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Abstract: The paper analyzes the attestations in Belizean Creole of the diagnostic features of English-lexifier contact languages proposed by Baker and Huber (2001). It compares the distribution of these features in Belizean Creole and the seven Atlantic English-lexifier pidgins and creoles considered by Baker and Huber (2001). The features identified serve for quantitative measures of the affinity between Belizean Creole and two varieties, Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole, which contributed to its emergence. A number of selected diagnostic features found in Belizean Creole are also discussed.
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1. Introduction

With the exception of Jamaican, most Western Caribbean English-lexifier creoles are relatively under researched. In the case of Belizean Creole, with which this paper is concerned, work on synchronic data is mainly limited to van Valkenburg (1977), Hellinger (1973, 1979), Dayley (1979), Hancock’s (1987) comparative analysis of a number of syntactic features on the basis of 50 sentences and phrases in 33 Atlantantic English-lexifier creoles, and Decker (2009). Holm (1978) includes data from Belizean Creole in his lexicogen of Miskito Coast Creole1. More recently, Bartens and Farquharson (2012) address diachronic issues as well in their study of the distribution of lexical Africanisms in six Western Caribbean English-lexifier varieties, including Belizean Creole2.

This paper presents the attestations in Belizean Creole of the diagnostic features of English-lexifier contact languages proposed by Baker and Huber (2001). It compares the distribution of these features in Belizean Creole and other Atlantic English-lexifier Pidgins and Creoles. It then evaluates the relevance of the diagnostic features attested in Belizean Creole to establishing historical-linguistic relationships with two English-lexifier creoles believed to have contributed to its emergence. Finally, a number of selected features are also discussed.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the corpus and the methodology used in compiling the list of first attestations in Belizean Creole of the diagnostic features of English-lexifier pidgins and creoles proposed by Baker and Huber (2001). Section 3 includes the list of the first attestations in Belizean Creole of these diagnostic features. Section 4 compares the distribution of diagnostic features in Belizean Creole and in the seven Atlantic English-lexifier pidgins and creoles considered by Baker and Huber (2001). Section 5 is concerned with the affinities between Belizean Creole and
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1 Also known as Miskito Coast Creole English (Holm 1978, 1989) or Nicaraguan Creole English (Bartens and Farquharson 2012).
2 The other five are Bahamian, Jamaican, Limón Creole, Miskito Coast Creole, San Andrés Creole, and Providence Creole.
two English-lexifier varieties, Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole, which contributed to its formation. Section 6 discusses a number of selected diagnostic features recorded in Belizean Creoles. Section 7 summarizes the findings.

2. Data and methodology


For the purposes of the present paper, diagnostic features are “significant phonological, lexical, or grammatical deviations from, or innovations to, varieties of British English – since British English was the major input in the restructuring process” (Baker and Huber 2001: 163). The 302 diagnostic features suggested by Baker and Huber (2001: 197-204) are divided into three groups: Atlantic (173), world-wide (75), and Pacific (54). Atlantic features are recorded in at least two Atlantic English-lexifier pidgins and creoles. World-wide features are attested in at least one Atlantic and one Pacific variety. Pacific features are only found in Pacific varieties. The approach adopted here is not limited to synchronic attestations, but it takes into account features recorded at any time in the history of Belizean Creole, although not all of these remain in use. One advantage of this approach is that it can contribute to establishing the historical links between Belizean Creole and other English-lexifier pidgins and creoles. Another advantage is that making use of Baker and Huber’s (2001) list of diagnostic features, the distribution of which is illustrated in seven Atlantic and six Pacific varieties, ensures comparability of their data with those on Belizean Creole.

For ease of reference, each diagnostic feature is numbered and labeled and/or defined as in Baker and Huber (2001: 197-204). In the case of a number of items found in published works, there are discrepancies between the year of the first attestation and the year of publication of the source. The date of the first attestation of some of these items corresponds to the year when the author is known to have been in Antigua. For others, it corresponds to a year explicitly mentioned by the author. The entry for each feature includes the date of the first attestation and the relevant reference. When an exact year cannot be established, the system used by Baker and Huber (2001: 164-165) has been adopted: a year preceded by a hyphen reads ‘in or before’. The year of full attestations, i.e. of well-established features, is unbracketed, while that of a marginal feature is given in square brackets. Attestations are scored as follows: a full attestation is scored 1, whereas a marginal one receives a score of 0.5. Variants are also listed, if they are
suggestive of different pronunciations or if they illustrate different uses/meanings. Some entries also include later attestations to illustrate the use of particular features. The sources are mentioned between round brackets. All examples appear in the orthography or system of transcription used in the sources. The length of quotations has been kept to a reasonable minimum. Relevant items in quotations are in bold characters. All quotations are accompanied by their translation.

3. First attestations in Belizean Creole

The following is the list of diagnostic features found in Belizean Creole:

3. aki (fruit/tree)  
akkee 1883 (Morris 1883: 113)
7. Anancy (folk tale character)  
Anansi stori 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 104)  
‘Anansi story’
brada hanansi 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 104)  
‘Brother Anansi’
nansi stori 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 106)  
‘Anansi story’
Hanaasi 1980 (Young 1980: 13)
Hanasse 1985 (Hellinger 1985: 174)
Anaansi/Hanaansi 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 28)
8. bad mouth ‘speak ill of, curse’  
‘No matter how much Mary speaks ill of Betsy’
9. bakra ‘European, white person’  
Buckras ‘white men’ 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 1)
10. bang ‘hit (as punishment)’  
ih wahn bang mi gud 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 41)  
‘he’ll really beat me’
13. bateau ‘boat’  
bateau 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 84)
15. big eye ‘greed(y)’  
big eye 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 99)
22. bra ‘brother’  
i se...bra 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 104)  
“Bro…” he said
Bre Tayga (Escurio 1983: 46)  
‘Brother Tiger’
Braa 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 62)
23. bubbly ‘woman’s breast’  
bobi ‘large breast’ 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 58)
27. calaloo ‘a rich soup or stew’  
kalalu 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 172)
29. chigger ‘chigoe’  
lak yu ga chiga eenu yu 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 74)  
‘as if you had chiggers’
30. copper ‘money’  
Yu kyaahn bai notn fi kapa 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 176)  
‘You can’t buy anything for a penny’
31. crapaud ‘frog’
crapaud 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 175)
32. cunny ‘stealth, cunning, cleverness’
kóni 1978 (Holm 1978: 25)
33. da, de (progressive)
Fool di talk 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
‘A fool is talking’
34. de, da, na, a (equative copula)
Fus laugh de na laugh. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
Lit. ‘The first laugh is not a laugh’
den a jos wan nyuusans 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 105)
‘they are just an annoyance’
35. de (locative copula)
wey weak fence dey 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
‘where the weak fence is’
36. dead house ‘mortuary’
ded hows 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 86)
37. dem (article, demonstrative)
Dem Indian men no be long now -1798 (Forbes 1914: 71)
‘Those Indian men won’t be long now’
pitel dem (nominal plural)
jentilman hu had waif dem 1970 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 106)
‘the gentlemen who had wives’
38. preposed dem (nominal plural)
dem pəkət 1987 (Hancock 1987: 305)
‘pockets’
39. dem (3PL POSS)
wid dehn bun an music 1974 (McKesey 1974: 95)
‘with their band and music’
40. dokumulakna (kind of starchy food)
dukunu n.d. (BKMD)
di kaan eena di dukunu 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 95)
‘the corn in the dukunu’
41. done VERB (completive)
til you done cross da ribber 1950 (Anderson 1958: 99)
‘until you have crossed the river’
42. doormouth ‘threshold’
bai dehn doa mowt 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 92)
‘in their doorway’
43. dohti ‘earth, dirt’
dutty ‘the earth gets slippery’
44. dry eye ‘boldness’
frai aiy ‘barefaced, brazenness, nerve, shamelessness’ 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 164)
45. duppy ‘zombie’
duppy 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 207)
46. eyewater ‘tear’
Save you eye-water for when you ma ded. 1980 (Young 1980: 21)
‘Save your tears for when your mother dies’.
47. for PRON NP (genitive)
Fe you coco roas. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
‘Your tuber is roasted.’
Fe dem kau 1987 (Hancock 1987: 291)
‘their car’
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59. for VERB (modal)  
Whey fe happen affa happen. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)  
‘What must happen has to happen.’

60. for true ‘truly’  
you ‘trike him good for true’ -1798 (Forbes 1914: 33)  
‘you struck him really hard’  
fu true ‘in truth’ 1997 (BKGSG: 42)  
di man mi did gaan eena di laydi haws fi chroo. 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 80)  
‘the man really did go into the lady’s house.’

61. fu (starch food, boiled and pounded)  
Good soup neber meet good fufoo. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)  
‘A good soup never meets a good fufu.’

62. ful up di kantayna dehn wid wasta 2012 (NT 2012: 236)  
‘fill this container with water’  
Dehn haat ful up wid aal kaina wikitnis 2012 (NT 2012: 380)  
‘Their heart is full of all kinds wickedness’

63. fum ‘beat’  

65. goombeh ‘a Cassandra’

to have goat-mout ‘to bring bad luck to whatever one talks about’ 1980 (Young 1980: 21)  
Yu put goat mowt pahn mi 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 126)  
‘You said that about me’

67. gumbay ‘drum’  
Barra gumbo neber play till day-light. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)  
Lit. ‘A borrowed drum never plays till dawn.’

69. loakos ahn wail honi 2012 (NT 2012: 6)  
‘locusts and wild bees’

70. how come ‘why’ etc.  
How kom dehn seh 2012 (NT 2012: 214)  
‘Why did they say’

71. hungry ‘hunger, starvation’  
Pipl mi-di ded fi hongri 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 214)  
‘People were dying of hunger’

72. ena, na (locative preposition)  
ena same road 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)  
‘on the same road’

73. Irish potato ‘potato’  
diirish pitiêta ‘white potato’ 1978 (Holm 1978: 1)

76. john crow (bird sp.)  
‘John Crow’ (vulture) -1798 (Forbes 1914: 58)  
jancrow ‘carion crow’ 1980 (Young 1980: 1)  
Jranko 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 164)

77. jook ‘pierce, stab’ etc.  
jook 1965 (Allsopp 1996: 316)  
juk 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 168)

79. jumbie ‘malevolent spirit, zombie’  
jumbie ‘spirit’ 1980 (Young 1980: 31)

81. k/g palatalized before f/  
kyaan tel yu 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 105)  
‘I can’t tell you’

gyardin ‘garden’ -1798 (Forbes 1914: 216)
84. kaka ‘shit, excrement’
caca ‘shit’ 1980 (Young 1980: 26)
86. kasada ‘cassava’
cassada 1883 (Morris 1883: 114)
87. kata ‘head-pad’
    if you put wahn kata anda it 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 177)
    ‘if you put a pad under it’
89. kiba ‘cover’
    all y hayr kibba y face 1974 (McKesey 1974: 91)
91. kokobe ‘leper, leprosy’
cucubay ‘a local leprous affection’ 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 181)
94. kunumunu ‘stupid person’
kunu’muna (Hellinger 1973: 134)
98. maga ‘thin’
    Tiger mauger 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
    ‘The tiger is thin’
dejn ni maaga 1980 (Beck 1980: 433)
    ‘they were thin’
maager dog 1980 (Young 1980: 17)
    ‘meagre dog’
99. magass ‘crushed cane’
    bagash ‘sugar cane byproduct, used as a fertilizer’ 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 37)
100. married ‘marry’
    Wal ya noh marid da gyal 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 225)
    ‘Why don’t you marry that girl’
102. mouth water ‘saliva’
    Mi mowt waata staat tu ron 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 236)
    ‘My mouth started to water’
104. nasey ‘nasty’
    Bever Dam da wan nasi place 1946 (Donohue 1946: 69)
    ‘Bever Dam is a nasty place’
111. nose hole ‘nostril’
    Di baybi noaz hoal 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 244)
    ‘The baby’s nostrils’
112. NP1 for NP2 (possessive N2’s N1)
    Unu da laik salt fi dis werl 2012 (NT 2012: 10)
    ‘You are the salt of the earth’
114. nufnuf ‘many, plenty of’
    nof nof ‘abundance’ 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 383)
115. nyam ‘eat; food’
    Dawg no nyam dawg. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
    ‘A dog will not eat a dog.’
120. obeah ‘kind of magic’
    Obeah art 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 173)
122. pantap ‘on’
    an payl dem pant ap a dem myul bak 1978 (Escure 1983: 34)
    ‘and pile them on the back of their mule’
123. pass (serialized comparative)
    pass 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 432)
    Da fish don pass faiv pong lang taim. 2013 (Decker 2013: 52)
    ‘The fish was much more than five pounds.’
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127. pikni ‘small; child, offspring’
    picney 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 172)
128. pinda ‘peanut’
    pindar-nuts 1883 (Morris 1883: 110)
    pinda 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 266)
129. play ‘(to have a) party, dance, amusement’
    laydit play eena [...] minischri 2012 (NT 2012: 141)
    ‘ladies have a party in [a] monastery’
130. pinda 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 266)
    pikni ‘small; child, offspring’
131. piinda 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 285)
    (make) play ‘(to have a) party, dance, amusement’
132. pinda 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 266)
    pinda 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 285)
133. pinda 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 266)
    pinda 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 285)
134. (for) sake (of) ‘because’
    seek a intafearing 1970 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 112)
    ‘because of interfering’
135. sayk a kvaahn kip yu mowt shet 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 301)
    ‘because you can’t keep your mouth shut’
    beks fi sayka dehn 2012 (NT 2012: 468)
    ‘angry because of them’
136. santapi ‘centipede’
    Wen santapi stin yu 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 300)
    ‘When you are stung by a centipede’
137. say (complementizer) a tel unu se breda taiga no ded 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1966: 106)
    ‘I tell you brother Tiger is not dead’
138. soso ‘only’
    a me de soso taak 1987 (Hancock 1987: 322)
    ‘I was merely chatting’
139. so tel() ‘until; a long time’
    nebba caald halligetta big mout sotay you done crass di riba 1974 (McKesey 1974: 103)
    ‘Never call an alligator ‘big mouth’ until you have crossed the river.’
    mi me so ngri swo tel mi me waan daf 1987 (Hancock 1987: 319)
    ‘I was so hungry, I almost died’
140. strong ear/ hard ear ‘stubbornness’
    aze-haad 1980 (Young 1980: 5)
141. sweet ‘tasty; please (v.)’
    Da joak [...] sweet mee 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 340)
    ‘That joke made me laugh.’
142. sweetmouth ‘flattery’
    shee ga sweet mowt 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 340)
    ‘she has a flattering mouth’
149. Takoma ‘Anansi’s son’
Hatakuma 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 144)

150. tan lek ‘be like, resemble’
Dis ya time no tan laka before’ time. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
‘This time is not like former times.’
Dem no stan laʃk dat 1987 (Hancock 1987: 287)
‘They’re not like that’

151. tata ‘father’
tata ‘Father; term of affection or respect for an elderly person’ 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 549)

152. tief ‘steal’
e tief piece 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
‘he steals a piece’

156. tother, tara ‘other’
John live tara side the canal 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 548)
‘John lives on the other side of the canal’

158. ugly ‘evil’
God no like ugly. 1980 (Young 1980: 30)
‘God doesn’t like evil.’

160. unu (2PL)
unu pipipl 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1966: 105)
‘you people’

161. vex ‘be-angry’
‘Her pa got up, vexed’
And no vex with we 1974 (Lord’s Prayer)
Lit. ‘And do not be angry with us’

162. wari (African board game)
warree 1996 (Allsopp 1996: 589)

166. WH make ‘why’
Weh mek you mouth so long? 1980 (Young 1980: 16)
‘Why is your mouth so long?’

169. woodslave (lizard sp.)
wood-slave 1806 (Henderson 1811: 153)

172. yai ‘eye’
yai 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 172)

173. yerri ‘hear’
You yerri Bellona blow? 1976 (Beck 1983: 54)
‘Did you hear Bellona blow?’

174. all about ‘everywhere’
Ah saach aal bowt fi mi kee 2009 (Crobie et al. 2009: 296)
‘I searched everywhere for my keys’

177. be (predicative copula)
dey be mos’ goos as free [-1798] (Forbes 1914: 157)
‘they are almost as good as free’

179. before time ‘formerly’
Dis ya time no tan laka before’ time. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
‘This time is not like former times.’
180. born ‘give birth’
  fi di uman baan ih baybi 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 34)
  ‘for the woman to have her baby’
181. bruck ‘break’
  me bruk rockstone 1957 (Beck 1983: 44)
  ‘I break stone’
  Big wo’d no brok man jaw-bone 1980 (Young 1980: 15)
  ‘Big words don’t break a man’s jaw’
182. byandby (adv.) ‘soon’
  I come back to ‘dis place for true, by and by’ -1798 (Forbes 1914: 215)
  ‘I’ll really come back to this place soon’
  Say it fu bumbai. 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 69)
  ‘Save it for later.’
  bam-bye ‘presently, soon’ 2013 (Decker 2013: 57)
183. dat() (definite article)
  til you done cross da ribber 1950 (Anderson 1958: 99)
  ‘until you have crossed the river’
184. dead ‘die’
  ii noa dat ii weng ded 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 105)
  ‘he knows that he will die’
185. dem (3pl.)
  Dehn di fight fi bigger potato 1932 (Beck 1983: 50)
  ‘They are fighting for the bigger potato’
  deng gaan chap òti plantej 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 104)
  ‘they went to clear the scrub’
  ‘they went all around’
186. fall down ‘fall (reanalysis)
  ia noa dat ii weng ded 1966 (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 105)
  ‘fall into temptation’
  jual dong 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 408)
187. for (infinite)
  me no know for talk -1798 (Forbes 1914: 45)
  ‘I don’t know how to speak’
  Dawg hab liberty fi watch gubnor. 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
  ‘A dog has liberty to look at a governor.’
  Wen man got natt’n fo do 1925 (Metzgen and Cain 1925)
  ‘When a man has nothing to do’
188. go (future)
  we go beat dem ‘paniar man -1798 (Forbes 1914: 70)
  ‘we will beat those Spaniards’
189. got ‘have’
  You got more gall than iguana got! 1924 (Ricketson jr. 1935: 286)
  ‘You have more gall than an iguana has’
  Dadi noh ga no moni fi bai ni buk dehn. 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 129)
  ‘Daddy doesn’t have any money to buy my books.’
  Humoch aklak yu ga? 2009 (Crosbie et al. 2009: 26)
  ‘What time is it?’
190. he (resumptive)
  Juaji hihn ga big akonk da bank 2014 (Salmon 2014: 91)
  ‘That Georgie has a big bank account’
191. he (3sg obl.)
  wid he -1798 (Forbes 1914: 157)
  ‘with him’
198.  he (3SG POSS)

No nigger [...] wink *e eye -1798 (Forbes 1914: 74)
‘No Black will wink his eye’

199.  him (3SG)

um picney white 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 172)
‘his child is white’

200.  Hihn noa evriting! 2012 (NT 2012: 646)
‘He knows everything’

202.  lili ‘little’

Lili hatchet 1950 (Anderson 1958: 99)
‘the small hatchet’

203.  little bit ‘slightly’

Ah di boas lee bit tu moch 2012 (NT 2012: 465)
‘I boasted slightly too much’

205.  make (causative/imperative)

No make I [let me] beat you up? 1980 (Beck 1980: 433)
‘won’t you let me beat you up?’

206.  make haste ‘hurry’

mike:s ‘hurry up’ 1973 (Hellinger 1973: 132)

207.  -man (agentive suffix)

huntsman ‘hunter’ 1806 (Henderson 1811: 57)

208.  me (1SG)

me nevar see -1798 (Forbes 2014: 23)
‘I have never seen’

209.  me (1SG POSS)

cussin me daddy 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 171)
‘cursing my father’

211.  more better ‘better’

una moa beta dan sohnabadi els 2012 (NT 2012: 492)
‘you are better than somebody else’

212.  most ‘almost’

dey mos’same as Maas Steve -1798 (Forbes 1914: 79)
‘they are almost like Master Steve’

213.  NP1 NP2 (possessive N1’ N2)

riber-bottom 1924 (Ricketson jr. 1935: 285)
‘the bottom of the river’

214.  never (negative-completive)

i neva stjaradi 1987 (Hancock 1987: 303)
‘She hasn’t (already) sung’

215.  no (negator)

me no know for talk -1798 (Forbes 1914: 45)
‘I don’t know how to speak’

218.  one (indfinite article)

Bever Dam da wan nasi place 1946 (Donoue 1946: 69)
‘Bever Dam is a nasty place’

219.  one time ‘(at) once’

I go swinge dem out one time -1798 (Forbes 1914: 124)
‘I’ll swing them out at once’

221.  piccaninny ‘small; child’

Every John-crow believe his own piccaninny white. 1924 (Ricketson jr. 1935: 285)
‘Every vulture believes its own offspring is white.’
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The total number of diagnostic features recorded in Belizian Creole thus amounts to 141. Of these, the following 15 features are not listed in Crosbie et al. (2009): 13. bateau ‘boat’; 31. crapaud ‘frog’; 15. big eye ‘greed(y)’; 32. cunny ‘stealth, cunning, cleverness’; 49. dohti ‘earth, dirt’; 51. duppy ‘zombie’; 63. fum ‘beat’; 69. honi ‘bee’; 73. Irish potato ‘potato’; 79. jumbee ‘malevolent spirit, zombie’; 91. kokobe ‘leper, leprosy’; 132. potapota ‘mud; muddy’; 151. tata ‘father’; 162. wari (African board game); 221. piccaninny ‘small; child’.

A brief comment is in order with respect to the attestations that predate 1900. According to Baker and Huber (2001: 159), the discovery of such attestations “minimizes the effect of later, non-diffusionist cross-influences” between the Atlantic English Creoles.
“e.g. through the media, modern communication or increased mobility in the 20th century”. As seen above, although the first records of Belizean Creole date from as early as 1798, only 29 (i.e. 20.5%) out of the 141 diagnostic features found in Belizean Creole are first recorded before 1900. This is a consequence of the fact that attestations of Belizean Creole are found in only four pre-1900 sources (see Henderson 1811, Morris 1883, Robertson Gibbs 1883, and Forbes 1914).

Note, however, that, in spite of the paucity of early records of Belizean Creole, two Atlantic features are, based on current evidence, first attested in this variety. The diagnostic features at issue are 76. *john crow* (bird sp.) and 81. *k/g* palatalized before /a/, both first recorded in 1798.

A number of diagnostic found in Belizean Creole must have been in use considerably earlier than the date of their first attestations. This is, for instance, the case of the African-derived lexical items. Out of a total of 19, only 3 have pre-1900 attestations. The remaining 16 are all first recorded after 1925: 7. *Anancy* (folktales character); 45. *dokanudukna* (kind of starchy food); 49. *dohti* ‘earth, dirt’; 51. *duddy* ‘zombie’; 61. *fufu* (starch food, boiled and pounded); 63. *fum* ‘beat’; 67. *gumbay* ‘drum’; 77. *jook* ‘pierce, stab, etc.’; 79. *jumbee* ‘malevolent spirit, zombie’; 87. *kata* ‘head-pad’; 115. *nyam* ‘eat; food’; 122. *potapota* ‘mud; muddy’; 143. *soso* ‘only’; 149. *Takoma* ‘Anansi’s son’; 160. *unu* (2PL); 162. *wari* (African board game).

Also, as is the case of other Atlantic English-lexified pidgins and creoles, feature 84. *kaka* ‘shit, excrement’ must have been in use earlier than the date of its first attestation. Presumably, as put by Baker (1999: 330), “many authors and publishers would formerly have considered this word too vulgar to print”.

4. Belizean Creole and other English-lexifier pidgins and creoles

Baker and Huber (2001: 171, Figure 5) show the absolute number of diagnostic features in the Atlantic varieties considered. With a total of 141 features, Belizean Creole ranks lower than Jamaican, Krio and West African Pidgin English, but higher than Kittitian, Suriname3, Gullah and Bajan.

According to Baker and Huber (2001: 171), “a fundamental difference between the Atlantic and Pacific varieties” is that “the absolute number of features in the latter is generally lower, with the average in the Atlantic being more than twice as high than that in the Pacific”. The average number of diagnostic features in Atlantic varieties is 145.4, but only 63.3 in the Pacific ones (Baker and Huber 2001: 171). With an absolute number of 141 features, Belizean Creole is therefore below the average for the Atlantic English-lexifier pidgins and creoles considered by Baker and Huber (2001).

The absolute number of world-wide features attested in Belizean Creole is 44. Table 1 compares the distribution of world-wide features in the Atlantic English-lexifier varieties considered by Baker and Huber (2001: 171) and in Belizean Creole:

3 The creoles of Suriname are treated as “a single entity” by Baker and Huber (2001: 161).
4 Abbreviations used in Tables 1 and 2: BEL = Belizean Creole; BJN = Bajan; GUL = Gullah; JAM = Jamaican; KRI = Krio; SKI = Kittitian; SRN = Suriname; WAF = West African Pidgin English.
Table 1. World-wide features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SRN</th>
<th>B JN</th>
<th>S KI</th>
<th>J A M</th>
<th>G U L</th>
<th>K R I</th>
<th>W A F</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>B E L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belizean Creole thus would fall within the range of Atlantic varieties (from 36.0 to 63.0), slightly below the average. Table 2 illustrates the proportion of world-wide features in the Atlantic varieties considered by Baker and Huber (2001: 172) and in Belizean Creole:

Table 2. Percentage of world-wide features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SRN</th>
<th>B J N</th>
<th>S K I</th>
<th>J A M</th>
<th>G U L</th>
<th>K R I</th>
<th>W A F</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>B E L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belizean would be again situated within the range of Atlantic varieties (from 28.4 to 41.6), below the average. According to Baker and Huber (2001), the relatively low percentage of world-wide features in the Atlantic pidgins and creoles is generally indicative of varieties spoken in territories in which there were population movements (see also section 5).

In light of the above, it may be concluded that Belizean Creole exhibits characteristics typical of the Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles in terms of the distribution of diagnostic features.

5. Affinities of Belizean Creole with Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole

Diagnostic features are also relevant to the assessment of the historical links between specific Atlantic English-lexifier creoles. Their distribution thus supplements historical evidence on e.g. colonization, demographics, the origin of slaves, and migration patterns.

It is well known that “as England’s largest and economically most important island in the West Indies, Jamaica became the “metropolis” for the smaller British settlements in the Western Caribbean” (Holm 1989: 467). Given that Jamaica “sent people of African descent to most of the other places where WECCs are spoken” (Bartens and Farquharson 2012: 187), from the point of view of the diffusion of Atlantic English-lexifier creoles, Jamaican is therefore “the most important variety in the area” (Holm 1989: 467).

British logwood settlements were established in what is today Belize in the 1670s. These settlers, known as the “Bay Men” were expelled by the Spanish in 1730 and 1754, when they joined the so-called “Shore Men” on the Miskito Coast, in what is today Honduras (Holm 1989: 477). After a military defeat by the Spaniards in 1786 and a peace treaty between Britain and Spain in 1787, some British 2,000 colonists and their slaves

5 In varieties having developed to a large extent independently, the percentage of world-wide features is significantly higher: thus, the average is 66.6% for the six Pacific varieties considered by Baker and Huber (2001: 173).

6 WECCs = Western Caribbean English-lexifier Creoles.

The socio-historical background outlined above points to historical-linguistic relationships between Belizean Creole, on the one hand, and Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole, on the other hand. This is confirmed by the number of diagnostic features shared by Belizean Creole with Jamaican and respectively Miskito Coast Creole:

Table 3. Diagnostic features shared by Belizean Creole with Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varieties</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEL with JAM</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL with MCC</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as shown by Baker (1999: 337), measuring the affinity between individual varieties must go beyond the mere comparison of shared features, given the differences in the quantity and quality of data available for each variety. Affinity can be determined with the statistical method used by Baker (1999: 337). First, the number of diagnostic features a pair of varieties would share if the distribution of these were random is calculated. The formula can be stated as follows: \( N_i \times N_j / N_t \) (where \( N_i \) = number of features in variety \( i \), \( N_j \) = number of features in variety \( j \), and \( N_t \) = total number of features considered). Second, the result obtained is deducted from the actual number of diagnostic features shared. This shows whether the number of the shared features is more or less than predicted by a random distribution. A high positive value for the difference between the actual and the predicted number of shared features indicates relatedness. This method can therefore be applied to the quantification of the affinities between Belizean Creole and other Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles which have influenced it. Since all three are Atlantic varieties, the base taken into account should consist of the 173 Atlantic and the 75 world-wide features of Baker and Huber (2001), i.e. a total of 248. The results are set out in Table 4:

Table 4. Affinities of Belizean Creole with Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varieties</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEL and JAM</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL and MCC</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, for both pairs, i.e. Belizean Creole and Jamaican and respectively Belizean Creole and Miskito Coast Creole, high better-than-random scores obtain. These reflect the strong influence of both Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole on Belizean Creole.

---

7 Including five features, which do not figure among those attested in this variety according Baker and Huber (2001: 197-204). For the relevant attestations see Avram (2003, 2004 and 2015a).
8 Data from Holm (1978).
9 The method was first used by Baker (1999).
6. Discussion of selected features

As mentioned in section 3, the diagnostic features attested in Belizean Creole include 19 lexical items which can be traced to African languages\(^\text{10}\). These are listed in Table 5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Anancy (folktale)</td>
<td>Akan / Guang / Gbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. dokunaldakna</td>
<td>Akan / Guang / Sefwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. duppy ‘zombie’</td>
<td>Akan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149. Takoma ‘Anansi’s son’</td>
<td>Akan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162. wari (African board game)</td>
<td>Akan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. dohiti ‘earth, dirt’</td>
<td>Akan / Igbo / Yoruba / Kikongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. potapota ‘mud; muddy’</td>
<td>Akan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. kokohe ‘leper, leprosy’</td>
<td>Akan / Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. fufu (starch food, boiled and pounded)</td>
<td>Atlantic / Bantu / Kru / Kwa / Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. jook ‘pierce, stab, etc.’</td>
<td>Fula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. (n)yam ‘eat; food’</td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. bakra ‘European, white person’</td>
<td>Efik / Ibibio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. obeah ‘kind of magic’</td>
<td>Efik / Ibibio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. sosso ‘only’</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160. unu (2PL)</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. fun ‘beat’</td>
<td>Ijo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. gumbay ‘drum’</td>
<td>Kikongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. jumbee ‘malevolent spirit, zombie’</td>
<td>Kikongo / Kimbundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. kata ‘head-pad’</td>
<td>Bantu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrence of these features confirms the important lexical contribution of the Gold Coast, i.e. the languages of the Akan and Gbe clusters, to the Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles\(^\text{11}\) as well as of languages, such as Efik, Ibibio, Igbo, contiguous or geographically proximate to the Gold Coast. The contribution of the Atlantic, Mande and Bantu languages is also reflected. However, several remarks are in order with respect to these lexical Africanisms. First, as noted by Parkvall (2000: 154), neither “the preponderance of […] Akan” nor “the widespread 2pl pronoun /unu/ […] from Igbo” are “compatible with any known or reconstructed demographical dominance of these two groups”. Second, these lexical Africanisms most probably did not emerge in situ. Indeed, as put by Bartens and Farquharson (2012: 187), “it seems extremely unlikely that slaves from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds […] would all independently adopt the same African word for the same concept”. Rather, their occurrence “is highly suggestive of diffusion from Jamaica” because it is “far more likely that the word[s] in question [were] in general use in one territory that participated in the settlement of others” (Barten \text{\textsc{\textit{s}}} and Farquharson 2012: 187). As already mentioned in section 5, the territory at issue is

\(^{10}\) For their etyma the reader is referred to Allsopp (1996), Aceto (1999), Baker (1999), Bartens and Farquharson (2012), Farquharson (2012).

\(^{11}\) See e.g. Aceto (1999) and Parkvall (2000: 109-112).
Jamaica. Unsurprisingly, all the 19 lexical Africanisms found in Belizean Creole are also recorded in Jamaican (Baker and Huber 2001: 197-201) as well as in Miskito Coast Creole (Holm 1978: 1-53).

The same African substratal input is also reflected in the following calques\(^{12}\):

15. \textit{big eye} ‘greed(y)’ from Akan and/or Igbo, 8. \textit{bad mouth} ‘speak ill of, curse’ from Mande, and 48. \textit{doormouth} ‘threshold’ from Mande and/or Yoruba\(^{13}\). As in the case of the lexical items of African origin, it is extremely likely that these calques were diffused from Jamaican, i.e. they are not independent developments \textit{in situ}\(^{14}\). Such cases are therefore instances of indirect idiomatic calques\(^{15}\).

Three other diagnostic features recorded in Belizean Creole are believed by some authors to be calques from African languages. Thus, Allsopp (1980: 91, and 1996: 221) traces feature 55. \textit{eyewater} ‘tear’ to Igbo and/or Yoruba. Mande and/or Igbo sources have been suggested by Allsopp (1996: 392) for 107. \textit{mouth water} ‘saliva’. For 148. \textit{sweetmouth} ‘flattery’ the sources mentioned by Alleyne (1980: 116), Holm (1992: 191) and Allsopp (1996: 542) include Akan, Gâ, Igbo, Vai and Yoruba. According to Alleyne (1980: 114), for instance, “there are many lexemes in Afro-American dialects which reveal a labeling pattern whereby objects are named in terms of an association between two primary objects”. However, compounds which are structurally similar to \textit{eyewater} are also found in other pidgins and creoles (Holm 2000: 104, Parkvall and Baker 2012: 237), with different substrate languages. According to Holm (2000: 104), “such compounds may have resulted from a universal strategy for expanding a Pidgin vocabulary to fill lexical gaps”. Parkvall (2000: 113), explicitly mentions \textit{eyewater} as a word “that could predictably be invented on the spot by anybody not knowing any other word”, and notes that this is typically done by lexicalizing semantically transparent compounds. Parkvall (2000: 113) therefore recommends caution since “much of what may be look African in Creole semantics may therefore well be but an indirect manifestation of former Pidginhood”. The same may hold for feature 107. \textit{mouth water} ‘saliva’ as well. As for 148. \textit{sweetmouth} ‘flattery’, this may be an illustration of the fact that “some metaphors [….] are so obvious that they may be expected to turn up by coincidence or ‘reinvention’” (Cassidy 1971: 215). Finally, according to Parkvall and Baker (2012), two other diagnostic features found in Belizean Creole may be idiomatic calques. These are 50. \textit{dry eye} ‘boldness’ is also a potential idiomatic calques, of “UNKNOWN ORIGIN” (Parkvall and Baker 2012: 236) and 66. \textit{goatmouth} ‘a Cassandra’, for which “no African [….] source [….] has yet been found”.

Three French-derived Atlantic features are found in Belizean Creole: 13. \textit{bateau} ‘boat’, 31. \textit{crapaud} ‘frog’, and 99. \textit{magass} ‘crushed cane’. Rather surprisingly, feature 31. \textit{crapaud} ‘frog’ is not found in either Jamaican Creole or Miskito Coas Creole, even though Allsopp (1996: 175) states that this word for ‘frog’ “is the term in widest folk use in CE [= Caribbean English]”. Only one Atlantic feature of Spanish origin is attested in

\(^{12}\) See also Avram (2013, 2017).

\(^{13}\) For their possible sources see Parkvall and Baker (2012).

\(^{14}\) See also Avram (2017: 20).

\(^{15}\) Which include “items diffused via transplanted creoles” (Avram 2017: 20).
Belizean Creole: 133. *rata* ‘rat’. Two world-features of Portuguese origin are recorded in Belizean Creole: 127. *pikni* ‘small; child, offspring’ and 221. *piccaninny* ‘small; child’.

Several forms appear to be restricted to specific registers or contexts, are obsolete or are perhaps no longer used. One such feature is 22. *bra* ‘brother’, which is nowadays “used only in folk tales” (Crosbie et al. 2009: 62). The two variants of 194. *got* ‘have’, *gat* and *ga* are in (quasi) complementary distribution: according to Crosbie et al. (2009: 122), the former is a “conditioned variant often used clause final or before words beginning with a vowel”. As for 9. *bakra* ‘European, white person’, Robertson Gibbs (1883: 171) comments that “it was once more generally their [= locals] habit to call the white folks” Buckras. Similarly, Donohue (1946: 65) writes that “until recently a white man was called ‘Backra’ by his colored friends”. Feature 128. *pinda* ‘peanut’ is found in Belizean Creole, but Crosbie et al. (2009: 189) specify that this form is “archaic” and it is losing out to *peenots* < English *peanuts*. Note, incidentally, that the form *pindar nuts* recorded by Morris (1883: 110) appears to be a hypercorrect variant, lit. ‘peanut nuts’, possibly via contamination with English *peanuts*. Consider next 91. *kokobe* ‘leper, leprosy’. Its only attestation in Belizean Creole dates from 1883 (Robertson Gibbs 1883: 181), and the word has apparently fallen out of use. Similarly, 221. *piccaninny* ‘small; child’ is not used anymore, being replaced with 127. *pikni* ‘small; child, offspring’. This occurs even in proverbs: compare *Every John-crow believe his own pickaninny white*. 1924 (Ricketson jr. 1935: 285) with *Ebry jancrow tink e pikni white* (Young 1980: 1).

As shown in section 3, feature 7. *Ananci* (folktale character) has a number of variants. Some of these, *Anansi* and *Anansí*, are quite close to the etymon: Akan *anânsi* ‘spider’ and/or Ewe-Gbe *anânsi* ‘spider’, Guang *ananse* (Allsopp 1996: 29, Baker 1999: 318, Bartens and Farquharson 2012: 179). Others preserve the etymological word-initial /l/, but this is preceded by /h/: *Hanaansi*, *Hanaasi*, *hanansi*, *Hanassee*. Finally, the variant *nansi* exhibits apheresis of etymological /l-. As for feature 149. *Takoma* ‘Anansi’s son’, etymologically from Akan *ntikúma* ‘small spider’, the Belizean Creole form *Hatakuma* exhibits a non-etymological /l/, additionally preceded by /hl/. Note that the addition in word-initial position of a (non-etymological) /hl/ is also attested in other Belizean Creole words, of various origins, such as *haligeta* ‘alligator’, *hamadili* ‘armadillo’, *hambrelo* ‘(archaic) umbrella’, *hooq*<sup>16</sup> ‘owe’ (see the corresponding entries in Crosbie et al. 2009).

Some variants of several forms reflect earlier pronunciations<sup>17</sup>. For instance, [b] for etymological /s/ (see also Baker 1999: 317) is illustrated by 89. *kiba* ‘cover’: the Belizean Creole variant *kiba*, from dialectal English *kiver* ‘to cover’, is now “archaic” (Crosbie et al. 189), whereas its more frequent counterpart *kova*, from English *cover*, preserves the etymological /s/. Similarly, in the case of feature 214. *never* (negative-completive), Crosbie et al. (2009: 214) that the variant *neba* is “archaic”, the modern one being *neva*. Other variants reflect the deletion of /s/ in onset clusters, typical of Atlantic English-lexifier pidgins and creoles<sup>18</sup>. For 134. *rockstone* ‘stone’ the various early sources for Belizean Creole use spellings such as <raktone> or <rak(s)tone>. Similarly, in 150. *tan

<sup>16</sup> In the orthography used in Crosbie et al. (2009) <oe> stands for [ou].

<sup>17</sup> For a review of the issues involved in the phonological interpretation of early records of English-lexifier creoles see Avram (2000).

<sup>18</sup> See Baker (1999: 318, Avram 2005: 34-100).
lek ‘be like, resemble’ the reflex of English stand is spelled <tan> by Metzgen and Cain (1925), but it is phonetically transcribed as [stan] by Hancock (1987: 287).

Two diagnostic features recorded in Belizean Creole are relevant to the distinction made in the literature between the Western Caribbean and the Eastern Caribbean English-lexified Creoles. Holm (1989: 445) writes that “the normal word for the spirit of a dead person is usually jumby in the Eastern group and duppy in the Western group”. However, as seen in section 3, both 51. duppy ‘zombie’ and 79. jumbee ‘malevolent spirit, zombie’ are found in Belizean Creole, a Western Caribbean English-lexifier variety.19

Consider finally feature 275. look out ‘take care of’. This is listed among the Pacific features by Baker and Huber (2001: 203), but, given its occurrence in Belizean Creole, which is an Atlantic variety, this diagnostic feature should be reclassified as a world-wide one.

6. Conclusions

The earliest attestations in Belizean Creole of diagnostic features of English-lexifier pidgins and creoles contribute to a better understanding of its linguistic past. The inclusion of diachronic data has circumvented the problem of the impact of language change – e.g. decreolization, various other internal developments, late (post-1900) non-diffusionists cross-influences – after the formative period of a particular variety, which may obscure historical links or the extent of the influence exerted by other varieties.

The feature-based approach adopted has provided a quantification of the affinities between Belizean Creole, on the one hand, and Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole, on the other hand. The significant contribution of Jamaican and Miskito Coast Creole to the formation of Belizean Creole is thus confirmed. These findings corroborate historical evidence and the role of Jamaica as a centre of diffusion.

Finally, the findings shed light on the distribution of diagnostic features in English-lexifier pidgins and creoles as well as on the classification of the diagnostic features of English-lexifier pidgins and creoles.
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19 See also Avram (2015b: 30-31).


