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(1) Vernacular Liberian English (VLE)
   a. Coastal variety:
      originated c.18th,
      dominated by Kru substrates
   b. Interior variety:
      originated early c.20th,
      dominated by Mande substrates

(2) CV(N) syllable structure
   in major substrate languages
   a. Coastal:
      i. CV: Klao (Singler 1979) = Kru in the map
      ii. CVn: Bassa (Bertkau 1975: 134)
   b. Interior
      i. CV: Loma, Dan/Gio, Bandi
         (Sadler 1951: 19ff; Bearth & Zemp 1967: 13; Singler 1991)

(3) Interior variety, interview with Overseer
   a. The first, the first, the first time we going Monrovia, the time we, we, we no hear English
      self, we wə talk for Lorma, from here to be Monrovia we wə get load we put it for wia baek,
      any town, we reach there, we tell to the people, "Give we house, we sleep there," we can't get
      it. They give we the kitchen, the rice kitchen. Sometime they give we, we go there, all the
      goat there all what leavi in the town, they want to fight with you for kitchen, because their
      load, wia load, they want to eat. We de drivı them. We sleep there. Day broke, we wake up.

(4) L1 Loma speakers of interior VLE (VLE-I) in 1981, 1985 (Singler 199The : 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paragoge</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
<th>Re syllabification</th>
<th>Glottal-Stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less basilectal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaster</td>
<td>10/75</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30/58</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottlepicer</td>
<td>6/75</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45/66</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Soldier</td>
<td>14/75</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26/70</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee</td>
<td>36/75</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24/59</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>27/75</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26/58</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>39/75</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6/59</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapper</td>
<td>40/75</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6/40</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>525</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Paragoge in the VLE-I basilect (Singler 1991)
   Add a front vowel to a monosyllabic consonant-final verb.
(6) Statistically significant factor groups for paragoge (Singler 1991: Appendix)

Each factor is assigned a value between .01 and 1.00. Values over .5 favor paragoge; values under .5 disfavor it. The further a value is from .5, the stronger it is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More basilectal speakers</th>
<th>Less basilectal speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vowel Height</td>
<td>Following phonological environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>consonant .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>vowel .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>pause .31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb-final consonant</td>
<td>Verb-final consonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/pl/ .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/t/ .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>/k/ .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>/v/ .72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>/s/ .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/l/ .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following grammatical environment</td>
<td>Following grammatical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP .72</td>
<td>NP .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun .34</td>
<td>pronoun .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb/PP .42</td>
<td>adverb/PP .31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particle (.00)</td>
<td>particle .68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowel height

input .49
p < .000

(7) Two unusual frequency patterns

a. Less basilectal: prevocalic (.76) > preconsonantal (.42) > prepausal (.31)
b. Less basilectal: after /p b/ (.56) > after /k g/ (.25), /t d/ (.26)
   More basilectal: after /p b/ (.85) > after /k g/ (.45) > after /t d/ (.29)

(8) In the interior basilect, prevocalic > preconsonantal > prepausal, but

a. Prevocalic paragoge (CV#V) is non-optimising compared to preconsonantal (CV#C)
b. Prepausal is usually the best environment for paragoge
   i. Best environment: Vietnamese L2 English, Bolivian Spanish (Hansen 2004; Lipski 2008)
   ii. Only environment: Galician, Old Spanish verse (Martinez-Gil 1997; Pidal 1953: 108–121)

(9) In the interior basilect, /p/ and /b/ favour paragoge, but

a. Brazilian L2 English: /k g/ 17.0% > /t d/ 13.5% > /p b/ 10.5% (Baptista & da Silva Filho 2006)
b. Berbice Dutch Creole: /t d/ 100% > /k g/ 96% > /p b/ 75% (Singh & Muysken 1995: 164)

(10) Existing accounts of paragoge

a. Substrate transfer and syllable-structure simplification don’t explain frequency patterns
b. Consonant release bursts predict the opposite of the BVLE-I frequency patterns
   i. Prepausal > preconsonantal > prevocalic (gestural overlap: Ng 2015: 136)
   ii. After /k/ > after /t/ > after /p/ (airstream pressure: Marty 2012)
(11) Why is the interior basilect different?
a. The input was the coastal variety, in which deletion is frequent
   - Which segments would most often be deleted? => Perceptual salience
b. Adult learners imitate frequency patterns from input (cf. Hudson Kam & Newport 2005)
   - How to produce the non-deleted consonants? => CV(N) substrates → Paragoge
c. Interior paragoge is most frequent where the final consonant is most perceptually salient
   - Perceptual salience of consonant ≠ audibility of release burst

(12) In interior basilect, prevocalic > preconsonantal > prepausal, because of salience hierarchy
a. Prevocalic consonants are extremely acoustically salient due to C#V transition
b. Preconsonantal consonants are less salient because C#C transition provides weaker cues
c. Prepausal consonants are least salient because there is no transition to a following segment

(13) In interior basilect, /p/ and /b/ favour paragoge, because of salience hierarchy
a. Labial /b/ > coronal /d/ > dorsal /g/ (Winters 2001)
b. Labials are often preserved while other consonants are deleted
   i. Latin > French: sapère > savoir but viña > vie, seçuru > sûr (Hualde, Nadeu & Simonet 2010)
   ii. Colloquial Singaporean English grasp [graps] but list [lis], risk [ris] (Mohan 1992: 120)

(14) Contribution to the field
a. Beyond substrate transfer: We can learn a lot by looking at paths of transmission.
b. Beyond creole phonology: There is useful data in pidgins and phonetic detail.
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