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Abstract: This article is a study of the Dravido-Portuguese creoles of the Malabar (modern-day Kerala, India) and Sri Lanka in terms of the formal means they use to mark the addressee arguments of various predicates of verbal interaction (e.g. talk, say, ask), and compares the functional range of such markers in the creoles with their counterparts in the lexifier language (Portuguese) and in the Dravidian adstrates (Malayalam and Tamil). This comparative study shows the different contributions of the lexifier and of the adstrates to the case-marking system of the present-day Dravido-Portuguese creoles, as well as the ways in which the functional range of the creole case-markers reveal diachronic processes of functional reanalysis.
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Resumo: Este artigo consiste num estudo dos crioulos drávido-portugueses do Malabar (actualmente Kerala, na Índia) e do Sri Lanka em termos dos meios usados para marcar formalmente os interlocutores de diversos predicados de interação verbal (ex. conversar, dizer, pedir), no qual se compara a amplitude funcional dos marcadores crioulos com a dos seus equivalentes na língua lexificadora (o português) e nos adstratos dravidicos

1 I would like to thank Ian Smith for kindly sharing with me unpublished Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese data, and also an anonymous reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions.
(o malaiala e o tâmul). Este estudo comparativo demonstra os diferentes contributos do lexificador e dos adstratos para o sistema de marcação casual dos actuais crioulos drávido-portugueses, bem como o modo como a amplitude funcional dos marcadores casuais crioulos revela processos diacrónicos de reanálise funcional.
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1 **Introduction**

In Schuchardt’s (1889a) classification, Dravido-Portuguese (*Dravidopor-tugiesisch*) referred to the subset of Portuguese-lexified creoles formed in the Dravidian-majority areas of Southern India and Northeastern Sri Lanka. Although Indo-Portuguese creoles were once numerous across the Dravidosphere (Schuchardt 1889a; Tomás 1992; Smith 1995; Cardoso 2006), to the best of my knowledge they subsist only in Cannanore [Kannur] in the Indian state of Kerala, and in the Sri Lankan cities of Batticaloa and Trincomalee.

Smith’s (1979a,b) research on the Indo-Portuguese of Batticaloa has shown that, in many domains, this language has come to resemble significantly the major language of the region, Tamil, with which it has been in close contact throughout its history (see also Bakker 2006) - and recent descriptive work on the Indo-Portuguese of India’s Southwestern coast reveals a comparable (though not entirely equivalent) process of metatypy under the influence of the dominant local language, Malayalam (Cardoso 2012).

Among various examples of isomorphism, Smith (1979a) highlights the similarity in the functional range of case-markers in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese and in Tamil. This article focuses on a particular aspect of case-marking in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles, namely the assignment of case to Addressee arguments, arguments which are associated with verbs of verbal interaction such as *talk*, *say*, or *ask* (see 1.2). Addressee arguments can be treated in different ways in different languages and, as a matter of fact, constitute one domain in which the languages involved in the contact equation which gave rise to the Dravido-Portuguese Creoles (primarily Portuguese, Malayalam and Tamil) diverge quite markedly. I have therefore selected this particular domain of case-marking in order to explore the extent to which the Dravido-Portuguese Creoles reveal the impact of the Dravidian languages among which they developed, innovate, or retain case-marking patterns modelled on their main lexifier (Portuguese).
1.1 Dravido-Portuguese sources

While some early data is available for Dravido-Portuguese creoles elsewhere (e.g. Teza 1872; Schuchardt 1882, 1883, 1889b; Dalgado 1900, 1917; Tavares de Mello 1908; Jackson 1990; see also Tomás 1992; Ladhams 2009), the only ones which have been documented in recent times are those of Batticaloa (studied in the 1970s by Ian Smith), Cannanore [Kannur] and the recently-disappeared creole of Vypeen, off Cochin [Kochi] (documented by myself since 2006). It is on the basis of these recent studies and corpora that I set out to explore the case-marking patterns of addressees in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles:

- The Batticaloa variety described by Smith (1977, 1979a, 1979b, 2013), the only one to have been researched in recent times, is taken as representative of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese [SLIP]. As a matter of fact, plenty of the earlier records of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese refer to other geographical variants and therefore, in theory, one could ascertain to what extent patterns of case-assignment varied across the island in the past; however, since there are reasons to question the authenticity and reliability of a good deal of the early Sri Lankan corpus (see Smith 1977; also Cardoso, Baxter & Nunes 2012), the focus here will be mostly synchronic;

- The corpora recently collected in Cochin and in Cannanore are largely equivalent, therefore we will refer to both varieties generically as Malabar Indo-Portuguese [MIP], after the old name for the coast of modern-day Kerala. Here too, despite the availability of short 19th-c. collections of texts, we will restrict our analysis to the modern data.

Given that the Dravido-Portuguese creoles have no conventionalized orthography, the reader will encounter substantial variation. In the case of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, I have retained the spelling developed by Smith for his published descriptions. In the case of Malabar Indo-Portuguese, given that linguistic documentation is an ongoing process, no final phonologically-based orthography has yet been developed; therefore, I resort to phonetic transcription here. With respect to example sentences in other languages, I use either the official orthography (in the case of Portuguese) or the romanisation adopted by the authors of the source grammars (for Malayalam and Tamil).
1.2 **Object of inquiry and method**

Predicates of verbal interaction or ‘linguistic action verbs’ (Verschueren 1981), such as Eng. *talk*, *tell* or *ask*, may be montransitive or ditransitive. Their valency requires an argument which I will term the ‘Speaker’ [abbreviated as ‘S’] and one corresponding to the ‘Addressee’ [abbreviated as ‘A’], and often also an indication of the content of the verbal interaction (in whatever form) which I will call the ‘Message’ [abbreviated as ‘M’]. The following English sentences illustrate this classification:

(1) a. Louise was talking to/with her mother.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ll}
   S & \text{A} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

   b. Louise told her mother the news.
   \[
   \begin{array}{lll}
   S & \text{A} & \text{M} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

   c. Louise asked her mother a question.
   \[
   \begin{array}{lll}
   S & \text{A} & \text{M} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

Even though the argument *her mother* is identified as the addressee in all of the sentences above, it can be conceptualised differently in terms of its semantic role: notice, for instance, how in (a), the Addressee can be treated either as a Companion (marked by the preposition *with*), thereby expressing reciprocity, or as a Recipient/Goal (marked by *to*). In fact, it is one of my aims to ascertain the default semantic role expressed by the case-marker(s) assigned to Addressee arguments in the various languages under analysis. Therefore, to try and capture a good deal of the potential variation within a particular language, I have collected data for three pragmatically-defined categories of predicates of verbal interaction:

- The *talk*-type: types of verbal interaction in which both the Addressee and the Speaker are agentive interlocutors, i.e. predicates of reciprocal verbal engagement (includes e.g. *talk, chat, discuss, argue, . . .*);

- The *tell*-type: types of verbal interaction in which the Addressee is conceptualised as a passive recipient of the Message and not necessarily expected to react (includes e.g. *tell, say, inform, convey, . . .*);

- The *ask*-type: types of verbal interaction which are aimed at eliciting a reaction from the Addressee, whether it be in the form of verbal act (includes e.g. *ask, . . .*) or otherwise (includes e.g. *demand, request, . . .*).
In order to conduct this study, relevant data was collected not only for Malabar Indo-Portuguese and Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, but also for their respective adstrates (Malayalam and Tamil) and for their main lexifier (Portuguese). As the intention was to be able to compare the functional range of case-markers involved in Addressee-marking in each language, the research proceeded in three steps:

Step 1: I collected example sentences for all five languages containing predicates of verbal interaction of the three types described above;

Step 2: For each of the five languages, I identified the default semantic roles expressed by all of the case-markers compiled in Step 1; for the purposes of this particular study, I will label these the associate semantic roles (as they are associated with the case markers attested for Addressees). Overall, seven associate semantic roles were identified in step 2: Patient, Recipient, Companion, Instrument, Temporary Possessor, Location, Goal;

Step 3: I collected example sentences for all five languages containing arguments with all seven associate semantic roles.

The results are given in section 2 below, which includes examples of all three types of predicates of verbal interaction and of all seven associate semantic roles for each of the five languages. The data are then compared and discussed in section 3, revealing a complex interplay of influences. This study provides ample evidence that, in high-contact languages, the phonetic representation of a particular (grammatical) element and its function need not be sourced from the same donor language nor match any entirely. It therefore confirms the insights of language contact scholars who have argued for the need to distinguish between the transfer of linguistic forms and the transfer of semantic or functional range – what Matras (2009) terms matter (also fabric, in Grant 2012) and pattern respectively.

2 Case-marking of addressees and associate semantic roles

2.1 Malabar Indo-Portuguese

The corpus of Malabar Indo-Portuguese which I have been collecting in Cannanore and Vypeen in the past years is composed of elicited material and recordings of spontaneous discourse. As mentioned earlier, the recordings made in Vypeen and in Cannanore are equivalent to a large extent, and therefore they will be treated here as complementary; nonetheless, for clarity, I indicate where and how each example sentence was collected. Although the treatment of this corpus is still ongoing, it was possible to extract several instances of both Addressee arguments and participants with the associate semantic roles.
2.1.1 Addressees in Malabar Indo-Portuguese

In Malabar Indo-Portuguese, Addressee arguments of talk-type predicates (Addressee talk) most often consist of an np followed by the postposition pært ‘near’ (2), which requires a linking morpheme -sø that also functions as a default genitive marker. However, elicitation reveals that -jútadø, typically a comitative/instrumental marker, is a possible alternative (3b):

(2) Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

pærmi bøs-sø māy-sø pærtə kæra kōbersa, bøs-sø pærtə
1s.OBL you-GEN mother-GEN near want talk you-GEN near
nø
not
‘I want to talk to your mother, not to you.’

(3) a. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

Stanley portuguese līgwajī Yvonne-sø pærtə te
Stanley portuguese language Yvonne-GEN near be.PRS
kōbersa.
talk
‘Stanley is talking in Portuguese with Yvonne.’

b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

Stanley portuguese līgwajī Yvonne jūtadø te
Stanley portuguese language Yvonne COM be.PRS
kōbersa.
talk
‘Stanley is talking in Portuguese with Yvonne.’

All other addressees in the corpus occur with the postposition pærtə. This is exemplified in (4) for Addressee arguments of tell-type predicates (Addressee tell), and in (5) for those of ask-type predicates (Addressee ask); notice that, in (4) and (5b), the fact that the 1s pronoun has a dedicated Genitive form does away with the need for the linking morpheme -sø:

(4) Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)

mínhø pærtə fala ki kæra.
1s.GEN near say what want
‘Tell me what you want.’
(5) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
   kawa el jê fala pay-sê pârta pisîn fana tama da.
   then 3SM PST say father-GEN near little money take give
   ‘Then he told father to give a little money.’

   b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
   Olivia-so filhô ministê pârta je fûta prâla pu asisti.
   Olivia-GEN daughter 1S.GEN near PST ask 3SM.OBL to help
   ‘Olivia’s child asked me to help her.’

2.1.2 Associate semantic roles in Malabar Indo-Portuguese

In Malabar Indo-Portuguese, the case-marking of patients responds to animacy. As shown below, animate participants are marked with postposed -pê (6a), while inanimate participants are assigned no case-marker at all (6b):

(6) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
   ælfõti-pê jê faze tirê
   elephant-OBL PST make shot
   ‘[We] shot elephants.’

   b. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
   agê friw kerê faze.
   water cool want make
   ‘[You] must cool the water.’

In (6a), -pê is glossed OBL[ique] because, in addition to marking animate patients, it also marks recipients (7):

(7) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
   akêl ja da sê, paymi ūga mil rupi lo da.
   DEM PST give COND 1S.OBL one thousand rupee IRR give
   ‘If [I] delivered it [i.e., a skin], [they] would give me one thousand rupees.’

   b. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
   paymi tê kâdê acha, olotê-pê tâmê lo da kovêri.
   1S.OBL be.PRS when get 3P-OBL also IRR give money
   ‘When I got [it], I would also give them money.’
Both companions (8a) and instruments (8b) occur with a case-marker which, in the corpus, assumes two slightly different realizations as -sūtado or -jūtado:

(8)   a. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
    Olivia-sa fili minha kraskas-sūtado ta brīka.
    ‘Olivia’s son is playing with my children.’

    b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
    nɔz fakə-jūtado kok lo kebræ
    ‘One breaks coconuts with a knife.’

In predicative possessive constructions, generic possessors are typically dative-marked in Malabar Indo-Portuguese. However, when it comes to temporary possession, the possessor is embedded in a particular locative phrase meaning ‘inside X’s hand’:

(9) Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicitated corpus)
    ælə pærmi prasāti nukə da ælə-sa mō-dētrə funə nutæ
    1SF 1S.OBL present NEG give 3SF-GEN hand-inside money NEG.be suydə.
    because
    ‘She didn’t give me a present because she didn’t have money.’

The morphological markers of locations, as expected, include an array of alternatives to convey semantic distinctions; for our purposes, in additional to generic location, those used to indicate proximate location and adjacency are particularly relevant. The Malabar Indo-Portuguese corpus contains the generic locative marker -dētrə (10a,b) and the marker of proximate location partə (10c), with the same collocational properties described for examples (2) and (3) above:

(10)   a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
    akə sister paymi hotel-dētrə ūga sirvis ja oəa da.
    DEM sister 1S.OBL hotel-LOC one job PST look give
    ‘That sister found me a job at a hotel.’
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b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)

market-dêtra tudo tê.
market-LOC all be.PRS
‘There’s everything in the market.’

c. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

hotel-sa pærte ùnga igrædji tæ.
hotel-GEN near one church be.PRS
‘There’s a church near the hotel.’

Goals are often unmarked when the predicates disambiguate the intended reading, as in (11a), or indicated by the oblique [dative-accusative] (11b) or locative marker (11c):

(11)  

a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)

olotrø akəl Mysore lo mãda.
3P DEM Mysore IRR send
‘They would send it to Mysore.’

b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

yo minhø írmê-pə lo mãda.
1S 1S.GEN sister-OBL IRR send
‘I will send [it] to my sister.’

c. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

yo minhø írmê pærte lo mãda.
1S 1S.GEN sister near IRR send
‘I will send [it] to my sister.’

2.2 Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese

For this exploration of the case of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese addressee, as discussed in 1.1., I rely mostly on the descriptions published by Ian Smith (1977, 1979a, 1979b, 2013), which are based on his work with the Indo-Portuguese community of Batticaloa, as well as additional data Smith kindly provided for this study. While, admittedly, Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese may diverge somewhat from other past and present variants of Sri Lanka, at this point no significant and reliable sources are available for other variants.

The reader will notice that this particular example contradicts what has been said earlier about the requirement that pærta occurs after a linking morpheme -sə. It is indeed one of the few examples of this, which I interpret as a result of the conversational setting (elicitation) and/or perhaps the over-productivity of the blocking effect of minhø.
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2.2.1 Addressees in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese

The sentences in (12a) and (12b) demonstrate Addressee_TALK arguments in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese:

(12) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)
   fôra jeentis juuntu pa-papiyaa etus-su vergôôña.
   outside people LOC INF-speak 3P-GEN shame
   ‘Speaking with outside people is a shame to them.’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 172)
   e:w ja:-fôla: anda: pa:y-ntu fôla:-tu vira: vi: miñê-ntu
   I PST-tell go father-LOC tell-PFV back come I-LOC
   diñe:ru tri:yô fôla:-tu.
   money bring QUOT-PFV
   ‘I said, “Go tell (talk to?) your father [then] come back and bring me the money”.

This type of addressee is assigned two related markers, viz. _juuntu_3 and -(u)ntu. In Smith’s (1977: 171) interpretation, -(u)ntu is a reduced form of the postposition _juuntu_ which “has become specialized as a locative case affix with the meaning ‘at, in, on, etc.’”, and therefore I will treat the two separately.

-(u)ntu also occurs with Addressee_TELL (13) and Addressee_ASK (14) arguments4, but the available corpus does not contain any instance with

---

3 In some of the earliest publications by Smith, a colon after a vowel was used to indicate it is long, while in later publications this is done by doubling the vowel grapheme: e.g. <ju:ntu> is equivalent to <juuntu>. Given that this study extracted examples from several sources, both orthographies can be found in example sentences, but I have opted for the double grapheme strategy in my discussion.

4 The early 20th-c. texts published by Tavares de Mello in 1908 provide an interesting clue with respect to Addressee_ASK arguments. In these religious texts (exact provenance unknown), the addressees of the verb _rugá_ ‘pray/ask’ are always preceded by the preposition _com_ ‘with’, which also occurs here as a comitative and instrumental marker:

(i) Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese (Tavares de Mello 1908[1998]: 118)

Poristo nós te rugá com Ti ajudá per teus servidores […]

therefore 1P be ask with 2S help OBL your.P servants

‘Therefore, we ask you to help your servants […]’

juuntu. In addition, Smith (p.c. June 2013) recognises another form -(u)ntaa\(^5\) that functions generically as a ‘human locative’ and also occurs with addressees – see (13a) and (14b). Lastly, an alternative oblique marker -pə is also attested in the corpus with tell-type predicates (13b):

(13) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)

\[\text{boos ja-fala voo ricad-ntaa falaatu.}\]
2s PST-say IND Richard-LOC QUOT
‘Have you told Richard?’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 202)

\[\text{ung go:te je:ntis-pə me: (ja-:)fəla: tiņə.}\]
a few people-OBL EMPH PST-tell was
‘He had only told a few people.’

(14) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 161)

\[\text{e:w e:li-ntu ja:-fəla: əwəɾə unə sumə:nə.}\]
I he-LOC PST-tell now one week
‘It is now one week since I told him [to tell you to come and see me].’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 2013)

\[\text{avara osiyoor taam [nɔcyva-ntaa] lo-puntaa, [...]}\]
now 3SG.HON also [bride-LOC] FUT-ask
‘Now he will also ask [the bride] […]’

2.2.2 Associate semantic roles in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese

The published Batticaloa corpus does not contain examples of all relevant patient categories, but Smith (1977: 165) clarifies -pə is the default accusative suffix for human referents (15a), while -Ø marks inanimates (15b), and either one or the other may occur with non-human animates:

\(^5\)-\((u)ntaa\) is presumably modelled on juntaadu, which occurs in the corpus only as a de-verbal adjective and not as a postposition (Ian Smith, p.c. June 2013).
(15) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 2013)
\[\text{tōna } \text{voos isti ravkiin ki-kustumaa jeentis-pa un} \]
afterwards 2s this violin HAB-practice people-OBL a
\[\text{gōta bata laraa [...]} \]
little hit PFV
‘Then shake up these people who are practicing violin a little [...]’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979b: 192)
\[\text{n¯os oy } \text{ənöti viũu lo-bevə} \]
we today night arrack POT-drink
‘We will drink arrack tonight.’

In addition, -pə is also a dative affix, as it marks recipient arguments. Given that the same affix is used for both (animate) patients and recipients, I label the marker OBL[ique]:

(16) Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 201)
\[\text{e:w eli-pə diñe:ru já:-dá:} \]
I he-OBL money PST-give
‘I gave him the money.’

Companions take the postposition juuntu:

(17) Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 172)
\[\text{na:ywə tam økə ley me: na:ywə-su je:ntis ju:ntu lo-ðanda:} \]
bride also DEM like EMPH bride-GEN people with POT-go
gre:jə.
church
‘The bride also in the very same way goes with the bride’s people to the church.’

Instruments, on the other hand, select a different postposition wɔnḍə:

(18) Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 169)
\[\text{miñe muye:re ja:-limpa: (ne) ispe:y p:anu wɔnḍə.} \]
my wife PST-clean — mirror cloth INST
‘My wife cleaned the mirror with a cloth.’
While no strategy is reported in the literature as marking temporary possession specifically, Smith (p.c. June 2013) clarifies that Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese co-opts the ‘human locative’ case-marker -(u)ntaa to indicate alienable possession (19a), which is a logical condition of temporary possession but is also wider in scope. Having put forth this caveat, I will nonetheless consider this construction in our discussion, as it establishes an interesting connection with other languages involved. Interestingly, the available corpus also contains a similar construction with -ntu instead of -(u)ntaa (19b).

(19)  

a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)  

nosa-ntaa noov taan teem naa?  
1p.GEN-LOC new CONJ be TAG  
‘We have a new [violin] too, don’t we?’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith forthcoming)  

[...] cōmi-ntu teem naa doos alaa  
man-LOC be.PRS TAG two there  
‘[...] that man has two there, no?’

Generic location is marked by -(u)ntu, which we have encountered earlier in connection with addressees (20a,b). The postposition (-su) peērtu indicates proximate location (20c):

(20)  

a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 198)  

iskɔ:lə-ntu tudus məlwa:r  
school-LOC everyone Tamil  
‘In school everyone is Tamil.’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 171)  

tɔ:na fuwa:m-ntu gərdə: mesta-kuzə  
then fire-LOC keep OPT-boil  
‘Then you must put [it] on the fire and boil [it].’

c. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)  

nɔɔyva-su peērtu doos stronay-s taam mesa-santaa  
bride-GEN near two bridesmaid-P CNJ must-sit  
‘Next to the bride, two bridesmaids must also sit.’

Goals are unmarked (21a) if inanimate, but receive locative -(u)ntu otherwise ((21b); see also (12b):
a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979b: 192)
   \( \text{ẽw amiām kulumbu tā-əndā} \)
   1S tomorrow Colombo PRS-go
   ‘I am going to Colombo tomorrow.’

b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 198)
   \( \text{pa-y-ntu əndə:} \)
   father-LOC go
   ‘Go to father.’

2.3 Portuguese

Portuguese indicates case by way of prepositions or, in the case of some pronominal case distinctions, through morphology. As the major lexifier of both Indo-Portuguese varieties at the centre of this study, it must be taken in as a potential source not only of the forms used to express case but also of case-marking strategies.

2.3.1 Addressees in Portuguese

With regard to the case of addressees, both European Portuguese and Classical (i.e. 16th- through 18th-c.) Portuguese establish a boundary separating Addressee-TALK arguments from Addressee-TELL and Addressee-ASK arguments. Addressees of talk-type predicates command the preposition *com* ‘with’:

(22) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa fala / conversa com a sua mãe.

DEF.F Luísa speak.PRS.3S talk.PRS.3S with DEF.F her mother
‘Luísa talks to her mother.’

Addressees associated with other types of predicates of verbal interaction are marked by dative *a*, if nominal, or corresponding indirect object forms of personal pronouns:

(23) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa disse uma mentira a uma amiga.

DEF.F Luísa say.PST.3S IND.F lie DAT IND.F friend
‘Luísa told a lie to a friend.’

b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa perguntou a uma amiga as horas.

DEF.F Luísa ask.PST.3S DAT IND.F friend IND.F.P hour.P
‘Luísa asked a friend the time.’
2.3.2 Associate semantic roles in Portuguese

In Modern Portuguese, nominal patients are unmarked, and personal pronouns have specific direct object forms, as demonstrated in (24a). Having said that, it is also true that certain verbs with a patient argument in their semantic valency attribute a specific preposition to their objects, such as locative *em* ‘in’ or dative *a* ‘to’ (24b). In addition, the preposition *a* (prototypically associated with recipients, see below) does surface in a few constrained cases, most notably before a pronominal patient in cases when the use of a stressed personal pronoun is required (as e.g. to attribute focus to the patient) - contrast the sentence in (24c) with (24a):

(24) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

\[ \text{Eu empurrei-o} / o \ João. \]

1s push.pst.1s=3sm.acc def.m João

‘I pushed him / João.’

b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

\[ \text{Não bat} / a \ ninguém. \]

neg hit.pst.1s loc dat nobody

‘I haven’t hit anyone.’

c. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

\[ \text{Eu empurrei-o} a \ ele. \]

1s push.pst.1s=3sm.acc dat 3sm

‘It was him that I pushed.’

A relevant issue here is the fact that, in Classical Portuguese, more direct objects occurred with preposition *a* than they do nowadays. Schäfer-Prieß (2002) identifies a tendency to associate preposition *a* to highly individuated participants (e.g. proper nouns), which had its peak in the period between the 16th and the 18th century, even if there is considerable variation in the production of different authors. According to another study, in 16th-c. texts the human patients of verbs such as *ameaçar* ‘threaten’, *castigar* ‘punish’, *consolar* ‘console’, or *prender* ‘arrest’ were routinely preceded by the preposition *a*, whereas they are not in Contemporary Portuguese (Silva Neto 1970: 510-511).6

Interestingly, the preposition *a*, which we have encountered with addressees in 2.3.1, is also the one that introduces nominal recipients in Portuguese, and is therefore treated as the default dative case-marker:

---

6 According to Teyssier (2005: 467), the incidence of *a* introducing direct objects was already much more limited than in Spanish, in which to this day human objects are introduced by the preposition *a* – see also Schäfer-Prieß (2002: 409).
(25) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

Vou dar um presente a um amigo.

go.PRS.1s give.INF IND.m gift DAT IND.m friend

‘[I] will give a present to a friend.’

Both companions (26a) and instruments (26b) take the preposition *com* ‘with’, although there are several other choices of prepositions to introduce companions:

(26) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa vai à escola (junto) com / mais a amiga.

DEF.F Luísa go.PRS.3s to.DEF.F school together with in.addition DEF.F friend

‘Luísa goes to school with [her] friend.’

b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

Abre a porta com esta chave.

open.IMP DEF.F door with this.F key

‘Open the door with this key.’

In Portuguese, possessors which function as subjects of predicative possessive constructions with the verb *ter* ‘to have’ are unmarked. However, in order to convey a notion of temporary possession, an adjunct PP may be added in which the possessor is recovered (often anaphorically) and marked by the comitative/instrumental preposition *com* (27). It is worth noting that, syntactically, this construction is not comparable to the argument case-marking observed for Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese:

(27) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa não tinha dinheiro com ela / consigo.

DEF.F Luísa NEG have.PST.IPfv.3s money COM 3SF 3.COM

‘Luísa didn’t have money on her.’

As shown in (26), one option to introduce companions is to use the word *junto* ‘together, next to’ before the comitative preposition *com*. This construction is nowadays particularly common in Brazilian Portuguese, and builds on the inherent semantics of the word: as an adverb, *junto* also introduces the notion of shared agency (e.g. *fomos juntos* ‘[we] went together’) and, in combination of other prepositions (*de* or *a*), constructs proximate or adjacent location (28):
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(28) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A chave está junto a esse vaso.

DEF.F key be.PRS.3S next to that pot
‘The key is near/next to that pot.’

In addition, em ‘in, at’ marks generic location in Portuguese (29a), whereas the complex perto de ‘near’ is a dedicated marker of proximate location (29b), and the language furthermore has a host of other complex prepositions to establish finer semantic distinctions:

(29) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A chave ficou em casa.

DEF.F key stay.PST.3S in home
‘The key stayed at home.’

b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A chave está perto de um vaso.

DEF.F key be.PRS.3S near to IND.M pot
‘The key is near a pot.’

The preposition a we have seen earlier as a marker of addressees, patients and recipients recurs with goals, in which function it competes with para ‘to’; the distinction between the two lies in the time-stability of the predicate, in that goals introduced by para are seen as more permanent than those introduced by a:

(30) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

Vamos a / para casa.

go.PRS.1P to to home
‘[We]’re going home.’

2.4 Malayalam

Malayalam, the major language of the modern Indian state of Kerala (which includes the coastal stretch formerly known as the Malabar), is especially important as the major sub-/adstrate of Malabar Indo-Portuguese. Yet, given that the earliest Portuguese settlements in Asia were precisely located in the Malayalam-speaking region, scholars have hypothesised that the contact between Malayalam and Portuguese was foundational in the formation of Portuguese-based creoles elsewhere in Asia (see Smith 1977: 143ff; Clements 2000, 2009), which would grant Malayalam a seminal role over a wider subset of Asian-Portuguese than just that of the Malabar.
2.4.1 Addressees in Malayalam

Malayalam has a nominal suffix -ooṭə expressing a typically Dravidian case often called sociative or associative in the literature (see Krishnamurti 2003: 235-237; Asher & Kumari 1997: 191ff), reserved for the stimuli of psych verbs (e.g. love, pity, be indebted) and the arguments of various predicates indicating social interaction (e.g. fight, borrow, excuse). This case is the one assigned to addressees of all types. Sentence (31a) exemplifies this for Addressee-TALK arguments, (31b) for Addressee-TELL arguments (and 35c,d) for Addressee-ASK arguments:

   ṇaan ᵀookṭar-ooṭə samsaariccu
   1s doctor-SOC speak.PST
   ‘I spoke to the doctor.’

   raaman raadhay-ooṭə oru kaaryam ārámnu
   Raman Radha-SOC a thing tell.PST
   ‘Raman told Radha something.’

   ṇaan ampalatt-il pookukayaanoo enno kuṭṭi enno-ooṭə
do.IMPV.PRS.INT QUOT child 1s-SOC
   coodiccu
   ask.PST
   ‘The child asked me if I was going to the temple.’

d. Malayalam (Nair 2012: 35)
   keeralam sanḍarśikkaṇam ennu anṭay-ooṭū avar
   Kerala visit.OBLG QUOT you-SOC
   apeeksiccirunnu
   request.PST.CONT
   ‘They had requested you to visit Kerala.’

2.4.2 Associate semantic roles in Malayalam

Typical patients take the accusative marker -e, as shown in (32):

(32) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 60)
   poolliskaaran vati konṭa kuṭṭiy-e aṭiccnu
   policeman stick INST child-ACC beat-PST
   ‘The policeman beat the child with a stick.’
Recipients, on the other hand, take a dative suffix which is sensitive to the phonological context of insertion and can therefore be realised as -kkə, -nə or -ə:

(33) a. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 181)

raaman innale kaṣṇan-ṇə ranta pustakamm koṭuttu
Raman yesterday Krishna-DAT two book give.PST
‘Krishna gave Krishnan two books yesterday.’


kutti-kkə amma paal koṭuttu
child-DAT mother milk give.PST
‘The mother gave the child milk.’

In Malayalam, there are several ways of signalling companions (Asher & Kumari 1997: 196): either with the noun in the sociative case followed by the postpositions kuṭṭi (34a), kuṭte, oppam or otto, or with the noun in the genitive case followed by kuṭte (34b).


saara kuṭṭukaariy-oottə kuṭti vannu
Sarah friend.f-SOC along.with come.PST
‘Sarah came with a friend.’

b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 196)

aval kuṭṭukaariy-ute kuṭte vannu
3 friend.f-GEN along.with come.PST
‘She came with a friend.’

Instruments can be indicated by a specific instrumental postposition koṇṭə – see (32) above – or the instrumental case suffix -aal:

(35) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 210)

tiiyin-aal kuṭil naʃippikkapettu
fire-INST hut destroy.PASS.PST
‘The hut was destroyed with(/by) fire.’

While Malayalam possessors are normally dative-marked (Asher & Kumari 1997: 174-175) in predicative possessive constructions, temporary possessors can be expressed in various ways: either by embedding the possessor in a locative phrase meaning ‘in X’s hand’ (36a) or by adding the locative postposition atuttə ‘near’ to a genitive-marked noun (36b):

\[\text{enre kayy-il paṇam uṇṭe}\]
1S GEN hand-LOC money be.PRS
‘I have money (on me).’

b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 175)

\[\text{ayaal-ute aṭutta nalla saarikaḷ uṇṭe}\]
3S GEN near good sari.P be.PRS
‘He has good saris (with him).’

Malayalam uses the case affix -il – see (36a) – to indicate generic location (37a), while proximate location uses the postposition aṭutta ‘near’ seen in the previous example sentence (37b) and, interestingly, the selection of the sociative case-marker -ooṭe conveys an idea of adjacent location (37c). In addition, an array of other postpositions is used to make finer locative distinctions (see Asher & Kumari 1997: 64-65).


\[\text{ii kaat-til valare aanakaḷ uṇṭe}\]
PROX forest-LOC many elephant be.PRS
‘There are many elephants in this forest.’

b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 196)

\[\text{kiṇarrin-re aṭutta ninnu}\]
well-GEN next.to stand.PST
‘[He] stood near the well.’

c. Malayalam (Nair 2012: 23)

\[\text{amma kuṇnin-e neńc-ooṭu ceeṛttirunu}\]
mother child-ACC bosom-SOC hold.close.PST.CONT
‘The mother had held the baby close to her bosom.’

Finally, goals take the same case-marker as recipients:

(38) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 62)

\[\text{raajamma kaṭa-kkə pooyi}\]
Rajamma shop-DAT go.PST
‘Rajamma went to the shop.’
2.5 Tamil

At one point, Indo-Portuguese creoles were used in a wide area of Sri Lanka, comprising both the Tamil-majority and Sinhala-majority parts of the island. The data on which our discussion of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, however, comes from the Tamil-speaking region (see 1.1), and therefore we take Tamil as the most relevant adstrate in this study – which is not to say Sinhala linguistic material and/or models could not have made their way into Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese. The primacy of Tamil in this study is supported by previous ones: Smith (1977, 1979a) identified early on significant similarities between Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese and Tamil, and later studies (Smith 2012; Cardoso 2012) show this link to be stronger than that with Sinhala.

2.5.1 Addressees in Tamil

In Tamil, Addressee_TALK arguments can be treated in a number of ways. They may take the sociative affix -ooT (39a), the animate locative affix -kitTe (39b), or the dative affix -ukku (39c):

(39) a. Tamil (Asher 1985: 30)

   kaññan daakṭar-oote peecinaan
   Kannan doctor-SOC speak.PST.3SM
   ‘Kannan spoke to the doctor.’

b. Tamil (Asher 1985: 64)

   neettu vantu en-kitTe peecana payyan
   yesterday come.PTCP 1S-LOC speak.PST.REL boy
   ‘The boy who came yesterday and spoke to me’

c. Tamil (Asher 1985: 86)

   avan tan-akku taanee peecikiTTaan
   3SM self-DAT EMPH speak.REFL.PST.3SM
   ‘He spoke to himself.’

Addressee_TELL arguments can also take a variety of case-markers, but the array is a little different. Instead of the sociative, the literature reports the accusative marker -e (40a), but also the animate locative (40b) as a formal/deferential alternative, and the dative (40c) in informal speech:

(40) a. Tamil (Asher 1985: 66)

   vaT saN viTaan en-e peecinaan
   yesterday sleep-3SM 3-LOC speak.PST.3SM
   ‘They spoke to the sleeping man.’

b. Tamil (Asher 1985: 66)

   saN viTaan en-kitTe peecana
   3SM 3-LOC speak.PST.REL
   ‘He spoke to the sleeping man’

c. Tamil (Asher 1985: 66)

   saN viTaan en-ukku peecinaan
   3SM 3-LOC speak.PST.3SM
   ‘He spoke to the sleeping man’

As examples in this section come from different sources, and these use slightly different conventions for romanisation, some orthographical inconsistency is unavoidable.
When it comes to Addressee_{ASK} arguments, the postposition \textit{paattu} (41a) and the animate locative marker (41b) are attested:

(41) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 43)
\textit{avan-e paattu kee\u{t}\u{t}aala?}
\textit{he-ACC at ask.PST}
‘Did she ask him?’

b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 189)
\textit{ayya\u{a}-ki\u{t}\u{e}e oru koraccaalaana vaa\u{a}haeyle oru vii\u{u}du}
\textit{master-LOC a cheap rent-LOC a house}
\textit{paakka sollungal-een}
\textit{to.find say.IMP-DEFER}
‘Would you be so kind as to ask the master to find me a cheap place to live?’

2.5.2 Associate semantic roles in Tamil

Typical patients take the accusative case affix \textit{-e}; accusative-marking carries the notion of definiteness, so that indefinite patients may be unmarked if they are inanimate (Schiffman 1999: 36-37):

(42) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 90)
\textit{tirud\u{a}nga en nay-e ko\u{n}\u{n}u\u{p}\u{t}\u{t}aanga}
\textit{thieves my dog-ACC kill.MALICE.PST.3p}
‘Thieves (in cold blood) killed my dog.’
b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 94)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{kaaru} & \quad \text{tondaravu} \quad \text{kođuttu-kiṭṭirundadu;} \quad \text{ad-e} \quad \text{vittu} \\
\text{car} & \quad \text{trouble} \quad \text{give-DUR} \quad \text{it-ACC} \quad \text{sell}
\end{align*}\]

tolecçuṭṭeen
IMPAT.PST.1S

‘My car was giving me trouble; I sold it off (and was finished with it).’

Recipients typically take the suffix -uƙku/akku/(y)kki, as demonstrated in (43a); in case they are assigned the animate locative marker kiṭṭe, the implication is that the predicate restores previous ownership (43b):

(43)  
\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)} \\
& \quad \text{avar-uƙku muttu maaleye kuđutteen} \\
& \quad \text{3s-DAT} \quad \text{pearl} \quad \text{necklace} \quad \text{give.PST.1S} \\
& \quad \text{‘I gave him the pearl necklace.’}
\end{align*}\]

b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{avar-kiṭṭe muttu maaleye kuđutteen} \\
3s-LOC \quad \text{pearl} \quad \text{necklace} \quad \text{give.PST.1S}
\end{align*}\]

‘I returned the pearl necklace to him.’

The sociative case-marker -ooɗe introduced in 2.5.1 is typically assigned to companions (44a). There are, however, alternative strategies involving the postpositions kuudo (44b) and toneyle (44c):

(44)  
\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 35)} \\
& \quad \text{sneydar-ooɗe} \\
& \quad \text{friend-SOC} \\
& \quad \text{‘with a friend’}
\end{align*}\]

b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 39)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{attaan} & \quad \text{kuudo} \\
\text{brother-in-law.NOM} \quad \text{with} \\
\text{‘with brother-in-law’}
\end{align*}\]

c. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 40)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{enga} & \quad \text{tonyele} \\
\text{we.NOM} \quad \text{with} \\
\text{‘with us’}
\end{align*}\]
Instruments have a dedicated case affix -aal(e), demonstrated in (45); however, when applied to inanimates, sociative -ooɖe may also have an instrumental reading (Schiffman 1999: 34ff).

(45) Tamil (Krishnamurti 2003: 236)

\textbf{villin-āl}  
bow-INST  
‘with the bow’

Just as in Malayalam, typical possessors are dative-marked (Schiffman 1999: 29-30) but, in order to convey the notion of temporary possession, the animate locative -kitṭe is selected:

(46) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)

\textbf{en-kitṭe paṇam irukku}  
1S-LOC money be.PRS  
‘I have money on me.’

The marking of generic location is sensitive to animacy, in that inanimate locations receive the marker -(i)le (47a) – reported in Smith (1977) as -(i)la(y) for Sri Lanka Tamil (47b) – and animate locations take the marker -(k)iṭṭe we have encountered earlier in a variety of functions (47c) – see also (40b):

(47) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 31)

\textbf{kooyil-le}  
temple-LOC  
‘in the temple’

b. Tamil (Smith 1977: 146)

\textbf{enka-Ta vi:TT-il\a kataykk-ama iрукk-ra:nka ta:y-takappan!?}  
we-GEN house-LOC speak-without be-PRS mother-father  
‘in our house are [her] parents not speaking it?’

c. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 31)

\textbf{avar-tṭte}  
he-LOC  
‘on him’

Finer semantic locative distinctions make use of several different postpositions. Notions of proximate location, for instance, may be indicated by \textit{pakkattle} (48a), \textit{pakkam} (48b) or -(a)ṇḍe (48c):
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(48) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 37)

kooyil-ukku pakkattle
temple.DAT near
‘near the temple’

b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 39)

meḍraas pakkam
Madras.NOM near
‘near Madras’

c. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 40)

avar-aṇḍe
he.NOM-near
‘near him’

Inanimate goals are dative-marked in Tamil (49a), while an animate goal takes the animate locative marker (49b):

(49) a. Tamil (Steever 2005: 119)

avan viṭṭu-ku oṭi pōnān
3SM house-DAT run go.PST.3SM
‘He went running to the house.’

b. Tamil (Smith 1979a: 198)

appa:-TTa po:
father-LOC go
‘Go to father.’

3 Analysis

To aid in the discussion, the results of the survey above are given in Table 1, which indicates what markers can be associated with each semantic role in all of the five languages under analysis. In this table, the first column refers to Portuguese and, to make the comparison easier, each of the Dravido-Portuguese creoles are shown next to their respective Dravidian adstrate. In each column, those markers that occur with addressees are given in bold type, so that it becomes clearer what functions they perform in other domains of the language.
Tab. 1: Markers attested in the languages under study for each semantic role; for each language, bold forms are the ones used to mark Addressee arguments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Malayalam</th>
<th>Malabar I-P</th>
<th>Sri Lanka I-P</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressee TALK</strong></td>
<td>com N</td>
<td>N-oŏ</td>
<td>N-(s) perto</td>
<td>N-(u)ntu</td>
<td>N-oode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N-jü̈tada</td>
<td>N juuntu</td>
<td>N-(k)ffe</td>
<td>N-(u)kku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a N</td>
<td>N-oŏ</td>
<td>N-(s) perto</td>
<td>N-po</td>
<td>N-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N-(u)ntu</td>
<td>N-(u)ntaa</td>
<td>N-(k)ffe [FORMAL]</td>
<td>N-(u)kku [COLL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressee TELL</strong></td>
<td>a N</td>
<td>N-oŏ</td>
<td>N-(s) perto</td>
<td>N-(u)ntu</td>
<td>N-(k)ffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N-(u)ntaa</td>
<td>N-e paattu</td>
<td>N-e paattu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressee ASK</strong></td>
<td>a N</td>
<td>N-oŏ</td>
<td>N-(s) perto</td>
<td>N-(u)ntu</td>
<td>N-(k)ffe [FORMAL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N-(u)ntaa</td>
<td>N-e paattu</td>
<td>N-e paattu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Patient**: Ø N
- **Recipient**: a N [+HUM]
- **Companion**: com N
- **Instrument**: com N
- **Temporary possessor**: N1 + com N1
- **Location**: em N
- **Goal**: para N [+TMP]

[Note: The language-specific forms are listed in the table, with bold forms indicating the preferred markers for Addressee arguments.]
For our purposes, it is now important to consider the sources of the actual linguistic forms used in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles (the *matter*, see 1.2) and of their functional distribution (the *pattern*), and the ways in which our data reveals processes of reanalysis and reconfiguration. One preliminary observation is that, in terms of matter, all morphemes used to mark addressees in Dravido-Portuguese are derived from Portuguese: MIP has *parto* from PTG *perto* ‘near’ and *jútado* from PTG *juntado* ‘joined/connected’ (and the connecting genitive marker *-s* from PTG *sua* ‘his/her(s)/their(s) [fem.sg]’); SLIP has both *juuntu* and *-(u)ntu* ultimately from PTG *junto* ‘together/next to’, *-(u)ntaa* from PTG *juntado* ‘joined/connected’, and *-pə* from PTG *para* ‘to’. However, a look at Table 1 also shows that none of these Portuguese morphemes mark addressees in that language; in order to understand how they came to be used with addressees in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles, we must first explain their functional range in the creoles.

### 3.1 Sourcing the functional range of addressee markers in Dravido-Portuguese

Even though Portuguese appears to be the only relevant donor of morphological material for markers of addressees in the creoles, the use of these markers could, in principle, have been influenced by Portuguese or their respective local adstrates (Malayalam in the case of the Malabar, Tamil in the case of northeastern Sri Lanka). To establish whether single lexifier/adstrate markers provide adequate models for the creoles, I have compared the functional range of the markers associated with addressees in Dravido-Portuguese with that of the markers in their donor languages with which any of them coincides at least once in Table 1. The results are given in Tables 2 and 3 (for the Malabar and Sri Lanka respectively); I have considered in this comparison only the creole markers which occur with addressees, excluding the markers in the donor languages which never coincide with them.

In these tables, each cell contains an equation \( \frac{x}{y} = z \), in which: \( y \) stands for the number of semantic roles in which at least one of the two markers being compared are attested; \( x \) indicates the number of semantic roles in which they coincide; and the division of \( x \) by \( y \) results in a value (\( z \)) between 0 and 1 for the degree of coincidence between the two markers, in which 0 indicates no match at all and 1 indicates a complete match. Shaded cells indicate equations which result in a \( z \)-value higher than .5, i.e. pairs in which the two markers coincide in more than half of their attested uses. While this is indeed a possibility, it is worth noting that in English, which arrived on the scene later and is nowadays spoken extensively by the small MIP-speaking
community, the preposition *with* has a functional range very similar to that of PTG *com*: it is both a comitative and an instrumental marker, and it can be used with Addressee-TALK arguments but not the other addressee types. In addition, *-jūtado* only occurs with Addressee-TALK arguments in elicited sentences collected through the use of English as an intermediary language, which opens the possibility that on-the-fly translational constraints might be responsible for it.

When it comes to Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, the data in Table 3 reveals some interesting similarities and differences, in particular with respect to the SLIP elements *juuntu*, -(u)ntu and -(u)ntaa. As explained earlier in 2.3.1, the SLIP elements *juuntu* and -(u)ntu have a common origin but, if treated separately, it becomes clear that the most relevant match for the functional scope of *juuntu* is the Tamil sociative marker *-oođe* while the use of -(u)ntu is particularly similar to that of the Tamil animate locative -(ki)tte. With respect to the first pair, the only function in which SLIP *juuntu* and TAM-oođe do not coincide is the expression of instrumental semantics with non-animates.
Tab. 3: Distributional similarity between addressee markers in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese and markers in its donor languages (Portuguese and Tamil).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N juuntu</th>
<th>N-(u)ntu</th>
<th>N-(u)ntaa</th>
<th>N-po</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG com N</strong></td>
<td>2/4 = .5</td>
<td>2/8 = .25</td>
<td>1/7 = .14</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG a N</strong></td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>3/8 = .38</td>
<td>2/7 = .29</td>
<td>3/5 = .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG Ø N</strong></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>1/3 = .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG mais N</strong></td>
<td>1/2 = .5</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG junto com N</strong></td>
<td>1/2 = .5</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG em N</strong></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG perto de N</strong></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG junto a/de N</strong></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTG para N</strong></td>
<td>2/3 = .67</td>
<td>1/8 = .13</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/6 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/8 = .13</td>
<td>6/7 = .86</td>
<td>4/7 = .57</td>
<td>2/8 = .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/5 = .2</td>
<td>3/7 = .43</td>
<td>1/7 = .14</td>
<td>2/5 = .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
<td>1/7 = .14</td>
<td>1/5 = .2</td>
<td>2/3 = .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>1/3 = .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 = .5</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 = .5</td>
<td>0/7 = 0</td>
<td>0/5 = 0</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/3 = 0</td>
<td>1/6 = .17</td>
<td>1/4 = .25</td>
<td>0/4 = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The case of addressee in Dravido-Portuguese
One should note, however, that this is a secondary function of TAM -oođe (see 2.5.2) and that overall Tamil distinguishes companions and instruments formally. It is perhaps more significant that Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese sides with its Dravidian adstrate in this respect, in contradistinction to Portuguese. Having said that, it is also noteworthy that other elements achieve a .5 match value with SLIP juuntu, namely all those that mark companions in either donor language: PTG com, mais and junto com, and TAM kuuđe and tőneyle.⁸ Both the Tamil sociative marker -oođe and the Portuguese comitative/instrumental marker com could motivate the functional expansion of SLIP juuntu to Addressee_{TALK} but not to Addressee_{TELL} nor Addressee_{ASK}. All in all, it is safe to say that, based on the data in Tables 1 and 3, the lead of TAM -oođe over PTG com as the most relevant model for the functional range of SLIP juuntu is marginal; further analysis of the use of juuntu in contexts in which the Portuguese and Tamil markers diverge (e.g. with stimuli of psych verbs) may clarify the situation.

As noted earlier, -(u)ntu achieves the highest match value with the Tamil animate locative -(k)iṭṭe but, interestingly, so does SLIP -(u)ntaa. These two elements have slightly different etymological sources (see 2.2.1) and are treated in descriptions of the language as slightly different in function too, with -(u)ntaa being reserved for human referents. However, in this function, there seems to be quite some competition from -(u)ntu, which, in addition to functioning as a generic locative, is also attested with animate and even human referents (e.g., in the case of addressees, but also possessors and animate goals). As a matter of fact, the match is more significant between TAM -(k)iṭṭe and SLIP -(u)ntu (.86) than between TAM -(k)iṭṭe and SLIP -(u)ntaa (.57). The only function in which -(k)iṭṭe is not matched by -(u)ntu, according to the available data, is its use as a marker of recipients in the rather specific contexts that convey the sense of restoring previous ownership (see 2.5.2). As for -(u)ntaa, it does not mirror the use of -(k)iṭṭe with Addressee_{TALK} arguments, recipients, and animate goals; considering that the available corpora contain less examples of -(u)ntaa than -(u)ntu, however, one cannot be certain that -(u)ntaa is disallowed in these functions. The functional scope of the Tamil animate locative is therefore essential to understand that of both SLIP -(u)ntu and -(u)ntaa (including their use as markers of addressees) but, interestingly, the

⁸SLIP juuntu occupies a particularly small number of cells in Table 1 (only 2) and, with the exception of PTG com, all the other donor language elements occur in 1 cell only. Under these circumstances, one should bear in mind that any single match or mismatch is bound to have a large impact on the final match value.
creole does not mirror univocally the Dravidian distinction between animate and non-animate locative markers: while the distribution of -(u)ntaa appears to be confined to animate (or perhaps human) referents, -(u)ntu waives such a restriction and, in this respect only, sides more closely with Portuguese.

When it comes to SLIP -pə, it is interesting that two elements in the donor languages achieve close high scores: TAM accusative -e (.67) and PTG dative a (.6). As described in 2.2.2, SLIP -pə is termed oblique precisely because it extends to recipients and animate patients. This conflation is not uncommon in the Portuguese-lexified creoles of South Asia (cf. the distribution of MIP -pə in Table 1; also Clements 1996: 160ff; Cardoso 2009: 180ff) and elsewhere in Asia (cf. Baxter 1988), as discussed in detail in Clements (2009: 55ff). A look at Table 1 shows that, with respect to this particular syncretism, it is Classical Portuguese that provides the most significant input, with its possibility to attribute the typical dative preposition a also to human patients (see 2.3.2), whereas both Portuguese and the Dravidian adstrates could account for the association of overt accusative marking with human participants. With regard to the use of SLIP -pə with addressees, the functional range of both TAM -e and PTG a could be invoked, with the caveat that the occurrence of the latter with AddresseeASK arguments does not seem to be paralleled by SLIP -pə. Again, though, the scarcity of available data does not allow us to rule out the use of -pə in this function and, as a result, we must relativise the small lead TAM -e appears to have over PTG a as a model for the use of SLIP-pə.

3.2 Diachronic excursus: contact-induced functional reanalysis

We have noticed, at the outset of section 3, that none of the Portuguese etyma for the Dravido-Portuguese addressee markers have that function in the lexifier language, and they are also not part of the donor language elements which emerged as particularly significant to account for the functional range of the creole markers. This implies the operation of a diachronic process by which, during the development of the Dravido-Portuguese creoles, Portuguese markers and their functions came to be rearranged. In this sub-section, we will attempt to reconstruct this process for each of the Dravido-Portuguese addressee markers, to the extent possible.

MIP -(sə) pərtə, as we have seen, derives its functional distribution from MAL -ootə and its phonological form from PTG perto (de). The cooption of this particular Portuguese form is easily explained on the basis of the data contained in Table 1, as both PTG perto (de) and MAL -ootə have locative functions. To be more precise, PTG perto (de) is a marker of proximate location, whereas MAL -ootə indicates adjacency. While these locative categories are not
coincidental, their association is perhaps based on the notion that, logically, adjacency implies proximate location (but not the other way around). Once this connection was established, the process of functional reanalysis (in this case, functional expansion) of PTG *perto (de)* on the basis of MAL *-ootɔ* could proceed, resulting in the modern functional range of MIP *(so)* *perto*.

As for MIP *-jûtado*, we have established that its form is derived from PTG *juntado* and much of its functional distribution appears to be modelled on PTG *com*. While PTG *juntado* (a participle form of the verb *juntar* ‘to join, connect’) does not occur as such in Table 1, the related adverb *junto* ‘together, next to’ (see 2.3.2) does, involved in the expression of proximate location and comitative. The shared comitative semantics of Portuguese *junto (com)/junto(s)* and *com* is perhaps the key to why, in Malabar Indo-Portuguese, a derivative of the former could take over a portion of the functional range of the latter to encompass instrument-marking and Addressee-TALK-marking.

The same Portuguese cluster (*junto* and *juntado*) is also involved in the development of three Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese markers, viz. *juuntu*, *(u)ntu* and *(u)ntaa*. However, as noted in 3.1, their function range reveals the influence of two different Tamil case-markers, viz. *-ooɗe* and *(ki)t.t.e*. With respect to SLIP *juuntu*, the process of functional reanalysis was probably motivated by the coincidence of PTG *junto* and TAM *-ooɗe* as markers of companions, while in the case of *(u)ntaa* the relevant functional match is that between PTG *(junto)/juntado* and TAM *(ki)t.t.e* in the locative domain. In the case of *(u)ntu*, the explanation is similar to that for *(u)ntaa*, but there is the additional question of whether there was ever a stage in the creole in which a single form (perhaps *juuntu* or similar) covered the combined functional range of modern-day *juuntu + *(u)ntu*, before a process of speciation and phonological reduction resulted in the modern-day distribution. An answer to this question is likely to lie in a critical analysis of older texts written in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, which lies beyond the scope of this study.

Finally, the case of SLIP *-pɔ* is a little more complex. If we were to limit ourselves to Table 1, we might propose that the fact that both PTG *para* (the etymon, also typically a marker of beneficiaries) and PTG *a* (one of the relevant functional models) can be used to mark goals provides the grounds for the association between matter and pattern which resulted in modern SLIP *-pɔ*. This may be so, but the fact that *para* or derivatives of it have additional functions (e.g. as addressee- or recipient-markers) not only in various other Portuguese-based creoles but also in some varieties of Portuguese (such as Brazilian Portuguese) raises the possibility that, in spoken Classical Portuguese, the functional similarity between *para* and *a* was closer than the available sources and descriptions indicate. This issue, once again, goes beyond the scope of the current comparative work, and stands as a final suggestion of further research which highlights the potential of the study of creole languages to challenge and motivate other domains of linguistic inquiry.
Abbreviations

ACC accusative, COM comitative, COND conditional, CONJ conjunction, CONT continuous, DAT dative, DEF definite, DEFER deferential, DEM demonstrative, DUR durative, EMPH emphasis, FUT future, GEN genitive, HAB habitual, HON honorific, IMP imperative, IMPFV imperfective, IND indefinite, INF infinitive, INST instrumental, INT interrogative, IRR irrealis, LOC locative, MAL Malayalam, MIP Malabar Indo-Portuguese, N noun, NEG negative, NOM nominative, NP noun phrase, OBL oblique, OBLIG obligation, PASS passive, PFV perfective, POT potential, PROX proximate, PRS present, PST past, PTCP participle, PTG Portuguese, QUOT quotative, REFLEX reflexive, REL relative, SLIP Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, SOC sociative, TAG tag, TAM Tamil.
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