèt.</i>
	children-DEF	who	ANT	disappear
	'The children. Who disappeared.'			

B:	<i>Wi,</i>	<i>wi.</i>	<i>É</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>bon!</i>
	yes	yes	and	that	is	good
	'Yes, yes. And that's good!'					

A:	<i>Mé</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>toujou,</i>	<i>en!</i>
	but	3PL	there	still	eh
	'But they are still there, eh.'				

B:	<i>Wi,</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>di.</i>
	yes	is	that	3PL	said
	'Yes, that what they said.'				

A:	<i>Yo</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>enstwi</i>	<i>yo.</i>
	3PL	have	for	instruct	3PL
	'They have to instruct them.'				

B:	Yo	(fou),	(fou),	(fou). 4	“Oo”!	papa,	papa,	papa.
	3PL	deep	deep	deep	oh	PM	PM	PM
‘They are deep, deep, deep. Oo, papa, papa, papa. ’								

A:	Wi.	Yo	ké	la	pou	tibwen	tan	toujou.
	yes	3PL	FUT	there	for	some	time	still
‘Yes. They will still be there for some time.’								

A:	Yo	ni	pou	enstwi	yo	pou	plonjé.
	3PL	have	for	instruct	3PL	for	dive
‘They have to instruct them to dive.’							

- 69 The euphemism *gosh* has a variety of other functions, all of which I found *oh my God* to also perform when exploring the COCA: facilitating self-repairs and reformulations (Downing & Caro, 2019: 107), “function[ing] as a narrative device used to punctuate the story, to effect topic continuation, ...[and] to alert the listener that the speaker does not intend to give up the floor”, and introducing reported discourse (Downing & Caro, 2019: 106). However, the only function among these that was performed by *Bondyé* and *papa* was expressing emphasis (Downing & Caro, 2019: 104-105). In (36), *papa* emphasizes that Interlocutor B truly cannot recall doing much of anything on Sunday and introduces the reason why: her broken arm. Similarly, above in (33), *papa* emphasizes the utterer’s appreciation of the sunshine and the nostalgic memories it brings her of life in Dominica. Like *gosh*, which emphasizes “evaluatives...[like] copular constructions... rhetorical questions...declaratives with question tags...and ‘literal’ questions” (Downing & Caro, 2019: 104-5), *Bondyé* in (37) underscores the utterer’s evaluation of one of the frogs in the picture book. She calls it *an kalité* ‘a type’, by which she seems to be referring to its mischievous, surprising behavior (i.e., ‘a [mischievous/strange] type [of thing]’).

(36) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 2:50-2:58]

A:	Kisa	ou	té	fè	asou	dimanch?
	what	2PL	ANT	do	on	Sunday

	'What did you do on Sunday?'
--	------------------------------

B:	<i>Mwen</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>chonjé;</i>
	1SG	not	can	even	remember
	'I can't even remember;				

<i>non</i>	<i>papa,</i>	<i>“cause”</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>yon</i>	<i>lanmen</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>kasé</i>	<i>la.</i>
no	PM	because	1SG	have	INDF	hand	there	which	broken	there
no <i>papa</i> , because I have a broken hand there which is broken there										

<i>Mwen</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>anyen ...</i>
1SG	not	can	do	anything
I can't even do anything.'				

(37) (Book Narration, LC, Edf82, gloss mine)

<i>Al</i>	<i>Bondyé,</i>	<i>“frog”</i>	<i>sala</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>sé</i>	<i>an,</i>	<i>an,</i>	<i>an</i>	<i>kalité,</i>	<i>pis</i>
ah	PM	frog	DEM	self	is	INDF	INDF	INDF	type	because
'Ah! <i>God</i> , that frog itself is a, a, a type, because										

<i>mi</i>	<i>“frog”-la</i>	<i>tonbé</i>	<i>ankò.</i>	<i>Mi</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>vòltijé.</i>
look	frog-DEF	fell	again	look	3SG	PROG	fly
look the frog has fallen again. Look it went flying.'							

- 70 French markers like *mon Dieu* 'my God' can be used mockingly or sarcastically to suggest that the addressee is sensationalizing something (Olivier, 2000: 170-1), to

correct the addressee or suggest that they modify their behavior (Olivier, 2000: 171), and to highlight that the utterer is undergoing an exceptional circumstance (Olivier, 2000: 167). Of these three functions, the Kwéyòl PMs take on the latter two: Correction and Exceptional Circumstance. In (38), Interlocutor A chides Interlocutor B, reminding B that she should not talk to Dominicans about rain. In (34) above, *Bondyé* highlights an exceptional circumstance that could warrant (but does not literally involve) calling on God. There, the utterer narrates the distress of a little frog in the picture book who is trapped inside a box.

(38) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 7:23-7:39]

A:	<i>Lè</i>	<i>'w</i>	<i>wè</i>	<i>sòlèy,</i>	<i>sòlèy,</i>	<i>sòlèy,</i>	<i>lapli</i>	<i>dèyè</i>	<i>'y</i>	<i>wi.</i>
	when	2SG	see	sun	sun	sun	rain	behind	3SG	yes
	'When you see sun, sun, sun, rain is behind it, yes.'									

B:	<i>Mwen</i>	<i>sav,</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>sav.</i>	<i>Èvè</i>	<i>Donmnitjen</i>	<i>pè</i>	<i>lapli,</i>	<i>wi.</i>
	1SG	know	1SG	know	and	Dominican	afraid	rain	yes
	'I know, I know. And Dominicans are afraid of rain, yes.'								

A:	<i>É,</i>	<i>papa!</i>
	and	PM
	'And, papa! '	

A:	<i>Pa</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>Donmnitjen</i>	<i>kont</i>	<i>lapli,</i>	<i>kon</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>pè,</i>
	not	say	Dominicans	about	rain	like	1SG	self	afraid
	'Don't tell Dominicans about rain, as I myself am afraid,								

<i>si</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>an,</i>	<i>(Donmnitjen).</i>
if	1SG	ANT	in	Dominica

if I was in Dominica.'

71 Like their CSL counterparts, *papa/Bondyé* ‘father/God’ can have a forward orientation (e.g., when introducing a correction of the addressee’s behavior), or a backward orientation (e.g., when expressing an emotional reaction). Their orientation can even be simultaneously forward/ backward; see (37) above where *papa* emphasizes both the utterer’s evaluation of the sunshine (backward) and the nostalgia it brings her (forward). Regardless, the scope of these markers and their CSL counterparts includes the entire content of the utterance(s) they modify. When expressing an emotional reaction, their scope can even extend extralinguistically to encompass the entire discourse situation. The results of this analysis of *papa/Bondyé* ‘father/God’ are summarized in the table below.

Tab. 4, Property comparison table for Kwéyòl *papa* ‘father (God)’ and *Bondyé* ‘God’ as they arise in the Kwéyòl data sources analyzed, as well as for French religious markers like *mon Dieu* ‘my God’ and English religious markers like *oh my God* as discussed in the literature

	PAPA/BONDYÉ	MON DIEU, etc.	OH MY GOD, etc.
Utterance Placement:	Initial	Initial	Initial
			Medial
			Final
	Free	Free	Free
Degree of Integration:	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated
	Free	Free	Free
Orientation:	Forward	Forward	Forward
	Backward	Backward	Backward
	Forward/Backward		
Scope:	Full Proposition	Full Proposition	Full Proposition
	Situational Context	Situational Context	Situational Context
Discourse-Pragmatic Functions:	Emotional Reaction	Emotional Reaction	Emotional Reaction
	Emotional Involvement	Emotional Involvement	Emotional Involvement
	Realization	Realization	Realization
			Self-Repair
			Punctuator

			Floor-Holding
			Reported Discourse
	Emphasis		Emphasis
		Mocking Overreaction	of
	Behavior Correction	Behavior Correction	
	Exceptional Circumstance	Exceptional Circumstance	

5.6. Kwéyòl La

- 72 Locative discourse markers, which I call *locative pragmatic markers* (LPMs) for consistency with the terminology used in this study, are “locative deictic elements...which under certain contextual conditions...function as discourse markers” (Felleg, 1998: 31). I analyzed tokens of *la* ‘there’ to determine whether it functions as an LPM in Kwéyòl as it does in neighboring Creoles (see Section 4.2).
- 73 In her work on Quebec French, Dostie (2007: 50-52) reports that *la*’s French etymon, *là* ‘there’, can be used as a PM, sometimes cooccurring with temporal or locative *là* (see (39)).

(39) (Dostie, 2007: 56, gloss and translation mine)

<i>Vous</i>	<i>allez</i>	<i>vous</i>	<i>asseoir</i>	<i>là</i>	<i>là.</i>
2PL	will	REFL	sit	PM	PM
‘You will sit LOC-there PM-there’					

- 74 In English, Schiffrin (1987: 328) notes that the PMs *there* and *here* are “often used in narratives to mark surprising outcomes in the complicating action”. The standardized English example below is provided by Felleg (1998: 61), whose study investigates locative PMs in New Ulm English, a German-influenced variety spoken in Minnesota.

(40) (Felleg, 1998: 61)

We looked and looked and, here, the dog had buried the keys!

- 75 Examples (41) and (42) are New Ulm examples of the PM *dere* ‘there’. Like all PMs, *dere* ‘there’ does not contribute to the utterance’s propositional content. Instead, its contribution is to “draw attention to the speaker’s perceived relationship to the topic and [to] focus attention on the topic itself” (Felleg, 1998: 62). In (41), the utterer has already specified the farm in question by adding *of yours*. The LPM provides “meaningful social information” (Felleg, 1998: 63): the utterer — located in St. Paul — “has positioned himself at a discourse-level inside the town of New Ulm” (Felleg, 1998:

64), a setting familiar to both interlocutors. In (42), “no place information has been or ever is introduced into the story” (Felleggy, 1998: 64). Rather, *dere* situates the story within “a private location...which is ultimately kept as the utterer’s personal information” (Felleggy, 1998: 65); it is “a subtle distancing device, used by speakers when they do not wish to take the listener to a specific locale, in these particular cases because the location was personally unpleasant” (Felleggy, 1998: 65). LPMs can also point back to earlier chunks of discourse, usually to correct, contradict, or comment on them, as seen in (43).

(41) (Felleggy, 1998: 63)

*It [the road] goes down to Cxx and ya drive past the farm of yours up **dere**.*

(42) (Felleggy, 1998: 64)

*It was all grammar and he had a test everyday’n I could get just about a hunnert every day, ya know, and I couldn’t answer that god darn gal down **dere**.*

(43) (COCA, Spoken)

A:	<i>This must be a bar mitzvah outfit here?</i>
B:	<i>No, no, this isn't- That- You're wrong there, Lou. This is a great satin woolback coat that you could wear during the day. Shine is in. It's one of the big important trends.</i>

76 Of these, the focus-marking (Forget, 1989: 63-64) and discourse deictic commentary functions (Dostie, 2007: 52) were also reported for the French locative PM *là*, which often focuses the addressee’s attention on information the utterer deems most critical. *Là* can also foreground a main topic before the utterer provides additional relevant details or reinforce the importance of an action requested by the utterer (Forget, 1989: 65-66). The latter is illustrated in (39) above, in which the utterer urges the addressee to sit. *Là* even acts as a floor-holding punctuator (Dostie, 2007: 54; Forget, 1989: 62).

77 There were six tokens of Kwéyòl *la* ‘there’ in the data that were neither post-nominal determiners, nor part of existential constructions, nor contributing locative information. All six were utterance-final or -medial. Like its CSL counterparts, these tokens of *la* brought the addressee’s attention to information the utterer deemed critical. Sometimes that information was a referent that was part of the interlocutors’ shared knowledge: both interlocutors know the man who had recently died in (11) above, as well as the area surrounding the house the utterer shares with her husband in (44). Note that (44) was not uttered in the said house; *la* does not reference a location within the situational context.

(44) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

Mé	i	ka	sanm,	ka	wété	pa	dèyè	nou	la .
but	3SG	PROG	seem	PROG	live	by	behind	1PL	PM
‘But he seems, to be living behind us there .’									

- 78 *La* also highlighted the utterer's relationship with or connection to a critical referent, like the first *la* in (45) that foregrounds the utterer's hand. In (45), *la* even displays its etymon's punctuating and topic detachment functions, segmenting each piece of critical information: the hand (the topic) and its broken state that prevents the utterer from her usual activities (the additional details). Example (46) shows *la* expressing an emotional reaction (here, frustration) and referring back to / commenting on something uttered previously.

(45) (Dialogue, LC, SMf59 & PJf58, gloss mine) [<https://nakala.fr/10.34847/nkl.9fd968h3>, 2:50-2:58]

<i>Mwen</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>menm</i>	<i>chonjé;</i>
I	NEG	can	even	remember
'I can't even remember;				

<i>non</i>	<i>papa,</i>	<i>“cause”</i>	<i>mwen</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>yon</i>	<i>lanmen</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>kasé</i>	<i>la.</i>
no	papa	because	1SG	have	INDF	hand	PM	which	broken	PM
no papa, because I have a broken hand there which is broken there										

<i>Mwen</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>anyen...</i>
1SG	not	can	do	anything
I can't even do anything...'				

(46) (Dialogue, LC, EDf82 & HMMf63, gloss mine)

A:	<i>Ou</i>	<i>pa</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>maché</i>	<i>si</i>	<i>'w</i>	<i>pou</i>	<i>alé</i>	<i>anba</i>	<i>la.</i>
	2SG	not	can	walk	if	2SG	for	go	down	there
	'You can't walk if you must go down there.'									

B:	<i>Non.</i>	<i>Janm-mon</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>fè</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>mal.</i>
	no	leg-1SG.POSS	PROG	do	1SG	bad

	'No. My leg is hurting.'
--	--------------------------

A:	Èvè	sé	sa	menm	mon	ka	di	'w	la,	"ennit"?
	and	is	that	same	1SG	PROG	tell	2SG	PM	ennit
	'And that same thing that I am telling you there , "ennit"?'									

- 79 Finally, there was one token (see (2) above) that the literature on *la*'s CSL counterparts does not account for. Here, instead of facilitating floor-holding, *la* cedes the floor as the utterer ends her narration.
- 80 *La*'s CSL counterparts can be oriented forward or backward; Kwéyòl *la*, however, consistently modified preceding content (backward orientation). Sometimes the content within *la*'s scope was an entire proposition, like in (44), but as demonstrated by the punctuating examples in (45), *la* can also bring the addressee's attention to specific portions of a proposition. The results of this analysis of *la* 'there' as an LPM are summarized in the table below.

Tab. 5, Property comparison table for Kwéyòl *la* 'there' as it arises in the Kwéyòl data sources analyzed, as well as for French *là* 'there' and English *here/there* as discussed in the literature

	LA	LÀ	HERE/THERE
Utterance Placement:		Initial	Initial
	Medial	Medial	
	Final	Final	Final
Degree of Integration:	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated
	Free	Free	Free
Orientation:	Forward	Forward	Forward
	Backward	Backward	Backward
Scope:	Full Proposition	Full Proposition	Full Proposition
	Constituent	Constituent	Constituent
Discourse-Pragmatic Functions:	Shared Knowledge		Shared Knowledge
	Relationship Focus	Relationship Focus	Relationship Focus
	Emotional Reaction		Emotional Reaction

			Location Distancing
	Discourse Deixis with Commentary	Discourse Deixis with Commentary	Discourse Deixis with Commentary
	Topic Foregrounding	Topic Foregrounding	
		Request Reinforcement	
	Punctuator	Punctuator	
	Floor-Ceding		

6. Discussion

6.1. Congruence & Functional Adaptation

- 81 Based on these results, congruence likely played a role in the development of *èben* ‘well’: it displayed several properties that French (*eh*) *ben* ‘well’ shares with English *well*. Its functional inventory also extends beyond its French etymon, incorporating three more functions of *well* and two functions not documented for either CSL marker (Result and Floor-Ceding). Overall, *èben* displays *functional broadening*: it has gained new functions not performed by its French etymon, perhaps under *well*’s influence.
- 82 By contrast, while the distributional features of *konsa* ‘so’ reflect congruent properties shared by its CSL counterparts, neither of the CSL counterparts’ shared functions was performed by the Kwéyòl PM. Instead, *konsa*’s inventory includes three functions unique to French (*ou*) *comme ça* ‘(or) like that’ and four of *so*’s other functions. Thus, *konsa* exhibits *functional shift*: though it may not perform some of its French etymon’s functions, it has gained multiple functions of English *so*.
- 83 The distributional features of *papa/Bondyé* ‘father/God’, too, generally aligned with those documented for similar markers of religious origin in Kwéyòl’s CSLs. In addition to the three congruent functions shared by their CSL counterparts and two functions documented for French markers like *mon Dieu* ‘my God’, these PMs have broadened their inventory to include the Emphasis function of English g-words like *oh my God*.
- 84 Similarly, most of the distributional features of *la* ‘there’, which is indeed used as an LPM in Kwéyòl, are congruent across its CSL counterparts. Its functional inventory, too, capitalizes on congruence, encompassing both of the functions shared by its CSL counterparts. Of *la*’s remaining functions, two are documented for English *here/there*, two are reported for French *là*, and one (Floor-Ceding) was not associated with either CSL counterpart. Thus, *la*, too, exhibits functional broadening compared with its French etymon.
- 85 The properties of the tokens of *well* that surfaced in the data were all documented for English *well* in the literature; notably, those properties were all congruent traits also displayed by *well*’s Kwéyòl counterpart *èben*. Likewise, the distributional features of the tokens of *so* in the Kwéyòl data, as well as two of the functions it performed, paralleled both the English literature and the properties of its Kwéyòl counterpart *konsa*.

However, *so* also performed four more functions in the Creole data, two of which are part of *konsa*'s inventory but are not documented for English *so*. Thus, *so* has a broader functional inventory in the Creole, perhaps due to contact with *konsa*.

6.2. The Potential Impact of Core Meanings

- 86 Why a Kwéyòl PM may perform some of its CSL counterparts' functions and not all is a complex question that requires further research. In the case of *konsa* 'so', there was even a pair of congruent functions shared by its CSL counterparts that *konsa* did not perform in the data. Recall from Sections 3.2 and 2.2 that integration of an SL pragmatic item into an RL often involves adaptation rather than a complete transfer of all the SL item's traits, and even though congruence may probabilistically favor certain linguistic properties for integration into a Creole, congruence as described by Baptista (2020) is a non-deterministic mechanism operating alongside other linguistic processes and social factors.
- 87 However, future research investigating what the Kwéyòl PMs' core meanings are and how their semantic networks compare with those of their CSL counterparts may prove enlightening. Recall from Section 3.1 that a PM's abstract core meanings permit the creation of new functions. However, they may still influence the breadth of functions a PM performs. For example, perhaps a Kwéyòl PM inherited core meanings from its French etymon earlier in the Creole's development that are not compatible with some of its English counterpart's functions.

7. Conclusions

- 88 The aim of this study was to gain insight into language contact and Creole emergence at the discourse-pragmatic level by comparing the properties of a selection of PMs in Kwéyòl, an understudied Creole variety, with those of their counterparts in French, Kwéyòl's lexifier CSL, and English, its non-lexifier CSL. The results revealed a tendency towards functional adaptation (specifically, broadening or shift) as CSL PMs were integrated into the Creole, as well as potential sites of English influence on the properties of Kwéyòl markers with French etyma. The results also highlighted several cases where Kwéyòl PMs of French origin displayed congruent properties shared by their French and English counterparts, and tokens of *so* and *well* that surfaced in the data reflected congruencies between how these PMs are used in English and how their Creole counterparts *konsa* 'so' and *èben* 'well' function in Kwéyòl. These outcomes suggest that both lexifier and non-lexifier CSLs influence the properties of a Creole's PMs and that congruence plays a key role in how their contributions are integrated into a Creole language at the discourse-pragmatic level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aboh, E. O. (2009). Competition and selection: That's all!. In Aboh, E. O. & Smith, N. (Eds.), *Complex processes in new languages* (pp. 317-44). John Benjamins.
- Aboh, E. O. (2015). *The emergence of hybrid grammars: Language contact and change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Aboh, E. O. & M. DeGraff. (2014). Some notes on bare noun phrases in Haitian Creole and Gùngbè: A transatlantic Sprachbund perspective. In Áfarli, T. A. & Mæhlum, B. (Eds.), *The sociolinguistics of grammar* (pp. 203-36). John Benjamins.
- Aboh, E. O. & M. DeGraff. (2017). A null theory of Creole formation based on universal grammar. In I. Robert (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of universal grammar* (pp. 40-58). Oxford University Press.
- Aijmer, K. (1987). Oh and Ah in English conversation. In W. Meijs (Ed.), *Corpus linguistics and beyond* (pp. 61-68). Brill.
- Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding pragmatic markers: A variational pragmatic approach*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Andersen, G. (2014). Pragmatic borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 67, 17-33.
- Baptista, M. (2020). Competition, selection, and the role of congruence in Creole genesis and development. *Language*, 96, 160-199.
- Barnes, B. K. (1995). Discourse particles in French conversation: (Eh) ben, bon, and enfin. *The French Review*, 68, 813-821.
- Beeching, K. (2011). The translation equivalence of *bon*, *enfin*, *well*, and *I mean*. *Revue française de linguistique appliquée*, 16, 91-105.
- Béguelin, M.-J. & Corminboeuf, G. (2017). *Ou comme ça, machin* et autres marqueurs d'indétermination dans les listes. *Discours*, 20, 3-35.
- Bickerton, D. (1981). *Roots of language*. Karoma.
- Bickerton, D. (1984). The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 7(2), 173-221.
- Bickerton, D. (2014). *More than nature needs: Language, mind, and evolution*. Harvard University Press.
- Blakemore, D. (1988). "So" as a constraint on relevance". In R.M. Kempson (Ed.), *Mental representations: The interface between language and reality* (pp. 183-195). Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bolden, G. B. (2006). Little words that matter: discourse markers "so" and "oh" and the doing of other-attentiveness in social interaction. *Journal of Communication*, 56(4), 661-688.
- Bolden, G. B. (2008) "So What's Up": Using the Discourse Marker So to Launch Conversational Business. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(3), 302-337.

- Bolden, G. B. (2009). Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker 'so' in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 974-998.
- Bouchard, R. (2000) M'enfin !!! Des 'petits mots' pour les "petites" émotions ?. In Plantin, C., Doury, M., & Traverso, V. (Eds.). *Les émotions dans les interactions* (pp. 223-238). Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- Bruxelles, S. & Traverso, V. (2001) *Ben*: apport de la description d'un "petit mot" du discours à l'études des polylogues. *Marges Linguistique*, 2, 38-54.
- Buysse, L. (2014). "So what's a year in a lifetime so": Non prefatory use of so in native and learner English. *Text & Talk*, 34(1), 23-47.
- Chady, S. K. (2021). Des connecteurs aux particules d'extension, le sens de *sipa ki* du créole mauricien. *Taikomoji kalbotyra*, 15, 9-25.
- Chaudenson, R. (2001). *Creolization of language and culture*. Routledge.
- Chaudenson, R. (2003). *La créolisation: Théorie, applications, implications*. L'Harmattan.
- Christie, P. (2003). Dominica and the French Caribbean: So far and yet so near. In G. Aub-Buscher & B. O. Noakes (Eds.), *Francophone Caribbean today: Literature, language, culture* (pp. 16-32). University of the West Indies Press.
- Colot, S. & Ludwig, R. (2013). Guadeloupean and Martinican Creole. In S. M. Michaelis, P. Maurer, M. Haspelmath, & M. Huber (Eds.), *The survey of pidgin and creole languages. Volume 2: Portuguese-based, Spanish-based, and French-based Languages*. Oxford University Press.
- Cooperrider, K., Nuñez, R., & Slotta, J. D. (2014). "The protean pointing gesture: Variation in a building block of human communication". *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 355- 360). Cognitive Science Society.
- Cooperrider, K., Slotta, J. D., & Nuñez, R. (2018). The preference for pointing with the hand is not universal. *Cognitive Science*, 42, 1375-1390.
- Corminboeuf, G. (2016). Comme ça, marqueur d'approximation. In Lefevre, F. & Dostie, G. (Eds.). *À l'articulation du lexique, de la grammaire et du discours : marqueurs grammaticaux et marqueurs discursifs* (pp. 263-282). H Champion.
- Corréard, M-H., Grundy, V., Ormal-Grenon, J-B., & Rollin, N. (2007). *Oxford Hachette French dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 4th Edition.
- Cuenca, M-J. (2008). Pragmatic markers in contrast: The case of *well*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1373-1391.
- Déprez, V. (2007). Nominal constituents in French lexifier creoles: Probing the structuring role of grammaticalization. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 22, 263-308.
- Dostie, G. (2007). La reduplication pragmatique des marqueurs discursifs: De "là" à "là là". *Langue Française*, 154, 45-60.
- Downing, A. & Martínez Caro, E. (2019). Interjections and emotions: the case of *gosh*. In Lachlan Mackenzie, J. & Alba-Juez, L. (Eds.). *Emotion in Discourse* (pp. 87-112). John Benjamins.
- Harper, D. (n.d.). Etymology of so. *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Accessed at <https://www.etymonline.com/word/so>.
- Fellegly, A. M. (1998). *Here/there, these/those, this/that: Locative discourse markers in New Ulm English*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Minnesota.

- Forget, D. (1989). Là: un marqueur de pertinence discursive. *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, 18(1), 57-82.
- Fox Tree, J. E. & Schrock, J. C. (1999). Discourse Markers in Spontaneous Speech: Oh What a Difference an Oh Makes. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40, 280-295.
- Frank, D. B. (Ed.) (2020). *Kwéyòl Dictionary*. SIL International. Accessed at <https://www.webonary.org/kweyol/>.
- Hansen, M-B. M. (1998). *The function of discourse particles: A study with special reference to spoken standard French*. John Benjamins.
- Honychurch, L. (1995). *The Dominica Story: A History of the Island*. MacMillan Education Ltd.
- Howe, M. L. (1991). *Topic change in conversation*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Hoza, J. (2011). The discourse and politeness functions of *hey* and *well* in American Sign Language. In C. B. Foy (Ed.), *Discourse in signed languages* (pp. 69-95). Gallaudet University Press.
- Joseph, B. D. (1983). *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive: a study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, B. D. (2010). Language contact in the Balkans. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (pp. 618-633). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Joseph, F. L. (1989). *La détermination nominale en créole haïtien*. PhD dissertation. Université de Paris VII.
- Jucker, A. H. (1997). The discourse marker *well* in the history of English. *English Literature and Linguistics*, 1(1), 91-110.
- Lefebvre, C. (1998). *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar: The case of Haitian creole*. Cambridge University Press.
- Local, J. K. & Walker, G. (2005). Methodological imperatives for investigating the phonetic organization and phonological structures of spontaneous speech. *Phonetica*, 62(2-4), 120-130.
- Ludwig, R., Telchid, S., & Bruneau-Ludwig, F. (2001). *Corpus créole: Textes oraux dominicaï, guadeloupéens, guyanais, haïtiens, mauriciens, et Seychellois* (pp. 31-65). Buske.
- Ludwig, R. & Pfänder, S. (2003). La particule *là* en français oral et en créole caribéen : grammaticalisation et contact de langues. In Kriegel, S. (Ed.), *Grammaticalisation et réanalyse: approche de la variation créole et française*, Travaux du CLAIX 18, 269-284.
- Marcus, N. E. (2009). Continuous Semantic Development of the Discourse Marker *well*. *English Studies*, 90(2), 214-242.
- Mayer, M. & Mayer, M. (1975). *One frog too many*. Penguin Young Readers Group.
- Mufwene, S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mufwene, S. (2008). *Language evolution: Contact, competition and change*. Continuum.
- Norén, K. & Linell, P. (2007). Meaning Potentials and the Interaction Between Lexis and Contexts: An Empirical Substantiation. *Pragmatics*, 17(3), 387-416.
- Norricks, N. R. (2009). Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 866-891.
- Olivier, C. (2000). L'interjection *mon Dieu*: variabilité sémantique et situations de discours. *Cahiers de praxémantique*, 34, 161-189.

- Paugh, A. L. (2012). *Playing with language: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. Berghahn Books.
- Peltier, J. P. G. (2022). *Powerful “Little Words” in Contact and in Context: Pragmatic Markers in Kwéyòl Donmnik, English, and French*. PhD dissertation. University of Michigan.
- Pichler, H. (2021). Grammaticalization and language contact in a discourse-pragmatic change in progress: the spread of *innit* in London English. *Language in Society*, 50(5), 723-761.
- Raymond, G. (2004). Prompting action: The stand-alone “so” in ordinary conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37, 185-218.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (2008). The limits of convergence in language contact. *Journal of Language Contact*, 2(1), 213-24.
- Tagliamonte, S. A. & Jankowski, B. L. (2019). *Golly, gosh, and oh my God! What North American dialects can tell us about swear words*. *American Speech*, 94(2), 195-222.
- Taylor, D. (1977). *Languages of the West Indies*. Johns Hopkins.
- Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, S. G. (2008). Social and linguistic factors as predictors of contact-induced change. *Journal of Language Contact*, 2(1), 42-56.
- Thomason, S. G. and Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. University of California Press.
- van Coetsem, F. (1988). *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*. Foris.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Whinnom, K. (1956). *Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Whinnom, K. (1965). Contacts de langues et emprunts lexicaux: The origin of European-based pidgins and creoles. *Orbis*, 14, 509-527.
- Winford, D. (2020). Theories of Language Contact. In Grant, A. P. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact* (pp. 1-27). Oxford University Press.

NOTES

1. It is primarily community elders who use Kwéyòl. “The language is losing fluent speakers and is no longer spoken as a first language by the majority of Dominican children; by most measures, then, [Kwéyòl] would be considered an endangered language” (Paugh, 2012:9). Fortunately, advocates such as the members of Dominica’s Konmité pou Étid Kwéyòl (Committee for the Study of Creole) are using publications, educational interventions, and other efforts to revitalize the language variety and to improve attitudes towards its use.
2. This article centers on a portion of my doctoral dissertation research (see Peltier, 2022).
3. Notice that throughout this manuscript, I use terminology that is modality-neutral, such as *utterer*, *user*, or *interlocutor* rather than *speaker* and *addressee* rather than *listener*. However, terms

such as *speaker*, *listener*, and *hearer* are used in the cited literature, as most of this research centralizes spoken languages.

4. The LC transcriber/translator uses parenthesis to indicate that a Kwéyòl user may have misspoken (e.g., *fou* ‘mad’ instead of *fon* ‘deep’ in (35), *Donmnik* ‘Dominican(s)’ instead of *Donmnik* ‘Dominica’ in (38)).

ABSTRACTS

Pragmatic markers (PMs) are multifunctional elements that allow language users to organize and coordinate discourse and to express their attitudes and cognitive states. This study compares the discourse-pragmatic functions and distributional features of four PMs in Kwéyòl Donmnik (*konsa* ‘so’, *èben* ‘well’, *papa/Bondyé* ‘papa/God’, *la* ‘there’) with those of their etyma in French, Kwéyòl’s lexifier ((*ou*) *comme ça*, (*eh*) *ben*, *bon Dieu*, *là*), and with their counterparts in English, the colonial source language with which it has been in contact for more than two centuries (*so*, *well*, *oh my God*, *there*). The properties of the Kwéyòl PMs are determined through a corpus analysis and are then compared to descriptions of the French and English PMs in previous studies. Each of the four Kwéyòl PM’s has functions in common with its French etymon and its English counterpart as well as its own unique functions. In addition, English *so* performs functions in the Kwéyòl data that are unique to Kwéyòl *konsa* ‘so’, suggesting that *so* is being integrated into Kwéyòl. This study expands the limited body of work on Kwéyòl and deepens our understanding of language contact and Creole emergence at the discourse-pragmatic level, particularly in cases involving a second, non-lexifier colonial source language.

Les marqueurs pragmatiques (MP) sont des éléments multifonctionnels qui permettent aux locuteurs d’organiser leurs échanges linguistiques et d’exprimer leurs attitudes et états cognitifs. Cette étude compare les fonctions discursives-pragmatiques et les caractéristiques distributionnelles de quatre MP en kwéyòl donmnik (*konsa* ‘alors/(ou) comme ça’, *èben* ‘(eh) ben’, *papa/Bondyé* ‘papa/Dieu’, *la* ‘là’) avec celles de leurs étymons en français, sa langue lexificatrice ((*ou*) *comme ça*, (*eh*) *ben*, *bon Dieu*, *là*), et avec celles de leurs homologues en anglais, la langue coloniale avec laquelle le kwéyòl a été en contact pendant plus de deux siècles (*so* ‘alors’, *well* ‘ben’, *oh my God* ‘oh mon Dieu’, *there* ‘là’). Les propriétés des MP kwéyòls sont déterminées par une analyse de corpus et par la suite comparées avec les descriptions des MP en français et en anglais dans des études antérieures. Chacun des quatre MP kwéyòls a des fonctions en commun avec son étymon français et son homologue anglais, ainsi que des fonctions uniques. De plus, le MP anglais *so* ‘alors’ joue des rôles dans les données kwéyòl qui sont uniques au MP kwéyòl *konsa* ‘alors/(ou) comme ça’, une observation qui suggère que *so* est en train de s’intégrer dans ce créole. Cette étude contribue à la littérature limitée sur le kwéyòl donmnik en même temps qu’elle approfondit notre compréhension du contact linguistique et de l’émergence des créoles au niveau discursif-pragmatique, particulièrement où il y a une deuxième langue coloniale qui n’est pas la langue lexificatrice.

INDEX

Keywords: pragmatic markers, Kwéyòl Donmnik, congruence, French, English

Mots-clés: marqueurs pragmatiques, kwéyòl donmnik, congruence, français, anglais

AUTHOR

JOY P. G. PELTIER

University of South Carolina, Columbia

jpeltier[at]mailbox.sc.edu