

## Book Review

### *Synchronic and diachronic perspectives on contact languages*

TJERK HAGEMEIJER  
Universidade de Lisboa  
Centro de Linguística  
tjerk@clix.pt

*Synchronic and diachronic perspectives on contact languages*. Edited by Magnus Huber & Viveka Velupellai (2007): Creole Language Library, Vol. 32. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Let me start by quoting the provocative last sentence of the last paper in this volume, which questions “(...) the very validity of the field of Linguistics called *Creole* and the validity of a categorisation of a group of the languages of the world under a rubric *creole*.” (Ferreira and Alleyne, p. 352). This question is recurrent in the field of creole linguistics and ultimately mirrors the conscience that it is hard to come up with a linguistically and/or socio-historically uniform hypothesis regarding the formation of creole languages. Even an advocate of the universal approach to creolization like Bickerton (1981: 2) carefully claims that “(...) my aim here is not to account for the origins of all languages known as creoles (which would be an absurd aim anyway since they do not constitute a proper set) (...)”.

The content of this volume and its broad-spectrum title indirectly highlight this ongoing epistemological quest. But rather than casting a spell on the field, it just illustrates that creoles studies are very much alive and continue to actively benefit many minority languages around the globe. The volume consists of 15 papers, selected from a total of 25 peer-reviewed submissions

based on talks held at the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics (SPCL) meetings in Curaçao (2004), Oakland (2005) and Albuquerque (2006). I will briefly address the content of each contribution.

Part I of the book focuses on phonetics and phonology in a diachronic and synchronic perspective.

The sociolinguistic study “Maintenance or assimilation?: Phonological variation and change in the realization of /t/ by British Barbadians” (pp. 3-22), by Michelle Braña-Straw, shows that this linguistic feature sets apart first (adult immigrants) and second (child immigrants) generation Barbadians in Ipswich (England) from the locally born British (called Anglos). In particular, it is shown that one individual who is integrated in both Barbadian and Anglo networks has negotiated his accent between both communities.

In his paper “Universal and substrate influence on the phonotactics and syllable structure of Krio” (pp. 23-42), Malcolm Finney attempts to establish to what extent segmental and syllable properties of this Sierra Leone creole are universal or substrate-induced. On the basis of empirical evidence, he concludes that no prominent role can be assigned to either view.

In “Tone on quantifiers in Saramaccan as a transferred feature from Kikongo” (pp. 43-66), by Marvin Kramer, it is argued that tone rules for non-universal quantifiers in Saramaccan, a Portuguese/English-related Surinam creole, constitute a marked pattern of rightward High spread, which cannot be assigned to Fongbe, the creole’s primary substrate language. Instead, it is shown that Kikongo, a secondary substrate language of Saramaccan exhibits the same marked tone spread rules, motivating Kramer’s claim that this constitutes the first piece of evidence of transfer from Kikongo into Saramaccan beyond lexicon and lexical phonology.

Shelome Gooden addresses the “Morphophonological properties of pitch accents in Jamaican Creole reduplication”, showing that intensive and distributive adjectival reduplication of monosyllabic and disyllabic bases requires distinct accentual treatments, in accordance with their different metrical structure. More precisely, distributive reduplication, like compounds in this creole, exhibit only one accented syllable, whereas intensive reduplication are doubly accented, which may be related to emphasis as a pragmatic function. Within the OT framework, it is further shown that reduplication is leftward and that faithfulness to the base is a strong requirement.

In his paper “Effort reduction and the grammar: liquid phonology in Haitian and St. Lucian” (pp. 91-114), Eric Russell Webb compares the surface realizations of liquids (/ʁ/ and /l/) in linguistically related Haitian Creole and St. Lucian Creole. Under the assumption that an “(...) explanation of any linguistic phenomenon should refer to extra-linguistic principles (...)” (p. 96), the discussion is couched in the model of Articulatory Phonology, with a crucial role for gestural tract variables and effort. The diverging properties in

the liquid domain between both creoles are then accounted for by different ranking of the articulatory constraints in an OT framework.

Part II of the book consists of five papers dealing with synchronic perspectives on the languages in question.

Maria Alexandra Fiéis and Fernanda Pratas focus on “Reflexivity in Capeverdean: predicate properties and sentence structure” (pp. 117-128) by comparing *se*-reflexives in Portuguese to their null counterpart in Capeverdean Creole (e.g. Ptg. *Pedro lavou-se* vs. CV *Pedru laba*, both ‘Peter washed (himself)’). In both languages, the Agent in these constructions absorbs the internal and external theta-role, but they differ in that the value of the Split IP parameter is negative in Capeverdean, with TP being the only syntactic projection in the middle field, and positive in Portuguese. Thus, Capeverdean would lack a projection to host reflexives and does not allow for late *se*-insertion in the spirit of Distributed Morphology.

In “An additional pronoun and hierarchies in Lower Columbia Chinúk Wawa” (pp. 129-158), by David Robertson, it is shown that nativized Chinook Jargon, essentially a contact language between Amerindian languages, exhibits a null object pronoun that had not been previously described. In contrast with other 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns, the null pronoun is primarily linked to inanimacy and the more microscopic findings allow for a refinement of the model of Differential Marking proposed by Aissen (2003).

David Frank provides a descriptive account of the properties of “Three irregular verbs in Gullah” (pp. 159-173). First, it is shown that Gullah has a set of preverbal TMA-markers and a class of nonstative verbs, but the paper largely focuses on the Gullah verbs for ‘to be’, ‘to go’ and ‘to do’, whose forms, in addition to main verbs, also function as preverbal TMA-markers.

In “Afro-Bolivian Spanish: the survival of a true prototype” (pp. 175-198), John Lipski presents a previously unknown, isolated speech community in the province of Nor Yunga (Bolivia) that arguably descended from black mine workers. Some of the features of Afro-Yungueño Spanish (AYS) are lack of gender agreement, bare nouns and limited verbal inflection. As Lipski points out, there seem to be typological similarities with the strongly restructured Portuguese of Helvécia in southern Bahia. In the light of the properties of AYS, the author suggests that it represents a decreolized version of a previously existing creole.

In “Copula patterns in Hawai’i Creole (HC): creole origin and decreolization” (pp. 199-212), Aya Inoue presents a study of copula variability on the island of O’ahu. It is shown that the following five contexts exhibit copula absence, in decreasing order of frequency: *\_gon>\_V+ing>\_Adj>\_Loc>\_NP*. Although O’ahu is known for its more acrolectal varieties, Inoue dismisses a scenario of decreolization with respect to copula absence. The hierarchical patterning above matches the findings for English-related Caribbean Creoles and Afro-American Vernacular English (AAVE), where African substrate languages are often held responsible for the

copula patterns. Since this explanation is not applicable to HC, this hypothesis is called into question.

Part III of the book is mostly concerned with diachronic creole issues, as stated by the editors.

In the paper “On the properties of Papiamentu *pa*: synchronic and diachronic perspectives”, the most extensive paper of the volume (pp. 215-255), Claire Lefebvre and Isabelle Therrien discuss multifunctional *pa* (arguably from Ptg. *para*), which is shown to function as a preposition, a mood marker, a complementiser and a Case marker. This use is then compared to Fongbe, an important substrate language of Papiamentu, and Portuguese. Couched in Lefebvre’s (e.g. 1998) theory of relexification, it is argued that *pa*’s phonological representation is derived from Portuguese and its syntax and semantics largely from Fongbe. Independently of the controversial status of relexification in creole formation, the exact role of Fongbe (or other substrate languages) for Papiamentu has not yet been established. The fact that the similarities between Papiamentu and Upper Guinea creoles (Capeverdean, Kriyol) have not gone unnoticed may also jeopardize the Fongbe connection, since Fongbe is not a substrate of the Upper Guinea creoles.

The paper “No exception to the rule: the tense-modality-aspect system of Papiamentu reconsidered” (pp. 257-278), by Nicholas Faraclas, Yolanda Rivera-Castillo and Don Walicek, focuses on several properties of the TMA-system of Papiamentu that in the previous literature were considered divergent from other creoles, such as the absence of a zero marker for perfective aspect and, directly related to this, the near obligatory use of *a* (perfective) and *ta* (imperfective). Special attention is paid to these markers and the relation between tense and modality. Contrary to previous claims, it is argued that Papiamentu TMA fits well within the creole typology when compared with the properties found in the *Sprachbund* that characterizes the Kwa cluster and particular Nigerian clusters such as Yoruboid and Igboïd. The latter are also important for Nigerian Pidgin English, which is used as an *ex aequo* of Papiamentu with respect to transfer. Even though these Nigerian language clusters share a great amount of features with Fongbe, it is quite striking that the two papers on Papiamentu in this volume found their analysis on different substrates.

Diana Guillemin takes “A look at *so* in Mauritian Creole: from possessive pronoun to emphatic determiner” (pp. 279-296) by arguing that in earlier stages of Mauritian *so*, from the French possessive pronoun *son*, was used both as a possessive and a definite determiner in genitive constructions (*So frère ça mamzelle là* ‘Le frère de la jeune fille’) to introduce a new referent. It is claimed that this typologically uncommon grammaticalization has fallen in decay due to the expansion of the determiner system over time. In contemporary Mauritian, *so* still marks emphasis in discourse.

“Chinese Spanish in 19<sup>th</sup> century Cuba: documenting sociohistorical context” (pp. 297-324) by Don Walicek concerns the migration of some

125,000 Chinese indentured labourers to Cuba between 1847-1874 and their attitudes towards the acquisition of Spanish and towards the (linguistic) contact with the other groups on the island. This work is based on *The 1874 Cuba Commission Reports*, an international report containing petitions and depositions with the purpose of detecting abuses inflicted on survivors of the Coolie Trade. Contrary to previous claims and despite the fact that Macao was an important port in the Coolie Trade, Walicek additionally argues that there is no compelling evidence to relate Chinese (Pidgin) Spanish to Macao Creole.

Finally, in “Comparative perspectives on the origins, development and structure of Amazonian (Karipúna) French Creole” (pp. 325-357), Jo-Anne Ferreira and Mervyn Alleyne describe the language situation of two French-related creoles, Karipúna and Galibi-Marwono, known as Kheuól, spoken in the Brazilian state of Amapá, in the border area with French Guiana. These varieties, spoken by a mixed ethnic group of approximately 4500 speakers, which primarily included Amerindians, are an offspring of Guianese French Creole (GFC), which functioned as the lingua franca in this area. In addition from lexical items borrowed from Tupi, Carib and Portuguese, it is shown that Kheuól shares properties with GFC which set these varieties apart from other genetically related French lexifier creoles.

It follows from the brief description that the papers in this volume are considerably heterogeneous: not only do they document many different languages but they also involve many different linguistic fields, theories and models. In addition to its linguistic value within contact linguistics, the book shows that creole studies maintain a strong focus on historical, typological and comparative aspects of language. Although the Portuguese-related creoles are apparently represented by a single paper on Capeverdean (Fiéis and Pratas), it ought not to be forgotten that Saramaccan is an English/Portuguese-related creole and that Papiamentu is generally considered a Portuguese-related creole relexified by Spanish. Furthermore, French-related Kheuól discussed by Ferreira and Alleyne is spoken in Brazil and in contact with Brazilian Portuguese, Walicek’s paper discusses a possible link between Chinese Spanish and Macao Creole and Inoue addresses the relevance of Portuguese for copula patterns in HC. Thus, it can be concluded that, even though the days of Afro-Portuguese monogenesis are now far past, language contact involving Portuguese or Portuguese-related creoles continues to be a cornerstone in creole studies.

## References

- Aissen, J. (2003) Differential object marking: iconicity vs. economy. *NLLT*, 21:3, 435-83.
- Bickerton, D. (1981) *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Lefebvre, C. (1998) *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- McWhorter, J. (2005) *Defining creole*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.