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The differences between basilectal and acrolectal varieties of a creole language are often identified, not only by lexical differences, but also by differences in verbal forms (e.g. [giv], [gi], [gi:] for ‘give’, or pronominal forms (e.g. [hm], [im], [hi], [hi:], [am] for ‘him’, from Guyana Creole English). This is also true for the lectal differences found in Daman Indo-Portuguese (DamanIP): the verb form dis (< Ptg. disse ‘s/he said’) is used in the acrolectal variety instead of faló (< Ptg. falou ‘s/he spoke’) ‘said’; the past-tense verb form vey ‘came’ (< Ptg. veio ‘s/he came’) is the acrolectal analog to basilectal djayo ‘came’, and the 3p pronominal form ilz (< Ptg. eles ‘they-M’) the acrolectal analog to basilectal ilot ‘they’. This study examines another trait of acrolectal DamanIP: the avoidance of the 2s familiar pronominal subject pronouns, which has led to the leveling of the familiar-formal distinction in the acrolectal variety of DamanIP.
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1. Introduction

In an oft-cited work on then-British Guiana English varieties, Allsopp (1958) illustrates the basilect-acrolect continuum in Guyanese Creole English (GCE) with the sentence ‘I told him’, as shown in (1), in which each functional or lexical element of the sentence corresponds to three or more forms: ‘I’: [ai], [a], [mi]; ‘told’: [tULD], [to:L], [to:l], [tEl]; ‘him’: [hm], [im], [i], [am], and where the most basilectal realization is not overtly marked for tense, and contains the present-tense form of the verb [tEl], as well as a reanalyzed object pronoun used as a subject pronoun.
For his part, Bell employs a similar strategy, shown in (2) (adapted from Bell 1976: 136 in Wardhaugh 2010:7) using the sentence ‘I gave him one’, to illustrate the complexity of the GCE lectal continuum. Again, for each functional or lexical element in the sentence there are two or more forms: ‘I’: [ai], [a], [mi]; ‘gave’: [giv], [giv], [gi], [gi:]; ‘him’: [him], [im], [hi:], [i:], [æm]; ‘one’: [wan], [wan]. However, in contrast to (1) above, here past marking is almost always overtly realized: morphologically in form of [giv], or with the free-standing elements [did], [di], or [bin] when these appear with [giv], [gi], or [gi:]. (The exceptions are sentences (1e, 1f, 1g, 1r), which appear only with the verb form [giv] or [gi].) What both discussions of the creole continuum in GCE have in common is their selection of elements to illustrate the differences and the variation: both analyses draw on pronominal and verbal forms to highlight the lectal variation. In cases of substantial restructuring, these are the forms that turn out to display substantial variation and those which clearly distinguish English-based creole features from their lexifier-language counterparts.

If we assume that these two subsystems of the grammar (the pronominal system and verbal paradigms) are typically affected by the major restructuring a language undergoes as a consequence of pidginization and/or creolization, the hypothesis would be that if there is evidence of a creole continuum in a given contact situation, we should find variation between a pidgin/creole language and its lexifier in just these subsystems of the grammar.

In Daman Indo-Portuguese (DamanIP), this is indeed the case. As will be discussed, both the DamanIP pronominal system and verbal paradigms exhibit clear lectal differences and variation. Noteworthy is that the contact situations such as in Daman and Guyana have something important in common: both creoles have co-existed beside their respective lexifier language
up until the present. We now give a brief sketch of the history of Daman and offer some thoughts on the formation of DamanIP before discussing the lectal differences.

(2) ‘I gave him one’

(a) [əɾ ɡɛɾv hɪm wʌn] **acrolect**
(b) ɡɛɾv hɪm wʌn
(c) [a ɡɛɾv ɪm wʌn]
(d) [a ɡɛɾv iː wʌn]
(e) e. ɡɪv hɪm wʌn
(f) [a ɡɪv ɪm wʌn]
(g) [a ɡɪv iː wʌn]
(h) [a dɪd ɡɪv iː wʌn]
(i) [a dɪ ɡɪ iː wʌn]
(j) [a dɪd ɡɪ iː wʌn]
(k) [a dɪ ɡɪː iː wʌn]
(l) [a dɪ ɡɪ hiː wʌn]
(m) [mɪ dɪ ɡɪ hiː wʌn]
(n) [mɪ dɪ ɡɪ iː wʌn]
(o) [mɪ bɪn ɡɪ iː wʌn]
(p) [mɪ bɪn ɡɪː iː wʌn]
(q) [mɪ bɪn ɡɪː æm wʌn]
(r) [mɪ ɡɪː æm wʌn] **basilect**

---

1 In this respect, DamanIP stands in stark contrast, for example, to Korlai Indo-Portuguese, spoken about 400 kms. to the south of Daman (see map), where Portuguese presence has been absent since 1740 and where all inhabitants have traditionally been agriculturists (cf. Clements 1996 and Clements 2015).
2. Historical Background of Daman

2.1. Chronological Overview of Daman

The Portuguese reached the Daman area for the first time in 1523, and captured Daman in 1534 with soldiers brought from Chaul/Korlai and Ormuz only to return it later in exchange for Bassein (near Bombay) (Moniz 1923:17). After some difficulty, the Portuguese were able to take control of Daman in 1559. D. Constantino Bragança, the viceroy of the State of India, had a fort built and organized a government with a military presence of 1200 (Moniz 1923:24). In 1581 Daman was granted the rights and privileges of a Portuguese city (Moniz 1923:25).

From 1581 to 1739, Daman was an active port, important both politically and militarily for the Portuguese, especially after the 17th century which saw the Chaul/Korlai area decline considerably. In 1740, the Maratha army invaded the Portuguese Northern Province, captured Chaul/Korlai and part of the Mumbai area, and in exchange for these settlements they allowed the Portuguese to keep Goa, Diu, and Daman (Cunha 1876). Although Daman was thereafter reduced to a minor administrative presence in the Portuguese empire, it still remained a cultural and commercial center during from the 18th to the 20th century. In 1961, the Portuguese colonies of Daman, Diu, and Goa were taken over by the Indian government, and given federal territorial status, answerable to the central government in Delhi.

Despite the fact that the Portuguese presence existed officially in Daman only up until 1961, there remains even today an unmistakable Portuguese presence, apparent in the Catholic religion of the people and in Catholic schools that taught Portuguese as a second language off and on in the last 30 years. Most Daman inhabitants are Portuguese citizens, and although English has taken over as the language of the church and is ubiquitous in the Daman Portuguese community, mass is still celebrated regularly in Portuguese, which is attended mostly by older Daman inhabitants.

Since the early 2000s, Daman has experienced an increasing emigration of its inhabitants to Europe and the influence of English is ever growing, as more and more citizens became aware they could apply for Portuguese citizenship.
2.2. The formation of Daman Portuguese

When Portugal began its colonization of India, 2,000 to 4,000 Portuguese men sailed to Asia annually, the majority ‘being able-bodied and unmarried young men, bound for Golden Goa and further east, relatively few of whom ever returned to Europe’ (Boxer 1975:67). For the most part, these men were from the lower classes of Portuguese society (Boxer 1963:62). The Portuguese practiced miscegenation from the beginning of the colonization. In fact, the reason there were few if any Portuguese women involved in the colonization was, as Boxer (1975:68) notes, ‘that so many Portuguese men, including the soldados ‘soldiers’ preferred to live with a harem of slave girls rather than to marry, at any rate in their younger and more virile days.’ The Portuguese casados (i.e. those who married) also had concubines and often owned slaves.
as well, both men and women, to carry out farm and other types of work (cf. Boxer 1963:61-62).

From the beginning of the colonization of India, we find evidence of Indo-Portuguese offspring. Fernão da Veiga, the judge in charge of the orphans in Goa, reported as early as 1516 to the King of Portugal that 70 orphans, many if not all arguably fathered by the Portuguese, were living from alms in Goa, and requested money in order to provide for them. This type of situation must have been prevalent at that time, not only in Goa, but also in Chaul, Daman, and other settlements as well, given that an overseer of orphans became an official posting in these Portuguese settlements. As an example, among the privileges given to the city of Daman in 1581 by D. Henrique, King of Portugal, was the appointment of a ‘clerk of the orphans’ (Moniz 1923:25).

As was their practice elsewhere, the Portuguese in the settlements in India took it upon themselves to convert the domestic slaves and their offspring to Christianity (Boxer 1963:59-60). The incorporation of Indo-Portuguese offspring as well as native Indians into the Catholic religion constituted a new community in the Indian society, a society reasonably characterized as one in which religious barriers were quite rigid and in which the social structure, i.e. the caste system, was strict and hierarchical. By becoming Christians, the lower-caste Indians became doubly isolated: first, they were isolated from their erstwhile same-caste peers by their religion, and from their Portuguese ‘landlords’ by their lower caste. Boxer (1963:75) notes that ‘the Portuguese at first tried to abolish caste distinctions among their Indian converts, but they soon found that this was impossible and they were forced, however reluctantly, to compromise with this immensely powerful and deep-rooted social and religious system.’ In fact, it was largely due to the barriers of the religious identity and caste as rigid social class that isolated speakers of DamanIP such that its creole language has been maintained up until today.

Regarding a possible scenario for the formation of the DamanIP, it is not unreasonable to assume that when the Portuguese arrived in Daman, they found the vast majority of the inhabitants to be Gujarati-speaking Hindus and Muslims. It was largely the lower-caste Hindus that the Portuguese, notes Boxer (1963:59-61), treated as domestic slaves and with whom they mixed. The first Portuguese to arrive in Daman were soldiers, most of which being of socially lower classes (Boxer 1963:62). It is reasonable to assume that these men probably were familiar with some version of restructured Portuguese, could communicate in this variety, and that they knew, of course, their own
dialect of Portuguese (cf. Clements 1992b, 1993a, 1993b). Apart from the Portuguese element brought by the soldiers, we also know that there must have been speakers, either of a southwest-coast pidgin Portuguese or a creole, whose variety had influence on the formation of the northern IP creoles. In all northern creoles we find reflexes of *appam*, the Dravidian word for rice-flour hand bread. Moreover, in Korlai Indo-Portuguese the word *khadya* ‘tiger’ comes from Malayalam *kaduwa* ‘tiger’.

Although there were several varieties contact, that is, Portuguese, restructured varieties of Portuguese, Gujarati, as well as a minor representation of African-language speakers, what we have, essentially, is largely a case of a two-language contact situation involving Portuguese and Gujarati, with Portuguese as the target language. The actual target for the Indian converts would have been the varieties of Portuguese spoken by Portuguese soldiers, the Indians who accompanied them from the south, and others. The variety emerging out of this situation would most likely have been a pidgin variety of Portuguese and/or a Portuguese creole. It is not unreasonable to assume the Daman Indians’ access to the standard colloquial Portuguese was not complete, and their access to Portuguese pidgin etc. may have been better.

Faced with a new living situation and presented with pidginized, creolized, and/or restructured input of a new language – recall that they did choose to convert to Christianity, which entailed adopting a new language and culture – I assume the Indians would have strived to make themselves understood, trying out words and utterances to see to what extent they could communicate with their Portuguese interlocutors. The successful tries were arguably considered ‘correct’. Thus, the nature of the Portuguese variety in Daman was initially a reflection of the set of communicatively successful utterances and words in the recent converts’ attempts at communicating with the Portuguese (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988:152-53). Some of these words and utterances reflect the imprint of the native grammar onto the variety of Portuguese being learned. For example, the Portuguese words *pé* ‘foot’ and *mão* ‘hand’ were reanalyzed by shifting speakers of Indo-Aryan languages such as Gujarati in Daman to mean ‘foot and leg’ and ‘hand and arm’, respectively. In Indo-Aryan languages, there is one word that corresponds to the whole of both extremities (‘foot’ and ‘leg’ and ‘hand and arm’).²

² Examples involving lexical semantics offer clear evidence of how shifting speaker carry native-language categories into the language they are targeting. The stage at which other structures find their way into a newly forming pidgin or creole language is not as straightforward. As an example, see the cases of naturalistic second language acquisition examined in Klein and Perdue (1992).
Creolization arguably took place in Daman when the offspring of the Indian domestics of the Portuguese began learning as a first language the variety of Portuguese spoken by their community, including parents, other families and family members. It is important to keep in mind that from very early on there existed Indo-Portuguese offspring in Daman and elsewhere in the Portuguese settlements in India. Assuming this scenario, and the isolating nature of the ever-pervasive caste system in place at that time, it seems justified to characterize the type of creole formation in Daman as having taken place in one to three generations. With the formation of this new primary language and the concomitant adoption of another religion, these new Christians forged a new identity. As a consequence, we can assume that social interactions with Hindus of their same caste decreased significantly because of religion. At the same time, the caste system isolated them from the higher caste Portuguese. It is not that they did not interact with these speakers, but rather that their interactions were restricted.

Historically, DamanIP has been spoken in two general areas in Daman: in Big Daman and in Small Daman. Small Daman is the city center and the locus for businesses, shops, hotels, and restaurants. The 1000-1500 DamanIP speakers in this area speak more the acrolectal variety of DamanIP. Big Daman houses government offices and to the south of it there are a number of residential neighborhoods, among which is Badrapur, where the more basilectal variety of DamanIP is spoken, by around 2500-3000 speakers.

There are two main trends that have affected DamanIP in recent years. First, there has been the aforementioned decline in the number of DamanIP speakers due to emigration to Europe. Second, English has made several inroads into the community. While all Catholic Damaneese speak DamanIP at home, English is the norm in school and the church. The majority of the recent Daman émigrés have settled in the UK, where they know the host-country language. In younger DamanIP speakers’ speech, there is evidence of the influence of English (cf. Clements 2009b). From a historical perspective, however, the Portuguese presence has played by far the larger role than English in the development of DamanIP, evident in the forms found in its pronominal and verb systems, which we now turn to.

3. Inter-lectal and Intra-lectal differences in verbal and pronominal forms

In this section, two comparisons will be made in order to illustrate lectal differences involving DamanIP. First, using a comparison between KorlaiIP
and DamanIP, I show that irregular forms are found in both lects of DamanIP where in KorlaiIP the corresponding forms have disappeared through analogy. Second, I compare some differences in DamanIP to highlight the intra-lectal differences.

3.1. Comparison of KorlaiIP and DamanIP verb forms

There are four verbs found in these two creoles, shown in Table (1) that exhibit categorical formal differences in the preterit: the KorlaiIP preterit forms hedzév ‘did’ and tedzév ‘brought’ are built on the present-tense/infinitival forms, and the form for ‘give’, yade is an innovation, a restructured irregular form from já deu ‘s/he already gave’. By contrast, their DamanIP counterparts are reflexes of the 3s preterit irregular Portuguese forms trouxe, fez, and deu. The fourth verb in question, ‘come’, displays two independent innovations in the preterit. In KorlaiIP, yave (< Portuguese já veio ‘s/he already came’) is a language-specific innovation, as is the basilectal DamanIP djayo (< Portuguese já veio ‘s/he already came’), but acrolectal
DamanIP has the preterit form *vey*, a direct reflex of the Portuguese 3s irregular preterit form *veio*.

**Table 1, Verbal forms for ‘bring, come, do,’ and ‘give’in KorlaiIP and DamanIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>present-tense forms</th>
<th>preterit forms</th>
<th>infinitival forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korlai IP</td>
<td>Daman IP</td>
<td>Korlai IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bring’</td>
<td>tedzen</td>
<td>(te)</td>
<td>tedzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘come’</td>
<td>tari</td>
<td>(te) cin</td>
<td>yave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘do’</td>
<td>hedzen</td>
<td>(te) fazen</td>
<td>hedzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘give’</td>
<td>tadan</td>
<td>(te) dan</td>
<td>yade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that DamanIP has direct reflexes of irregular verb forms where KorlaiIP has either innovative irregular forms or forms created by analogy to more frequent forms in their respective paradigms suggests that the presence of Portuguese has influenced this outcome, just as the presence of English is appealed to in order to account for the acrolectal forms [tould] and [gerv] in (1-2) above. Recall that Portuguese has been present in the Daman area, to a greater or lesser degree, during its entire history. By contrast, the Portuguese presence in the Chaul/Korlai area was minimal to non-existent from 1740 onwards.

**3.2. Comparison of basilectal and acrolectal DamanIP verbal and pronominal forms**

It is impossible to know how long the two varieties of DamanIP have existed side by side, but thanks to the work of the early creolist Sebastião Rodolfo Dalgado, we know that the Damanes spoke two lects of their language as far back as 1850 at least. Dalgado (1903) includes translations in both lects of the bible story “Prodigal Son” (Luke 15.11-32), included in Appendices A and B. In Appendices C and D, I have added present-day versions of the story as told by a speaker of acrolectal DamanIP and a speaker of basilectal DamanIP. The Small Daman version was collected in 2000 and told by a 19-year-old woman.

---

3 In the present tense, KorlaiIP formally distinguishes ongoing (e.g. *tedzen* vs habitual (e.g. *to tedze*) forms, as does Daman IP, where ongoing is expressed as *te trazen* and habitual as *trazen*.
The Big Daman version was collected in 1991 from a 51-year-old man from Badrapur.

It is important to note that even though the two varieties are generally seen as being spoken in different geographical areas, I have found that most of the speakers I have studied display features of both varieties to varying degrees and frequencies. Moreover, in some respects, the texts published by Dalgado (1903) display variation as well. Thus, the distinction between the two varieties is not categorical, but one of degree on various different levels. In the discussion that follows, I take illustrative examples from the four texts as well as from Dalgado (1903) and my field notes to highlight the key lectal differences apparent in DamanIP.

The comparison of lexical item use yields a fairly consistent pattern (Table 2). Regarding the verb ‘work’, the older lexical item is servi(r) in 1903, but in the 20th century we find the corresponding nouns, both sirvis and trabal in basilectal DamanIP, but only trabal in acrolectal DamanIP. Regarding the verb ‘say’, we find forms both of fala and dize. In 20th-century acrolectal DamanIP, however, only the forms dize, dizí, dis are found, no forms of fala. In this variety, we also find for ‘put’ the form por, whereas in 1903 in both lects the older forms buta and/or puza are found. For ‘see’, in acrolectal DamanIP only forms of ver are found, where otherwise we find the form ulya. And finally, for ‘get up’, we find in all lects from both time periods the forms from launta and levôtâ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Daman (1903)</th>
<th>1990-2000</th>
<th>Small Daman (1903)</th>
<th>1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>server</td>
<td>sirvis, trabal</td>
<td>‘work’</td>
<td>serví</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falla, diss</td>
<td>fsla(n)</td>
<td>‘say, said’</td>
<td>falla, diss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buta, puza</td>
<td>buta</td>
<td>‘put’</td>
<td>buta, pôss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulhôu</td>
<td>ulya</td>
<td>‘see, saw’</td>
<td>ulyô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>launta</td>
<td>launta, levôtâ</td>
<td>‘get up, lift up’</td>
<td>launto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to copulative verbs (Table 3), both varieties of DamanIP have te ‘is/are, has/have’ and tîy ‘was/were, had’, the copula e/er (< Ptg. é ‘s/he/it is’, era ‘s/he/it was’); the imperfect forms are found only as auxiliaries in Dalgado’s texts, and only in present-day acrolectal DamanIP do we find imperfect copulative forms used in a locative copulative construction, as in (3).
In the group of non-copula and non-auxiliary verbs, no imperfect forms are found in basilectal DamanIP.

(3) ɪ akəl fił mayz vel ki ɪshtav, ɪl nəw
    and that child more old REL COP-IMP3SM NEG
    ɪshtav kaz
    COP-IMPHouse
    ‘And the older brother who was there, he was not at home.’

Disregarding the imperfect forms used as auxiliaries and copulas, one striking difference between the two DamanIP lects in both periods is the presence of imperfect forms of various verbs in the acrolectal variety and the near-absence of the same in the basilectal variety (Table 4).

Table 3. Copulative verb forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big Daman</th>
<th>Small Daman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Dalgado (1903) 1990-2000</td>
<td>in Dalgado (1903) 1990-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tá / (aux.)</td>
<td>tá / tav (aux.)</td>
<td>ishta / ishtav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te / tinh</td>
<td>te / tinh</td>
<td>te / tinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛ / e / er</td>
<td>e / er</td>
<td>sô / ɛ / er</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In acrolectal DamanIP, we also find present-3s forms (Table 6), which are entirely absent in basilectal DamanIP.
Table 5. 3s present-tense forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Daman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deix ‘let’</td>
<td>apâñyo ‘get’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esper ‘wait’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fech ‘close’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fic ‘stay’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostr ‘show’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning now to the pronominal paradigms in DamanIP, the subject and object pronoun inventories for both periods and varieties are given in Tables 6-7. One key trait of the pronominal system in DamanIP is that there is no discrete form for 2p familiar form. This does not seem to be only a trait of DamanIP as KorlaiIP does not have a discrete 2p familiar form either. That said, a striking difference between the two lects is that the present-day acrolectal variety has done away with the 2s familiar form. In other words, it no longer makes the formal/familiar distinction pronominally, whereas basilectal DamanIP does maintain the distinction.

Table 6. Subject Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big Daman</th>
<th>Small Daman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. eu/nós</td>
<td>yo/nós</td>
<td>eu/nós</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Fm). (v)óss//----</td>
<td>òss// ---</td>
<td>óss// ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (FR).</td>
<td>use/usez</td>
<td>ussê (você)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. êl(ell)/illôt</td>
<td>il (el)/êl/ilot(ilot)</td>
<td>êl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Object Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big Daman</th>
<th>Small Daman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. par-mim// ---</td>
<td>par(m)i/i anos</td>
<td>par mim// ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Fm). pór-óss</td>
<td>pór-óss// ---</td>
<td>por-óss// ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (FR).</td>
<td>puse//pusez</td>
<td>pro-ussê// ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. par-êl// ---</td>
<td>pirel/pirel/pilêl</td>
<td>par êl (a êl)// ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several other differences worth noting, as well. In neither variety is there any vestige whatsoever of Portuguese object clitics. Both subject and object pronouns are built on the Portuguese subject pronoun paradigm, except for the basilectal 3p, where we find the forms *ilot, elot* derive from Portuguese *eles outros*. The object pronouns exhibit a categorical difference between present-day basilectal and acrolectal DamanIP. In the basilectal variety, the object case marker is, abstractly, $pV(r)$, which has the realizations $pa(r)$- for 1s, $po$- for 2s familiar, $p$- for 2s formal and 3p, and $pir$- for 3s. Note that these are found in both lects in 1903, only in the basilect nowadays. By contrast, present-day acrolectal DamanIP uses the object case marker, abstractly, $a$, which has the realizations $a$- for 1s and 2s/p, and $ay$- for 3s/p. Given that the object marker $a$- is found only once in Dalgado’s (1903) Daman texts (i.e. it is rare in those texts), this marker is arguably a relatively recent development.

Lastly, the possessive pronoun paradigm (Table 8) exhibits the remarkable feature that in the third person there are two systems. In one of these, the presence of *su* ‘his/her’ and *suz* ‘their’ appear to be vestiges of an older system. (For example, the same system is found in KorlaiIP). The DamanIP form *suz* ‘their’ (not equivalent to Portuguese *suas* ‘his-, her-, their- fem-pl’) is infrequently heard and only in the oldest people’s speech. The other system in DamanIP uses the marker $d$- for the non-first person forms, where in KorlaiIP we find no such marker at all. Given that this system is already well documented in Dalgado (1903), it must have developed well over 140 years ago for it to be documented by Dalgado. In DamanIP, gender is again distinguished in 3s. The formal vs. informal distinction in 2s is maintained in the basilectal variety, but not in the acrolectal one.

As a final comment on the pronominal system in DamanIP, it is remarkable that Damanese of both varieties speak, somewhat pejoratively, about the basilectal variety as *fala ‘ς-πόρος’* ‘speak “thou-you”’ an expression used interchangeably with *fala tort* ‘speak twisted’. Thus, they have created an expression to refer to the basilectal using the subject-object pronoun pair *ς-πόρος* metalinguistically, as well as metaphorically.
Table 8. Possessive Determiners/Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Daman</th>
<th>Small Daman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
<td>in Dalgado (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. mim (minh) //nóss</td>
<td>mi/nóss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Fr). vós (d’oss)</td>
<td>d’oss/ ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Fr). ---</td>
<td>d’ussê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. su;</td>
<td>dil/del/su/dilot/suz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duse/dusez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discussion and concluding remarks

In this study, I have argued that the cases of influence on Daman Indo-Portuguese due to the continued presence of the Portuguese language in Daman can be interpreted as cases of the selection by some DamanIP speakers of a perceived more prestigious Portuguese form over an older, less prestigious Portuguese form. In the lexicon, for example, the verb *por* ‘put’ is selected over *buta* or *puza*, the past form *dis* (< Ptg. *disse* ‘s/he said’) is selected over *faló* ‘said’ (< Ptg. *falou* ‘s/he spoke’), and the noun *trabal* (< Ptg. *trabalho* ‘work’) is selected over the older *sirv*is (< Ptg. *serviço*). We also find cases in which a non-reduced form of the verb closer to modern Portuguese is selected over a reduced form, as in *levñta* ‘get/lift up’ for *launta* (<Ptg. *levantar* ‘get/lift up’). The selected forms of the imperfect and 3s present-tense (Table 4 and 5) can also be considered more prestigious and/or ‘correct’ as compared to their counterparts: *achav* (< Ptg. *achava* ‘s/he was finding/used to find’) over the creole form *tiŋ achan*, and *dav* (< Ptg. *dava* ‘s/he was giving/used to give’) over the creole form *tiŋ dan*. All these perceived prestigious forms have come to make up the acrolectal variety of DamanIP.

I propose that all of the cases just mentioned are fundamentally different from the lack of 2s familiar pronouns found in modern-day acrolectal DamanIP. Here we have a case, I argue, of avoidance of a form throughout the whole pronominal paradigm. The reason for this leveling of the formal vs. familiar distinction in the pronominal paradigm of acrolectal DamanIP seems to be the following: at one point in the history of DamanIP, the 2s pronouns *ős* and *porős* became stigmatized forms for some DamanIP speakers, possibly because there are no longer any corresponding cognate forms in modern Portuguese. That is, *ős* (< Middle Portuguese *vos*) as a subject pronoun
declined in use, especially in the 19th century. In the acrolectal version of DamanIP in Dalgado’s (1903) text, the familiar-formal distinction is still present, but its use is odd, appearing as it does in the voice of the father addressing his older son, first with the formal subject pronoun você and then with the familiar object pronoun por-óss, as shown in (4). (The relevant pronouns are underlined and in bold.)

\[(4) \quad \text{Antão su pae fallô que, filh, você tá ficá commig} \]

\[
\text{then 3S father said that son 2S.FR TMA stay with-me}
\]

\[
e \quad \text{tud noss bem é por-óss}
\]

\[
\text{and all our good COP.3S O/G/PR-2S.Fm}
\]

‘Then, his father said, “son, you are staying with me, and all our belongings are yours.”’

In the basilectal variety, only familiar pronouns are found in the same passage of the text, as shown in (5). The two versions of this same passage of the Prodigal Son story show us a number of things. The basilectal variety contains atli-putli, a Gujarati term (an example of partial reduplication) for ‘belongings’, representing perhaps the greater influence of Gujarati on basilectal DamanIP. At the same time, the basilectal variety also contains the acrolectal form diss, where one would have expected falô, as noted above.

\[(5) \quad \text{pae de bich diss: Voss, filh, semp já ficou minh} \]

\[
\text{father of kid said 2S.Fm son always TMA stay-PST my}
\]

\[
\quad \text{junt e tud minh atli-putli é d’óss.}
\]

\[
\text{with and all our good COP.3S GEN-2S.Fm}
\]

‘The kid’s father said, “you, son, have always been with me, and all our belongings are yours.”’

With regard to pronoun use, the basilectal variety has no 2s formal pronoun forms whatsoever. Based on how address forms are used today, in the northwest of India at least, the parent-offspring relation is asymmetrical: parents typically use familiar address forms in speaking with their offspring,
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while the offspring use formal address forms in speaking with their parents. However, we do not see this in either the basilectal or and acrolectal Daman IP varieties. Thus, the portrayal of pronoun use in the 1903 texts might not be representative of actual use at that time. However, it might be a portrayal of stereotypical use. And it could also be that the person who transcribed the texts may have been uncertain about the use of pronouns, especially in the acrolectal variety.4

While the use of both formal and familiar pronouns in DamanIP at that time is not possible to know, we can say with confidence that in acrolectal DamanIP today, the use of 2s familiar pronouns is avoided whereas both familiar and formal forms are commonly found in basilectal DamanIP.

Finally, it was alluded to above that in speaking about the registers of DamanIP, DamanIP speakers have coined the terms tort ‘twisted’ pulit ‘polished’. The term tort refers to the basilectal variety or a basilectal trait, while the term pulit denotes the acrolectal variety or an acrolectal trait. But, the phrase fala tort ‘speak twisted’ not only refers to speaking in basilectal DamanIP, it also carries a distinctly negatively connotation to it. The expression fala tort ‘speak twisted’ is interchangeable with fala as-porcs ‘speak thou-thee’. However, acrolectal speakers are said to use the pronouns as and/or porcs for pragmatic purposes, such as to express disrespect toward an interlocutor or to display anger toward someone. This is a case, then, of partial paradigm leveling driven by purely sociolinguistic rather than linguistic factors.
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APPENDIX A

Small Daman Creole Portuguese

Um hom’ tinh doi filh.
Já fallô pa su pae aquel mai piquinin’,
que dá-cá su quião que tá pertencê a
êl. E êl já repartiu pa tud doi filh tud
quant tinh.

Dupoi de passá algum temp fez um
imbrúi de tud su fat aquel rapaz piquinin’,
e já foi ficá num terr bastante lonj
e estranh, e alli já deu cab de tud, et já
ficô bastante miserav, e foi serví um sinhôr
pa guardá pâorc.

No mei de mat desert tinh sentind
muit fom e querí comer de mesm comid
de pôorc, mas nem aquel achav e tava
morrendo.

E assi’ nest estado começô lembrá de
caz de su pae, ond tu é fartur, ond
tud criad tinh bastante pa comê, e êl agor
tinh morrend de pur fom’.

Ficô bastante rependid de su conduct,
e log já resolvê voltá caz de su pae pa
pedí perdão.

Começô caminhá pa caz, e su pae,
quando ulhô de lonj e conheceu su filh,
saiu diant com muit pressad, e com
grand amor abraçô e bijô su filh.

E ês filh butou injoelh no su pé, e fallou
pa su pae que êl tinh fêt grand peccad

APPENDIX B⁵

Big Daman Creole

Um hom’ tinh doi bich.
Piquinin’ bich já fallô pu su pae:
Mim pai, dá par mim minh herdad. El
já deu.

E su filh tomou bastan bazruc e já
foi bastante lonj. El alli já cumeu, já
bebeu. já balhou e perdeu su herdad.

Quand su bôls ficô vasiu, êl tinh
grand fom’.

El então já foi sirvir um sinhôr, e par
elle mandou pastar pôorc.

E tinh fom’, nem farel tinh dand par êl.

Bich então já pensou: Caz minh pae
bastant criad tem sirvin’, e illôt tem
cumen’ barrig chê, e eu islai misér tem
curtin’.

Eu vai minh caz e fallá pu minh pae:
Pae, eu já deu bastante disconsolação
par vóss, fazê par mim voss criad.

Assim tinh pensan’ e assim êl já fez.

E su pae, quand ulhou pu su bich, já
correu e já deu par êl abraç e já bijou.

Minh pae, já fallô bich, eu já fez
grand peccad; vóss, pae, num papiá par
mim; fazê voss criad.

Su pae já mandou trazê vistid e já
butou par êl, pusou anel na ded e
sapat na pé.

⁵ Appendices A and B are taken from Dalgado (1903).
e tinh perdid o nom’ de filh, e querí ficá caz com’ criad.

Log su pae deu visti fat ric, butou anel de grand valor na ded, deu calça sapat.
Mandô depoi matá um boisinhe e fez grand féss pa chegado de su filh, que él tinh dad pa mort.

Quand butô mêz, su filh gran vêu de varj, e ficô muit zangad, parqui su pae fez tamanh féss pa su filh piquinin, e nam querí entrá dentr de caz, e su pae vêu buscá par él.

E su filh fez grand sentiment, fallan’ que nenhum dí deu a êlum cabritinh pa comê com su amig, saben; que é su filh obedient.

E agor que chegô su filh que deu cab de tu na vid estragad, deu comê noss boisinhe mai gord e mai com que nós tinh.

Antão su pae fallô que, filh, você tá ficá commig e tud noss bem é por-óss. E su irmão tinh perdid, e agor é bom que nós fique content, par qui que él já vêu voltad.

Su pae já fez bastant manjá.

Ess lai tinh fallan’: Ess minh filh tinh murrid a agor já ficou co vid, él já tinh perdid e já voltou.

Quand bich grand já voltou su caz pirguntou pu su criad par que su caz tinh cantan’. Su criad já diss: Bich piquinin’ já chigou, e senhor mandou matá bunit bezerr.

Bich ficou inquizilhad; num entrou su caz. Pae de bich olhou pâr él e já chamou.

Bich fallou: Pae, cum vóss tant ann ficóu d’óss junt, vóss par mim nunc já deu pândig pu eu comê e bebê junt minh amig; eu semp par vós já obedceu.

Mim irmão já pirdeu tu su furtun’, e já regalou e pandigou bem, e pu él voss já fez manjá.

Pae de bich já diss: Vóss, filh, sem já Ficou minh junt e tud minh atli putli é d’óss.

Ess minh bich tinh murrid e já ficou co vid; él já tinh pirdid e agor já incontrou
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APPENDIX C

Fiêl Prodig
(as told by Cheryl, a nineteen-year-old female, resident of Small Daman)

uma vez tiŋ ū ṣm ko doy Vita fil.
one time EX.PST one man with two child

Once there was a man with two sons.

ū di, akol sigun fil dis pô pay
one day that second child said O/D/P father

One day, the younger son said to his father,

ki yo kër miŋ part dô propriedad purki yo kiri
COMP 1S want my part of property because 1S wanted

AI want my part of the property because I want to

tuma, vender, i tuma diñer, i ir pô ot part,
take sell and take money and go O/D/P other part

take [it], sell [it] and take the money and go to some other place,

fika nô ot part, yo nôn kër fika ko pay.
stay O/D/P other part 1S NEG want stay with father

and live in another place. I don’t want to live with [my] father.

ɒntaw pay drishrõbiw tud akol entrô doy Vita fil
then father distributed all that between two child

Then, the father distributed the property between the two sons.
i dew ael. ñntaw il turno tud ñkɔl i
and gave O3SM then 3S took all that and
and gave [his half] to him. Then, he took it all and

vindew i il saiw dɔ kaz, i foy fika ko ....,
sold and 3S went-out of house and went stay with
sold [it], left home and went to live

ot part aψi, ko amig I tud. il foy ot
other part such with friend and all 3S went other
[in] another place, with friends and all. He went to another

part, ñez nov amig i tud, i ishta
part made new friend and all and AUX
place, made new friends and all, and he was

viver. I kɔm il tiŋ mwit diŋer, il te ... ,
live and as 3SM had much money 3SM have
living. And as he had a lot of money, he had...

mwit jent vey ko il i fiko amig i
much people came with 3SM and became child and
many people came with him and became friends and

ishtav kumer, beber I tud aψi ez ishtav
AUXIMP eat drink and all such 3P AUX-IMP
they ate, drank and all. In this way, they
fikar asì.
stay such
were living.

and one day 3SM spent all his money and NEG
And one day, he (i.e. the son) spent all his money, and didn’t

had no rupee with 3SM ten all his amig
have even one rupee on him. Then all his friends

saw COMP 3SM NEG had money and nobody NEG
saw that he had no [more] money and no one

would be with him. All abandoned him, left and went away.

And as he had no money, no one would call

O3SM O/D/P eat in house and all so 3SM stay-IMP
on him to eat in [their] houses and all. So, he was left
alone then 3SM went look-for work one alone. Then he went to look for work. One

day 3SM went house of king O/D/P ask-for work then day, he went [to the] house of [the] king to ask for work. Then,

[the] king said, “there’s no work here, there’s only

one, looking after [the] pigs and feeding

Then, he said, “I have nothing

there and all and AUX-IMP do that work and O3SM 3P
there and was doing all that work, and [the people he was working for]
NEG give-IMP nothing O/D/P eat only 3SM had O/D/P
would give him anything to eat. To eat he only
ekume  kumid  dø  pørk. I  døpoyz  il  arepønden
eat  food  of  pig  and  after  3SM  repenting
had pig feed. And afterwards he repented.

il  diz  ki  kriad  ki  fik  nɔ  kaz  dø  mew
3SM  say  COMP  servant  REL  stay  L/DIR  house  of  my
He said, “[the] servants who live in my father’s house
pay  te  miXor  kumid  ki  yo  apáyš  aki.
father  have  better  food  than  1S  get  here
have better food than I get here.”

il  largo  akøl  trabal  i  i(v)  pɔ  kaz.  i  ù  amig
3SM  left  that  work  and  go-IMP  O/D/P  house  and  one  friend
He left that work and was on his way home. And a friend

dil  viw  nɔ  kamín  ail,  i  nɔ  pudi  kuñase  ail,
his  saw  L/DIR  road  O3SM  and  NEG  could  recognize  O3SM
of  his  saw  him  on  the  road,  and  couldn’t  recognize  him  (i.e.  at  first)

kɔm  il  eshtav  ko  rrop...  nɔn  tĩj  rrop,  nɔ,  mwit  bë
as  3SM  COP-PST  with  clothes  NEG  had  clothes  TAG  very  well
as he was with clothes, he didn’t have [his] clothes in very good shape
and all COP-PST torn and all
and all was ragged and all.

so and then 3SM went and said O/D/P
So, then [the friend who had seen the son] went and said to his (i.e. the wayward son’s)

pay dil ki duse fil ki largo i foy, il
father his COMP GEN-2S.FR child REL left and went 3SM
father, Ayour son who left and went away, he

vol, vol, ishta volta dənəv pə kaz. əntəw pay
re re PR return again O/D/P house then father
is returning home again. Then, [the] father

foy i tros ael, dew uza nəv rrop, sapat i anəl
went and brought O3SM gave wear new clothes shoe and ring
went and brought him [home], [he] gave [him] new clothes to wear, shoes and rings

i tud də oyr dew uza ail. I mando mata
and all of gold gave wear O3SM and ordered kill
and all of gold he gave him to wear. And [he] ordered they slaughter

ũ may gran kabrit ki ilz tiŋ. I fəz fəsht ë kaz.
one more big goat REL 3P had and made party in house
the biggest goat they had, and they had a party at home.
I akəl fil mayz vel ki ishtav, il nāw ishtav
and that child more old REL COP-IMP 3SM NEG COP-IMP
And the older brother who was there, he was not at

kaz, il tīn id fūr. Il kən volto, il kən
house 3SM PS gone-PPART outside 3SM when returned 3SM when
at home, he had gone out. When he returned, when he

viw ki tīn fazen fesh i tud, i nən kiri
saw COMP AUX.PST doing party and all and NEG wanted
saw that they were having a party and all, he didn’t want

i(r) dent də kaz purki il fiko zangad ko pay
go inside GEN house because 3SM became angry with father
to go inside the house because he was angry with [his] father.

ki il kiri dize asī ki yo ishtav fikar
COMP 3SM wanted say such COMP 1S AUX-IMP stay
He wanted to say, “I have been

tant də temp ko pay, yo, nāw, semp uviw ki pay
so much time with father 1S NEG always heard what father
so long with [my] father, I always obeyed what [my] father

dizi i tud i pay nuk nə disha faze fesht
say-IMP and all and father never NEG allow do party
would say and all and father never allowed me to have a party
ami ko mew amig. i il non kiri. ontaw pay
O1S with my friend and 3SM NEG wanted then father
with my friends.” And he didn’t want [to go inside]. Then, [his] father

saiw for i dis ki es fil ki
went.out outside and said COMP this child REL
went outside and said “this son who

tin pordid agar ami apoño il, i yo non
PS lost-PP now O1S got 3SM and 1S NEG
I had lost, I have found again. I don’t

ker perder dənəv. sə ishtav faze fesht.
want lose again so AUX-IMP do party
want to lose [him] again. So, [I] was having a party.

sə nāw fika zangad ko il.
so NEG become angry with 3SM
So, don’t be angry with him.”
APPENDIX D

Istor do fil prodig

(as told by Paulo Cruz dos Remedios, a male in his 50s, resident of Badrapur)

Er ŕe ves ki tiŋ ŕe pay doy fil EX-PST one time COMP EX-PST a father two son
Once upon a time there was a father and two sons.

i es fil piken pidiw tud bë:z del u
and this son small asked for all share EN-3S REL
and this younger brother asked for his share

ki é partid del. tumo ŕe del partid.
which COP.3S part GEN-3S took one GEN-3S part
of what was coming to him. [He] took his part.

Pay flan purki ker tud es, fšlan? Nào, yo
father QUOT why want all this QUOT neg I
Father asked, “Why do you want all this?” The younger brother said, “No, I

ni ker fika. Yo vay pør ot terr. yo ni ker
NEG want stay 1S go O/D/P other land 1S NEG want
don’t want to stay. I’m going to another land. I don’t want

fika duse junt. Doy irmāw, yo ni ker fika
be GEN-3S.FR with two brother 1S NEG want bê
to stay with you. There are two brothers, I don’t want to stay
dent də es kaz, fəlan. Yo vay pər ü ot terr, within of this house QUOT 1S go O/D/P one other land in this house. I’m going to another land.”

fəlan. dɔs vontad, fəlan su pay. Yo dan dɔs Quot your-fam will says his father 1S give GEN-2S “As you wish,” said his father. “I will give [you] your

bə:s. Dew akəl metad də del. Dəpoy də sapresāw share gave that half of GEN-3S after of separation share.” [He] gave [his] half. After the separation

do doy piso fez, do doy irmāw. u ki ë of two person did of two brother REL which is of [the] two people, of the two brothers, that which was

partid del. El tumo su partid i jafoy pər ot terr. part GEN-3G 3SM took his part and went O/D/P other land his part, [the younger brother] took his part and went to another land.

jafoy pər ot terr, ali santo nə party, ko amig, went O/D/P other land there sat L/DIR party with friend [He] went to another land, there [he] sat in, with friends

amigkamarad, bastant amig ja sab ki el tĩn bō friend-comrad quite-many friend TMA know COMP 3SM had good friends and companions, many friends knew that he had a lot of
money sat ate drank L/DIR bar good parties

money. [He] sat, ate and drank in [the] bar, good times

tud tiŋ fazend. kumew, bebew, i dəpy (kumso)
all AUX-PST doing ate, drank and then inchoat
all that [they] were doing, [they] ate and drank, and then the money began

vay kaban diŋer. Asi kaban, kaban, ulyo ali ki
go ending money such ending ending saw there COMP
to run out. As [the money] was running out, [they] saw there that,

agɔr tud amig tud ja ulyo tud ki agɔr ja komso
now all friend all TMA saw all COMP now TMA started
now all [the] friends saw that [the] money had begun

kaba diŋer. dali, ū ū kumso fudji. Kumso
end money from-there one one began escape began
to run out. From there, one by one began to run away. [They] began

larga pril. i asi fiko fiko fiko tud. i tud largo
leave O3SM and such became all all all left
to leave him. And so all this happened and all [the friends] left

i fujiw. Ulyo ki kabo diŋer. ningɛ nu konvido
and escaped saw COMP finished money nobody NEG invited
and ran away. [They] saw that [the] money ran out. Afterwards, nobody invited
him afterwards O/D/P lunch nor dinner no one NEG called him to lunch or to dine, nobody called

him O/D/P eat 3SM TMA die hunger wander on him to eat. He was dying of hunger. He was wandering

from one side wandering from other side afterward arrived L/DIR house from one place to another. [He] then arrived at [a] house, and

let’s then search a work TAG went house of king said, “let’s search for work.” [He] went to the house of [the] king

search work that king QUOT my with NEG EX.PRS nothing work to look for work. That king said, “with me there is no work.

There is only the work of tending to [the] pigs”, said the king,

“of feeding the pigs.” “Whichever work”, said the brother. “If it’s tending to pigs,
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fólan, pork *to [to] pork, fólan
QUOT pig ‘then’ pig QUOT (*NB: to is from Gujarati, part of an ‘if-then’ construction.)
then tending to pigs it shall be.”

il kwant temp a fika fom. i el ti vay
3SM how-much time FUT become hungry and 3SM TMA go
How much time he would remain hungry. And he would go on

dan kume pő pork. i okel faryel ki vin dan kume
give eat O/D/P pig and that fodder REL coming giving eat
feeding the pigs, and that fodder that he was feeding

pő pork i el tame chigo pő kume. ko fom
O/D/P pig and 3S also arrived O/D/P eat with hunger
the pigs he would even eat sometimes. With [such] hunger

ki a ñaze, i oʒ do kume okel fa-farəl,
what FUT do and while eat that fodder
what was [he] supposed to do. And while eating that fodder

il arapənden do del pekad. lembran do su pay,
He repented of GEN-3S sin remember of his father
he repented because of his sin. He remembered his father,

ki yo kaz do mi pay, yo tiŋ kumen fartur,
comp 1S house of my father 1S TMA eating “my fill”
that “in my father’s house I always had more than enough to eat.
“Today I arrived in this land, my sin. Now, I’ll go to my father

and ask for pardon: father, don’t consider me

as a son, but at least as a servant, but

I’ll go now to my father, to my father’s house.”
From there he left that work and returned home.

With ragged clothes and all, he arrived [home] on the road.

Someone saw him, and said, “How did you get this way,

with ragged clothes, like a disgraced person, how did you get like this?”

The boy said, “What to say? It was my destiny.” And he came [home]

very slowly. I sat down in the road. And there

a well-known friend came and gave word at the house
do su pay, ki ôkel duse fil ki tînj andad, of his father COMP that GEN-2S.FR son REL TMA gone of his father that “your son who had gone,

i il djayo, yo ulyo pert do na kamin, and 3SM came IS saw near of L road he is back, I look near the road,

te vin ko rrop raʒgad tud, fôlan. nu TMA come with clothes ripped all QUOT NEG [he] was coming, wearing ragged clothes and all.

pod kuñase pril, fôlan. əntaw, fôlan min fil vin, can recognize him QUOT then QUOT my son come [I] couldn’t recognize him.” “So, my son has come”

fôlan, su pay kô ôkel grand alegri. QUOT his father with that great joy said his father, with great happiness.

Su pay tînj ôkel es, ki algû di a volta me. his father had that this COMP some day FUT return EMPHL/DIR His father had an inkling that one day his son would return.

el tînj may amor pôkâl. I el jafoy metad kamin 3SM had more love O-that and he went half road He now had more love for him. And he went out halfway on the road
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pɔ resɔbe pɔ su fil. Andan, il dan ù abras. O/D/P receive O/D/P his son going 3SM give a hug to receive his son. Walking [up to him,] he gave [him] a hug.

“I knew COMP some day will come father saying 1S
“I knew that one day [you] would come.” said his father. “I

arɔpɔndew agɔr dɔ mi pekad, fɔlan. i agɔr repent now of my sin QUOT and now repent now for my sin,” said [the son.] “And now,” [said the boy,]

use sɔ nu konsɔdera parmi kɔm fil 2SFR if neg consider me as son
“if you don’t consider me as a son,

fɔlan, prɔmen kɔm kriad, fɔlan. disha parmi dent QUOT at least as servant QUOT allow me inside at least as a servant. Allow me in

dɔ kaz. pay fɔlan yo fil fɔlan, yo anot kɔm di of house father QUOT 1S son QUOT 1S night as day the house.” The father said, “I, my son, I night and day

nu tiŋ sɔn, fɔlan, dez ki ɔs jafoy, fɔlan. NEG had sleep QUOT since 2SFm went QUOT didn’t sleep from the time you left.
Let’s go home.” [He] sent for someone to bring clothes. [The boy] changed all of his clothes there on the road he changed clothes.

[The father] gave [him clothes] to put on. [He] threw out those ragged clothes, gave [him]

new clothes brought O/D/P house and of-that best goat REL EX.PST new clothes to put on, [he] brought [him] home. And with the best goat there was

that fat goat killed called did one big celebration called a fat goat, he killed [it], called [all] and made a big celebration. [He] called

all people of neighborhood did one big celebration gave lunch all all the people from the neighborhood, and held a big celebration. [He] gave everybody lunch.

A son that [he] had lost, [he] found
Su pay pensan ki así su fil ki tiñ
his father thinking COMP such his son REL PST
His father thought that he’d found the son he’d

perdid, inkontro. i irmäw gran fongan, pay fongan,
lost-PPART found and brother big said father QUOT
lost. And the older brother said, “Father,

akol kabrit yo tiñ dishad po miñ an. Use akol
that goat 1S AUX.PST kept O/D/P my year 2SFR that
I had been keeping that goat for my birthday [celebration]. You,

kabrit fongan kwan yo pidiw di dɔ miñ an, use
goat QUOT when 1S asked-for day of my year 2SFR
that goat, when I asked [you for it] for my birthday, you

falo nāw, fongan. i odŋ il ki tiñ tomad tud
said “No” QUOT and today 3SM REL PS taken-PPART all
said, ‘no’. And today he (i.e. the big brother) who had taken his whole

bè:z dɔ kaz jafoy, fongan. Ki pril use pudi tira for
share of house went QUOT COMP O3SM 2SFR could throw out
share of the house, he left. You could have thrown him out

do kaz, fongan, odŋ nu te nēyũ nisidad po disha
of house QUOT today NEG EX.PRS no need O/D/P allow
of the house. Today there’s no need to let him back
dent dɔ kaz, fɔlan. i use mato ŋ bɔ kabrit inside house QUOT and 2SFR killed one good goat into the house. And you killed a good goat

pril, dew kume, janta banta pɔ tud fɔlan, dɔ gran O3SM gave eat lunch etc. O/D/P all QUOT of big for him, and gave everyone lunch and food, [you] made a big

fes fez pril, fɔlan. Fil, fɔlan, i es é ŋ fil celebration did O3SM QUOT son QUOT and this COP-PRS one son celebration for him.” The father said, “son, this is a son.”

fɔlan, es dɔ mɛmɔ sang, fɔlan, es miŋ fil, əs QUOT this of same blood QUOT this my son 2SFm He is of the same blood. This is my son, you
tame fil, fɔlan. Kwal pay pɔd fika sɛ fil, fɔlan. Also son QUOT which father can remain without son QUOT [are] also [my] son. Which father can stay without his sons.

puris, yo rɔsɔbew prel, es tame é fil. Rɔsɔbew because of this 1S received O3SM this also COP son received Because of this, I received him. He is also my son.” [He] received

prel kɔ gran es, fɔlan. Kɔm el tiŋ perdid fɔlan, O3SM with big this QUOT as 3SM PS lost-PP QUOT him with great happiness. He had been lost,
acho, el tiŋ perdid fosl, acho.

found 3SM PS lost-PPART QUOT found

and now he’s found, he was lost, now [he’s] found.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

1      first person
2      second person
3      third person
AUX    auxiliary
COMP   complementizer
COP    copulative verb
D      dative marker
DIR    directional marker
EMPH   emphatic marker
EX.PST existential verb, past form
Fm     familiar pronominal form
FR     formal pronominal form
FUT    future marker
GEN    genitive
G      goal marker
IMP    imperfect form
L      locative
M      masculine
NEG    negation
O      object marker
P      purpose clause marker
PST    past tense markers
P      plural
POSS   possessive determiner
PPART  past participle
PREP   preposition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>tense-mood-aspect marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>