11. CREOLES

IRIS BACHMANN

1. Introduction

This chapter aims to describe the origins and development of Romance creoles. I shall discuss different theories of creole genesis including different variations of superstratist, substratist and universialist theories. In accordance with more recent approaches to creole genesis due attention will be given to sociohistorical circumstances of creole genesis and its relation to other forms of contact-induced change such as koineization and partial restructuring. This will raise questions about the nature of language change and the importance of language contact on it as opposed to language internal change.

Throughout the article I shall adopt a Romance creole perspective drawing mostly on research on French, Portuguese and Spanish creoles. However, as will become clear in the discussion on the history of Pidgin and Creole Studies, one must adopt a comparative creole perspective for some of the discussion on creole genesis in order to accurately reflect developments.

I shall start by discussing the history of Creole Studies and its close relation to the discipline of Romance Philology and the paradigm of historical-comparative grammar in the nineteenth century. In this context I discuss claims that creole genesis mirrors the genesis of the Romance languages, an issue under discussion from the early academic descriptions of Romance creoles. The emergence of the discipline of Pidgin and Creole Studies in the context of American Structuralism in the 1960s, however, largely eclipsed the relation to the lexifier language and

11. CREOLES

IRIS BACHMANN

1. Introduction

This chapter aims to describe the origins and development of Romance creoles. I shall discuss different theories of creole genesis including different variations of superstratist, substratist and universialist theories. In accordance with more recent approaches to creole genesis due attention will be given to sociohistorical circumstances of creole genesis and its relation to other forms of contact-induced change such as koineization and partial restructuring. This will raise questions about the nature of language change and the importance of language contact on it as opposed to language internal change.

Throughout the article I shall adopt a Romance creole perspective drawing mostly on research on French, Portuguese and Spanish creoles. However, as will become clear in the discussion on the history of Pidgin and Creole Studies, one must adopt a comparative creole perspective for some of the discussion on creole genesis in order to accurately reflect developments.

I shall start by discussing the history of Creole Studies and its close relation to the discipline of Romance Philology and the paradigm of historical-comparative grammar in the nineteenth

century. In this context I discuss claims that creole genesis mirrors the genesis of the Romance languages, an issue under discussion from the early academic descriptions of Romance creoles. The emergence of the discipline of Pidgin and Creole Studies in the context of American Structuralism in the 1960s, however, largely eclipsed the relation to the lexifier language and focused on creoles as nativized pidgins and the characteristics of pidgins and creoles as a typological group. The historical background provides a basis for a critical discussion of different theories of genesis and for the question if Romance creoles are to be considered Romance languages. In this context, the notion of creoles as 'advanced' representatives of Romance varieties will be discussed together with similar claims for non-standard forms of modern Romance languages. I shall focus on recent claims that creolization has been involved in the formation of Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese and non-standard Caribbean Spanish. This discussion leads us to a reexamination of recent models of contact-induced language change through dialect levelling in English and Spanish. We will show that Romance creoles should be related to these processes of change instead of being set apart from Romance languages. Their genesis, when compared to other developments in Romance languages, demonstrates a need to take language contact and contact-induced change more seriously in all languages. What emerges from recent discussions is a need to relate language change to the sociohistorical settings in which languages are transmitted and develop. Moreover, our discussion of the beginnings of Creole Studies in nineteenth-century Romance Philology and the subsequent naturalization of the concept of language will lead us to a discussion about the process of standardization and its role in language change. I shall argue that models of language change need to take standardization and the respective contact situations between the standard and the coexisting vernaculars such as described under the

notion of continuum and diglossia for the creole context into account in order to determine language change as a situated historical process.

2. The history of Creoles Studies and its beginnings in Romance Philology

2.1 The Romance model

The linguistic phenomenon called creole languages came to prominence as a consequence of European expansion from the fifteenth century. The languages of the European colonial powers generally provide most of the lexicon of these languages,[1] while the affiliation of the grammatical structure has been a hotly-debated issue in theories of creole genesis. Besides Portuguese, Spanish and French as the lexifier languages for the Romance creoles analysed in this chapter, English, Dutch and Danish also served as a basis for creole languages having emerged from European expansion. In recent decades the discussion has been opened to pidgin and creole languages, which have emerged from the contact between non-European languages only (cf. Versteegh 2008 for an overview). While descriptions of and writing in creole languages date back longer, academic interest in creole languages emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century in the context of historical-comparative grammar and particularly in the field of Romance Philology. I will argue that this did not happen accidently, but followed from the research paradigm of the discipline, in which Romance creoles occupied a clearly-defined space. Analysing this research configuration will shed light on the much-debated relation between creole languages and their lexifiers, i.e. the question of

[1] Therefore these languages are often called the lexifier, another term used is base language. Cf. Chaudenson (2001:23f.) for a discussion of the theoretical and ideological implications of both terms in their relation to creole genesis. See also the section on genesis theories. I will use both terms throughout the chapter.

genetic relation, types of language change and the supposed exceptional status of a shift with 'abnormal transmission' that they are said to represent (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:146).[2]

Since Hall (1966) the standard view on creole genesis has been that creole languages arise from a pidgin through nativization, although this view has been challenged in recent years as will be discussed later. Pidgins are defined as drastically reduced languages that provide a basic communication tool in a contact situation between speakers with different native languages. The massive reductions that characterize the non-native pidgin are thought to be partly reversed by the process of creolization, which involves re-elaboration of grammatical complexity. Interestingly, the distinction between native creole and non-native pidgin was not such an important issue in nineteenth-century linguistic descriptions of creole languages.[3] Rather the term creole, originally used in the Romance context for people born in the new world, was later applied to other things including some language forms particularly in the French colonial context (Chaudenson 2001:1-13;[4] Mufwene 1997:37-39; Stein 1998:612). The term pidgin on the other hand originated in the English colonial context in Asia and was initially used for speech forms in that region (Mühlhäusler [1986] 1997:1-3). What we find instead in early attestations of these linguistic phenomena is a reference to these varieties as degenerate forms or corruptions of the original Romance language such as *português adulterado, corrumpido, corrupto, deturbado; español corrompido, chapurreado; français bâtard, corrompu, grossier, mauvais* [bastard/deformed, corrupted, corrupt, distorted

[2] Cf. DeGraff (2003 and 2005) for a critical discussion of this theoretical stance, which he calls creole exceptionalism. While we subscribe to the general critique of DeGraff, we believe that his historical argument relies too much on the discussion of anthropological, non-linguistic sources for the nineteenth century and that he therefore overlooks the specific place that Romance Philology accorded to creoles as well as its difference from the foundation of Pidgin and Creole Studies in the twentieth century.

[3] While Schuchardt (1909) distinguishes between *Handelssprachen* (trade languages) and *Sklavensprachen* (slave languages), he does so by characterizing the languages by their different usages rather than in terms of life cycles.

[4] We will cite the 2001 translation, which is a revised version of Chaudenson (1992).

Portuguese; corrupted, broken Spanish; bastard, corrupted, grossier(gross, make-shift), bad French]. In addition to these terms, the more general term of *gíria, jerga, jargon* [jargon] were used, and were also applied to the speech forms of delinquents or other socially marginalized persons (Stein 1998:614). These terms were not exclusive to creole languages, but were also applied to other non-standard varieties.[5] Furthermore, the corruption metaphor was commonplace for the description of the development of the Romance languages from Latin, which were often seen as degenerate language forms compared with Latin. Fuchs (1849:50), who describes views on the development of the Romance languages since the renaissance, introduces it as a widely held opinion:[6] 'The almost general opinion, which also follows almost necessarily from most of the earlier views, is that the Romance languages are on a far lower level of development and linguistic perfection than the Latin language, because they are considered mostly as mixed languages and as mere corruptions and deliberate deformations of Latin.'

Apart from the reference to ideas about the superiority of inflectional over analytic languages as propagated by Humboldt ([1827-29] 1996), Fuchs's use of the terms mixed languages and corruptions (*Verstümmelungen*) is striking in its similarity to the stereotypes about creole languages, including the supposed violent nature of their genesis. Of course, Fuchs only cites these views to debunk them as misperceptions that have been proved wrong by the insights of the new discipline of Romance Philology and, particularly, by Friedrich Diez's (1836) pioneering work which demonstrated that vulgar Latin is the missing link to establish a continuous development of the Romance languages from Latin (cf. Oestereicher 2000; Lüdtke

[5] Compare, for example, the debate surrounding a possible fragmentation of Spanish in Latin America after independence and Andrés Bello's and later on Rufino José Cuervo's use of terms such as *corrupción* and *corruptelas*, who also draw the comparison to the case of Latin case (cf. Scharlau 2004).

[6] Here and throughout all non-English quotations will be given in their English translation only.

2001), thus successfully applying the model of historical-comparative analysis developed by Jacob Grimm for the Germanic languages (Auroux, Bernard and Boll 2000:159-62).

It is precisely in this context of Romance Philology that the first linguistic analyses of creole languages emerge and the comparison to the Latin/Romance scenario is frequent (cf. examples given in Bachmann 2005:31-33). However, we can notice that in most cases some difference is underlined to introduce a fine distinction between the two cases. Hugo Schuchardt, considered the founding father of Creole Studies with the most substantial body of work on creole languages at the time, is an interesting example for this qualified comparison (Schuchardt 1883a:236): 'This consideration brought me to creole studies or rather brought me back to them; because after Scholle (1869) had rightfully rejected the term "daughter languages" for Romance, I looked for real daughter languages and thought to find them in creoles, whose development indicated a break to me, and thus formed an instructive contrast to the development of Romance. In recent times, an interest developed in establishing the influence of pre-Romance languages on vulgar Latin which had been uncritically exaggerated by older scholars and was ignored in comfortable precaution by younger ones, and it seemed to me that one ought to look particularly outside Europe to determine the characteristics and the limits of such influence.'

As can be seen from Schuchardt's citation, the continuity of Romance languages with vulgar Latin is already considered a given at this time, however, the idea of a break in transmission implicit in the corruption metaphor is now applied to creole languages. Even though Schuchardt's interest lies in establishing the influence of language mixture in all language change against the doctrine of the Neogrammarian sound laws, which are thought to operate purely on an internal level, the idea of continuous sound change was too central to language studies at the time to be tackled head on (cf. Baggioni 2000). Creole languages thus provided

a testing ground at the margins of the principal object of research, which lay in the reconstruction of the major European national languages.

2.2 Creoles as vernacular languages: the context of dialect studies

However, despite the difference established by Schuchardt between the essential continuity from Latin to Romance as opposed to a break in development from Romance to Creole, Romance creoles were analysed, as the term daughter languages indicates, as derivations of Portuguese, Spanish and French respectively, while acknowledging substrate influence. Adolpho Coelho (1880-86) openly blurred this distinction in a series of articles by simply referring to the different overseas varieties of Portuguese including creole languages in his title as 'The Romance or neo-Latin dialects of Africa, Asia and America'. Schuchardt's analyses also consist of elaborate derivations of sound changes for which he compares creole languages not only with the standard form of their European lexifier, but also makes use of comparison to other overseas varieties as well as older stages of the base languages to situate the creoles in a web of interrelated language changes (Bachmann 2005:42-45;55f.). For São Tomense, for example, he lists systematically occurring sound changes of which he says (Schuchardt 1882 KS I:896) [7][8]: 'Here, as elsewhere African tendencies have met those of Romance languages, resuscitating old features in a new setting.' With respect to /r/, he notes the following changes (examples all taken from Schuchardt 1882 KS I):

Disappearance	a	between vowel and consonant:	*bodo* < *bordo* 'bank'[9]
	b	between vowel and glide:	*stoia* < *storia* 'story'

[7] KS stands for Kreolische Studien, a series of articles by Schuchardt published in proceedings of the *Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.*

[8] I am citing the translation of Schuchardt's text (2008:136) by Tjerk Hagemejer and John Holm in Holm and Michaelis' edition of key texts in *Contact Langauges.*

[9] He notes that this change is also common in Fench creoles as well as in many French dialects.

	c	word finally :	*bendê* < *vender* ‘to sell’
becomes /l/	a	between vowels:	*calo* < *caro* ‘expensive’
	b.1	between consonants and vowel	*complá* < *comprar* ‘to buy’
	b.2	with metathesis	*flime* < *firme* ‘firm, fixed’
	c	word initially	*leno* < *reino* ‘kingdom’

Note that Schuchardt does not usually give the base word from which the creole word has been derived through the listed sound changes unless it is an unusual derivation, for which intermediate reconstructed stages are given (*djelo* (Port.: *dinheiro*, **diyelo*, **dielo*); he assumes his audience of Romance philologists to be familiar with Romance languages as a point of comparison. In another case, in which he describes nasalization in São Tomense and compares it to other creoles he lists (*frominga* < *formiga*) in Papiamentu, giving both Old Spanish and Portuguese as possible sources for *formiga*.[10] In the same article he describes the shift of stress with slight vowel lengthening for São Tomense (*cumó* < *como*; *cablá* < *cabra*) and compares this to Portuguese spoken in Angola and to the region of São Paulo in Brazil. When discussing the frequent sound changes /λ/ > /j/; /θ/ > /s/ and /v/ > /b/, he notes that these are ‘common for Spanish and particularly established in the overseas territories’ (Schuchardt 1884 KS IV:141).

This anchoring of Creole Studies in Romance Philology can also be seen in the fact that Gröber’s *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie* ‘Manual of Romance Philology‘ intended to publish a section on Romance creoles. While the preface to the first edition mentions a chapter with the aim of explaining the relation of some Romance languages to creole, thus

[10] In later examples, he gives Spanish base words for Papiamentu forms such as for the palatalized dental fricatives in *djes* < *diez*; *djente* < *diente*. Lenz (1928) follows Schuchardt in acknowledging some Portuguese influence on Papiamentu, while also expanding Schuchardt’s Spanish derivations with a more systematic

focusing on the genetic status of creoles (Gröber 1888,I:VI), the second edition (Gröber 1904,I:V) announces a chapter dedicated to the description of creole vernaculars (*creolische Mundarten*). Although neither chapter was finished, the explicit mention by the editor as well as the change from a more general genetic discussion to the description of individual creoles seems to indicate that creoles were increasingly recognized as a valid object of research and one which belonged to the realm of Romance Philology.

This interest in creole languages followed the emergence of dialect studies across Europe from the 1870s (cf. Morpurgo-Davies 1998:289) and needs to be seen as complementary to this development. As research on sound change advanced, philologists were looking towards dialects as repositories for possible sound change through which they could demonstrate past developments in real time. Similarly, creole languages could indicate possible future developments in the base languages, which remained after all the main focus of historical reconstruction.

This intimate relationship between creoles and other varieties of Romance manifests itself in yet another way that indicates a different conceptualization of language in relation to its communicative functions. In the French colonial context, the term *patois* was initially also used for creoles as a generic term for the local vernacular (Stein 1998:614; cf. also Mufwene 1997:39). While the term creole was only used in the Romance context and foremost for French and to some extent Portuguese creoles, the French term *patois*,[11] was used for English creoles in the Caribbean, where the term creole was only introduced in the twentieth century by linguists, who used the term in the context of Pidgin and Creole Studies (Stein 1998:613f.; Mufwene 2000:79; Le Page 1988:30). This usage points towards a conceptualization of creole

comparison to varieties of American Spanish (cf. Bachmann 2005:45f.). Lenz, a German Romance Philologist who worked at the University of Chile, was in a good position to elaborate this American dialect comparison.

languages as similar to regional vernaculars, which were undergoing changes in their communicative functions due to the increasing importance of emerging standard languages.

The term *patois* is attested as early as the thirteenth century and initially referred simply to language or a way of speaking, sometimes to natural languages in an affectionate way. As Thomas (1953) shows, the negative connotations of the term *patois* coincide with the progressive standardization of the French language and the concomitant institutional support from the sixteenth century onwards, which relegated other regional languages increasingly to the realm of purely oral usage and moreover to being confined to the use by the uneducated as the local elites adopted the *Île de France* standard. However, it is important to keep in mind for our discussions of creole genesis that until the nineteenth century the acquisition of standard French was restricted to an educated elite as well as passive knowledge of the standard to varying degrees (Posner 1997:83-86). Certainly, in the colonial settings in which creole languages emerged, the metropolitan standard played a minor role (cf. the detailed discussion in Chaudenson 2001:145-53). Mufwene (2000:69) talks about a diffuseness of language practices in the historical settings in which creoles emerged. More detailed studies to determine exactly how the term *patois* was used in these contexts would be needed to trace its semantic changes in different local situations.

Important for our discussion is the conceptual distinction contained in the term *patois* which marks the relationship to the developing new standard: language is conceptualized both in terms of the distinction between written and spoken code and between educated and uneducated language users. These parameters must have been of particular importance in linguistic communities that were being reconfigured by increasing centralization towards a

[11] The use of the term *patois* in its general meaning of vernacular was first attested in English in 1643 according to the OED.

national standard and where, therefore, the regional languages were loosing some of their communicative functions. Specifically, it meant that these languages became associated with the lower, uneducated classes instead of marking a regional distinction.

Interestingly, it is precisely in this sense that the equivalent term *volkstaal* 'vernacular' (literally 'folk language') was applied in the ABC islands (Lesser Antilles: Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao) to Papiamentu at the turn of the twentieth century. It was primarily used in discussions about the spelling systems for Papiamentu and the more general debate about the insufficient knowledge of Dutch among the islands' inhabitants and hence the status of Papiamentu vis-à-vis the colonial language Dutch (cf. Bachmann 2007). Putte (1999:21f.) relates this increasing interest in language matters to Dutch nation-building and the role of recently-standardized Dutch as the national language. It seems that by the late nineteenth century the important change in the conceptualization of the term *patois* described by Thomas (1953) had gained prominence in relation to underlying changes in language practices such as the increasing distribution of national standard languages through the education system. However, it is interesting to note that it was also central for the discipline of Romance Philology from its beginnings in the first half of the nineteenth century. There, the term vulgar Latin and the older term *Römische Volkssprache* 'Roman vernacular', (the same term as *volkstaal*), indicate the same conceptual distinction of the language spoken by the common people in the Roman colonies as opposed to the literary language widely documented historically. The problem for philologists was how to get hold of these spoken varieties that allowed the reconstruction of continuous language change, but which were by definition not faithfully recorded in writing. The solution lay in documents that deviated from the written standard and thus gave a glimpse at underlying variation.

Scholars working on creole languages at the time encountered a similar problem. While they

were able to base their studies on documents written in creole, those were often recorded using the spelling conventions of the base language and often documented by people with different degrees of knowledge of the creole language. Therefore we find ample discussion in Schuchardt, who was a classist by training and had worked on vulgar Latin, on the nature of the creole texts that formed the basis of his analyses. Consider the following example from Schuchardt 1883 KS II:810): 'Above all, the orthography is usually extremely inconsistent even within one and the same text. The effort to stick to the Portuguese spelling, for example, reigns to an excessive extent in the translation of the New Testament of 1826. Where they deviate from the tradition, they often do so only half-heartedly, and thus we come across many forms that are neither genuinely Portuguese nor genuinely Creole. We have a similar case in our documents. One cannot expect valid results from the attempt to peel off the capricious masquerade covering the spoken sound.'

What is reflected in this citation is a fairly common situation for a non-standardized language, which is written down using the spelling conventions of another language, in this case the related base language Portuguese. Schuchardt must have been familiar with these 'contaminated' documents from his work on vulgar Latin and his task as a philologist consisted precisely in establishing the specificity of the language used in the document through critical text analysis. However, in his complaint he points towards a further problem underlying historical-comparative analysis with its increasing focus on sound change. While alphabetic writing in general bears a relation to the sound of language, the Romance spelling systems also follow the morphemic and etymological principle to varying degrees. This creates obstacles for an analysis whose prime objective is the analysis of sound change, even though inconsistencies of spelling can obviously also contribute important information about the actual pronunciation. In addition, the discussion of the creole data point again to the close

relation of creoles with their lexifiers, particularly in those contexts where the two languages coexisted. And even were they did not coexist immediately, a related standardized language could play the role of providing a source for lexical and grammatical expansion (cf. Martinus 1990 and Joubert 2002 for Papiamentu, in which case both the related Spanish and the official language Dutch have played this role). For the philologists, access to creole data was generally guaranteed through local attempts to write down oral creole sources with the help of an established literary language.

This discussion of vernacular versus literary languages in philology points to an underlying tension in the make-up of the discipline that became more prominent towards the end of the nineteenth century including the increasing drift between literary studies and linguistics. The explanations in Gröber's manual of the discipline *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (1888) can be analysed as exemplary evidence. Gröber points out that the principal objective of Romance Philology, in analogy to Classical Philology, is to analyse the outstanding works of literature thus tracing the cultural history of a nation whose culture manifests itself in the national language. However, Gröber is aware that in order to trace the history of the Romance literatures one has to deal with their more humble beginnings as vernacular literatures. He therefore discusses in a chapter the so-called oral sources of Romance Philology to bridge the gap: 'By oral sources of Romance Philology we mean the languages and ways of speaking used for communication among the lower classes, as well as those manifestations of the *Geist* of the Romance peoples dressed in literary forms, which are not disseminated through writing but proliferate and are passed on orally, from one generation to the next. Together with artifacts, practices, customs, pastimes and the way of life of the Romance peoples, they form the basis of Romance folklore and convey knowledge of Romance popular culture.' (Gröber 1888 Bd. I: 197)

Again, we find the distinction between written and spoken code on the one hand and between high and popular culture, the latter being associated with the lower strata of society. Gröber tries to neutralize this difference by relegating the popular culture to the realm of folklore, while reserving the realm of philology for high literature. However, the distinction cut across the literary field as we can see in the way the Dutch scholar Hesseling, also a classicist by training, and his Curacaon collaborator Cohen Henriquez (Cohen Henriquez and Hesseling 1935/36:162) used the popular character of Cervantes's literature to compare its proverbial nature to their collection of creole proverbs, thus justifying their literary character.

2.3 The naturalization of language: the vernacular/standard divide revisited

While literary studies tried to neutralize the distinction between the literary and the vernacular in favour of the literary, linguists began to criticize the value of the literary at the expense of the natural character ascribed to spoken dialects. Not only did they become wary of the written representation of language as discussed, but they were aware of the encroaching character of the standard languages gaining terrain and beginning to substitute the traditional dialects in some areas.

Herman Paul's discussion of the German language context in the final chapter of his monumental *Principien der Sprachgeschichte* ('Principles of the History of Language'), the so-called bible of the Neogrammarians, is exemplary in that respect (cf. Herman Paul 1880:266-88). He discusses the standard language mostly in terms of its artificiality as opposed to the natural dialects, which he describes as 'infected' by the standard to varying degrees (p. 274). However, Paul is aware of the distinct quality of the standard language, in which, if learned through formal instruction and used mostly for writing, the impact of sound change on word formation is minimized according to his view. However, he claims that

ultimately, the artificial language may be naturally acquired as the standard gains wider distribution thus blurring the line between traditional dialects and the written standard. Interestingly, Paul (p. 282) assumes that language mixture between varieties, the dialects and the standard, will take place as the standard spreads thus leading to numerous face-to-face interactions between dialect and standard speakers. This leads, according to Paul, to a number of intermediate forms between the standard and the vernacular forms. On the other hand, he discusses social situations in which the distinction between the standard form and the vernacular remains more stable, because it has not yet penetrated everyday vernacular language practices and is thus acquired only in an artificial way, namely, through formal instruction (his example being the Swiss German case). It is interesting to note that in both cases, Paul refers to the vernacular varieties and the standard as different languages and assumes underlying bilingualism in these cases ('*Doppelsprachigkeit*'), which reflects the systemic idea of language proposed by Saussure and which was present already in the later Neogrammarian writings (see Bachmann 2005:121-33). We also cannot fail to notice the similarity to modern discussions of diglossia (Ferguson 1959) and continuum (DeCamp 1971b), which have been used to describe creole/lexifier situations and which are seen to be marked by a similar difference between stability versus increasing interpenetration.

However, Paul introduces a further distinction to salvage the ultimate dominance of the unconscious language use over the artificial and to minimize the theoretical impact of writing on language development: he draws a distinction between *Schriftsprache* ('written language') and *Gemeinsprache* ('common language') thus making it clear that the standard language is not simply equivalent to the written standard, but that the high variety exists in both forms. While the written code is always learned in an artificial way, that is through instruction, the spoken standard may be acquired naturally as it gains wider distribution. We therefore need to

distinguish on an individual basis how the person has acquired a language in order to know if it is natural or artificial to them. The mixing he describes then only takes place as the standard gains wider distribution as a natural language so that the standard and the dialects come into contact in everyday communication more and more frequently. The social and media distinction between literary and vernacular language discussed in the previous section is substituted here by a distinction between the acquisition processes anchored in the individual speaker. While Paul maintains the distinction between standard and vernacular (*Gemeinsprache* and *Mundart*), the terms gain a different theoretical status through the emphasis on the mental process of acquisition and the dominance of face-to-face communication in its effect on language change. Paul, acknowledges the importance of the written form and its wide distribution through printing (p. 286) in the way it protects the language material from the erosions typical for sound change, which can lead to a reorganization of structural properties. However, he does not see this influence as a productive force, but merely as a slowing down factor.

Hunnius (1988:346) therefore seems right in tracing the beginnings of the turn towards natural language at the expense of standard languages to the Neogrammarians. However, our discussion shows that they were aware of the conceptual problems involved in delimiting the object of research to natural language and to processes of sound change triggered by face-to-face interaction, while at the same time basing their research on written documents exhibiting a range of language and writing practices.

2.4 Creoles as full-fledged natural languages

The focus on the natural qualities of language and the embedding of processes of language change in the mental processes of individual speakers, which is at the heart of Herman Paul's

Principles of the History of Language (1888), despite his problematization of writing and standard languages in the last two chapters of his book, is fully established by the time creoles gain a more prominent place in language studies in the context of American Structuralism and plays a fundamental role in the emergence of Pidgin and Creole Studies as an academic discipline. As Hall's book title *Pidgin and Creole Languages* (1966) indicates, the focus on the natural characteristics of languages goes hand in hand with the distinction between pidgins and creoles as defining stages in a pidgin-creole life cycle (Hall 1962), which presupposes the existence of a non-native pidgin, drastically reduced in its grammatical and lexical properties, which is then expanded through a process of nativization when the creole becomes the native language of a speech community (Hall 1966:xi-xiii). While creole languages are recognized according to this view as full-fledged languages in their function as native languages, they remain in a state of exception through their relation to non-native pidgins and therefore to their supposed unnatural beginnings (cf. also DeGraff 2005:558-62).

It is illuminating in this context to look at some of Hall's other writings of that period, which highlight the role of the mother tongue for the psychological development of a person and relate the concept of a speech community to a homogeneous group of native speakers of the same variety (cf. Bachmann 2005:174-79). While we discussed Paul's awareness of the communicative function of the standard language and its impact on language practices, Hall's conception of language largely eclipses the material and social distinction between literary language and vernacular, which were still operational in historical-comparative grammar. While Hall (1952:14), a Romance linguist himself with training in historical linguistics, acknowledges the existence of standard languages, he perceives them as yet another variety, spoken naturally by privileged groups of society. The difference with respect to other varieties lies only in the value judgments attached due to social status of their respective speakers,

which are considered extralinguistic factors. The marginalization of the material distinction between standard and vernacular, which began with the shift in focus onto natural language by the Neogrammarians is complete in American Structuralism by the time Pidgin and Creole Studies emerge as a discipline.

This wider change in the conceptual underpinnings of language studies allowed the reshaping of the study of pidgin and creole languages as a group rather than as appendices of their base languages. However, this came at the price of conceptualizing them as a special group of languages, which could be defined by their peculiar developmental status.[12] This paradigmatic change led to a number of descriptions of creole languages from a structural perspective, particularly in academic theses, which focused purely on the internal grammatical functions of the analysed languages without making reference to the lexifier and the creole's historical development (cf. Bachmann 2005:166-74 for a discussion of Papiamentu). Silva-Fuenzalida (1952:12-19) for example analyses the verbal morphology of Papiamentu. Consider the following examples:

Mi ta bini (I come, I'm coming)

Mi tabata bini (I was coming)

Mi a bini (I came)

Lo mi bini (I will come)

Silva-Fuenzalida does not consider the derivation of these preverbal markers from Spanish or Portuguese *está* '3PS.SG stay, is'; *estaba*+*está* (*está*PAST.IMP); *ha* '3PS.SG has'; *logo*[13] 'later' as Lenz (1928:120f.) does. Instead, she takes all verbal forms she has identified, and

[12] Mufwene (2000:70f.; 2001:82) speaks of creoles as disenfranchised varieties, for which the distinction of a different group of speakers has led to claims of exaggerated difference from their lexifiers as well as of the non-applicability of ordinary processes of language change.

[13] While the three verb forms can be derived from Spanish or Portuguese, *lo* seems of Portuguese origin. The Spanish form is *luego*.

distinguishes between the inflected forms *ta* 'am, is, are' and *taba* 'was, were', the prefixes *lo* (future prefix) and *a* (past complete prefix), as well as infinitive forms (the invariant verb form) such as *bini* (to come), *tembla* (to shake), *tende* (to understand) and the respective present participles (*binyéndo*, *temblándo*, *tendyéndo*).[14] She justifies the different treatment of the preverbal TMA (Tense, Mood, Aspect) markers, which even requires her to assume a zero suffix for the past complete and the future aspect, because her whole analysis departs from the different status of the verb *ta* (p.16). She argues that it is the only verb showing inflexion and that its inflected forms thus function as 'auxiliaries to form the present and past incomplete' (p.16) as well as serving as copulas (*es ta malu* 'this is bad'; *es tabata malu* 'this was bad'. She assumes *–ba* to be the inflection by which the past incomplete is formed without giving an account of the fact that the form generally used is *taba+ta* (cf. Maurer 1998:164). She then derives the present participle by postulating the suffixes *–ando* and *–endo* and an i-suffix for verbs ending in a consonant (an stem alternation) with a zero allomorph to derive patterns such as *por*, *pudyéndo* (to be able, being able). Due to her focus on derivational patterns, she does not consider the different syntactic status of *lo*, which can precede non-stressed subject pronouns (see above).[15]

In addition, we see in studies on pidgins and creoles an increasing reliance on English as the academic meta-language instead of the respective lexifiers, which allowed for a comparison of the data with other, completely unrelated languages. Hall (1966:53) gives an example by discussing the Tok Pisin (Neo-Melanesian) verbal marker *–im* together with the transitivity markers on the verb in Hungarian. Of course, these typological comparisons require a common terminology, which is based increasingly on English. Note also the following

[14] She does not mention the past participle formed through stress of the last syllable of the invariant verb forms (*duna* > *duná* 'give') or the prefix *di-* (*fangu* > *difangu* 'catch') or the combination of other verbal markers with

typological comparison including Romance creole examples from Michaelis (2000) for copulas developing from subject pronouns, which is done in a similar typological spirit[16]:

Joan **e** nha pai (Kabuverdianu)

Joan COP my father

'Joan is my father'

Ami **i** pursor (Kriyol (Guiné-Bissau))

I COP teacher

'I am a teacher

Nem bilong dispela man **em** Dabi[17] (Tok Pisin)

name POSS this man he Dabi

'the name of this man is Dabi'

Malta **hi** gzira (Maltese)

Malta COP/3SG.FEM island

She argues that the copulas diachronically developed from a resumptive pronoun in a topic-comment structure such as *John, he/this man* and shows that they still show some morphosyntactic properties of the original construction such as the syntactic position typical of pronouns (Portuguese creoles), the limitation to 3SG subjects and gender marking (Maltese), while in Tok Pisin the grammaticalization process is just starting from a resumptive pronoun and coexist with the general copula *stap.*

Interestingly, there was also a shift in topographic focus in Pidgin and Creole Studies at the time. While early Creole Studies emerged in the context of Romance Philology and focused

lo (cf. Maurer 1998:166;168).

[15] Compare Maurer (1995) for a detailed analysis of the tense and aspect system in Papiamentu.

[16] Michaelis (2000:177f.) convincingly argues for the pronoun origin (*ele*) of copula instead of an origin in the Portuguese copula forms *é* and *era* given that the copula precedes the negative particle unlike other verbal particles and triggers the use of stressed pronoun instead of the clitic forms used in predicates.

on Romance creoles, the emergence of Pidgin and Creole Studies in the context of American Structuralism focused initially on Caribbean Creoles and their pan-Afro-American dimension. DeCamp's (1971a) historical account in the proceedings of the second conference on Creole Studies held at the University of the West Indies underlines this American focus. While he acknowledges the early work of Schuchardt and Hesseling as precursors, he focuses on the period after World War II, when the emergence of Pidgin and Creole Studies allows to define these languages as an independent group and thus as a separate object of research. Instead, within the historical-comparative paradigm, creole languages had to be analysed as derivatives of their base languages in order to enter the research paradigm. For the first time, creole languages based on English became the focus of research as one can see from the *Proceedings of the Conference on Creole Language Studies* (Le Page 1961), the first of its kind taking place on the eve of independence of the British West Indies.[18]

This focus on the pan-Afro-American dimension was related to efforts to justify an independent status for Afro-American English as opposed to White American English. Consider the following citation from Bailey (1965:172): 'I would like to suggest that the Southern Negro "dialect" differs from other Southern speech because its deep structure is different, having its origins as it undoubtedly does in some Proto-Creole grammatical structure. Hence, regardless of the surface resemblances to other dialects of English – and this must be expected, since the lexicon is English and the speakers are necessarily bi-dialectal –

[17] There is also a verbal copula (*stap*) in Tok Pisin.

[18] Van Name (1869/70) even claimed that there were no English creoles due to the already highly mixed character of English. Statements like these underline the need for more historical research on the perceptions of individual creole languages in their local contexts.

we must look into the system itself for an explanation of seeming confusion of persons and tenses.'[19]

The connection of Afro-American English to a creole grammatical system serves to give it an independent status from English and attempts to explain supposed deviance from the English language by its roots in a different grammatical system. This line of argument and its relation to language attitudes is also the focus of DeCamp's (1971a:33) explanation: 'If American Negro English is indeed a creole with varying degrees of acculturation to standard English, rather than a divergent dialect with varying degrees of deviance from standard English, the social and political implications will be great indeed. […] If the creole-origin hypothesis for Negro English is confirmed and if the Negro, like the Chicano, really does have a genuine linguistic heritage rather than merely a substandard deviant dialect of English, a great many people, both black and white, will have to revise drastically their attitude toward Negro English.'

Note that the distinction DeCamp makes depends on the possibility to claim a creole connection for African American English since that acknowledges its status as belonging to a different language system. Only the status as a different language with its own grammatical system seems to guarantee a 'genuine linguistic heritage'. It is interesting to compare this discussion with Paul's, who distinguished the standard language and the dialects as different language systems with the possibility of language mixture occurring between them. DeCamp's and Bailey's discussion, on the other hand, seems to take the historical roofing of different varieties through standard languages as a purely structural matter. Therefore, they interpret dialects as lying within the same language system, while African American English

[19] The term 'Negro English' is common in these early works until the late 1970s. In Valdmann (1977) the term 'Black English' substitutes for it to be later replaced by Afro-American Vernacular English (AAVE) or African-

could be proven to be fundamentally different in its structural make-up through its relation to a creole grammar and could hence be recognized as a separate linguistic entity and consequently indicative of a different ethnic identity.

It is clear that the distinction between dialect and language is not considered in its relation to processes of standardization anymore. The existing categories are taken for granted and translated into structural differences; hence the importance to claim that creoles are independent language systems, which led to a focus on describing the maximally basilectal varieties. A variety such as Afro-American English causes problems in this scenario because it rather seems to display a continuum in relation to English and hence goes against the scenario of maximal difference.

Milroy (2001) notes that it is precisely when the standardization of the major European languages has reached a high level and the standard languages were widely distributed across society that linguistics started to ignore the processes that had led to standardization and their impact on the linguistic ecology. This is precisely what my discussion of the history of Pidgin and Creole Studies has demonstrated. However, Milroy (2001) shows convincingly that such views on 'normal' language use are deeply influenced by our own language ecologies in which standard languages play an important role, but that this model is by no means universal. Furthermore, standardization itself brings about changes in language through the elaboration of lexicon and grammatical structure to fit the pragmatic needs of the new fields of usage (cf. for example Schlieben-Lange 1983; Auroux 1992) and the existence of standard languages combined with widespread literacy have led to a substitution of traditional dialects by varieties that are heavily influenced by the standard (Koch 2004:614), which is a process

---

American English (AAE).

that Paul (1888) was able to see at work in the mixture of standard and dialect varieties even if he did not explore its precise implications.

The different perceptions of creole languages discussed here gives testimony to the historical grounding of conceptions of language and their importance for the study of languages. Similarly Le Page (1988:28) points out that both the notion of standard language and of native language are cultural stereotypes, which change historically and from one society to another. He sees the two stereotypes as flip sides of a coin, since they both depend on a belief in largely homogeneous monolingual societies (p. 29f.). Interestingly, while the emergence of creole languages, arguably with different degrees of autonomy vis-à-vis coexisting languages (lexifier or not), falls in the period of a slowly-increased stabilization and promotion of national standard languages in the metropolitan colonial societies, they were yet far from being widespread in their home countries, let alone in the colonies. The colonial societies then at the time of the formation of creole languages had very different language ecologies from today with many dialects and languages in contact without a clear overarching standard language allowing for considerable degrees of variation and approximations (Mufwene 2000:73).

3. The Genesis of Romance Creoles

In this section, I shall show how theories of creole genesis are underpinned by the change in the perception of language as primarily natural language, before I move on to discuss more recent developments in creole genesis theories that tap into a wider discussion of language contact and change. As previously discussed, the research on creoles in the nineteenth century followed largely the historical-comparative paradigm and therefore analysed creoles essentially as derivatives of their European daughter languages with a certain degree of

influence from their substrate languages acknowledged. While a discussion about language mixture did exist (Bachmann 2005:50-56), this discussion was largely constrained by the assumption of language change as driven by regular and continuous sound change. Thus predictably the American linguist Whitney concludes in an article 'On mixture in language' (1881) that, in the case of English, language mixture with respect to grammatical structure could not be proven and that any derivational features seemingly borrowed from French such as *pure, purity* should be attributed to lexical borrowing of derived forms. However, this point of view begs the question of how else morphological processes could be interpreted by speakers if not through the analysis of repeating structures, thus recognizing the same derivational pattern as in French. What this example shows is that the mainstream of the discipline tended to focus on language-internal processes of change instead of mechanisms of change by external influence from other languages. This was the reason why Schuchardt (1885) in his debate with the Neogrammarians had to argue such a fine line to demonstrate that while external influence was possible is was to be sought in the way meaning was attributed to word forms in the form of calques or possible elimination of grammatical distinctions where the structure of the superstrate and the substrate language were too distinct. Schuchardt used Humboldt's term of inner language form (*innere Sprachform*), to indicate that these mechanisms belonged to the core processes of language change in a similar way to well-established processes of sound change (Bachmann 2005:53-55). In relation to Philippine Spanish creole (Chabacano), Schuchardt (1884, KS IV:127) discusses the origins of the anterior marker *ya.* Comparing the Spanish form 'he wrote' *escrib-ió* (stem+3SG.PRET) with the Tagalog form *su-ng-múlat* (conjugated verb form + infix *ng*), he argues that the difference in grammatical structure is too great and that therefore the language learner only recognizes the semantic identity of the expression of anteriority or past tense. But due to the dissimilarity

of the forms, he argues that there is a need for the creation of a new form (*Neubildung*) substituting the infix *ng* with the prefix *na*, which is then translated to Spanish *ya* (already) and used as a preverbal marker with the invariant verb form as *ya escribi* 'he wrote'.

More mechanical and radical theories of language mixture such as Adam's *Essai d'hybridologie linguistique* (1883), in which he proposes that creoles are made up of European lexical items grafted onto an African or Malayan grammar, were the views of an outsider, who had relatively little impact on the academic profession of historical-comparative grammar and Schuchardt himself rejected Adam's view on language mixture (Schuchardt 1883a; 1909:443).

3.1 Français avancé or système optimum

We can see an interesting example of this paradigm, which thus favoured superstratist theories by the very nature of its conceptualization of language, brought to its logical limits in Hjelmslev's discussion of the genetic relation of creoles (Hjelmslev 1938). The yardstick for genetic relation is not so much the vocabulary *per se,* but the grammatical building material, namely, the lexical elements used to form verb and noun phrases. Hjelmslev argues that there is a complete continuity with respect to these *formants* of the grammatical system because they are all derived from the *langue initiale* (although there are examples of functional substrate morphemes such as the 3PL pronoun *nan* in Papiamentu, which is also used to mark plural). On the other hand, Hjelmslev acknowledges that the underlying creole system is different from the system of the initial or base language. We take his discussion (p. 283f.) of the noun phrase as an example. He notes that Mauritian creole has essentially preserved the

form and function of the indefinite French article (*éne*[20] < *une*), while the definite article is ignored, in his words, often forming part of the noun (éne léroi = un roi 'a king'). He concludes that this leads to a system of two articles as well, however, the distinction is not between definite and indefinite article, but between an indefinite and a zero article, which exhibit the following paradigm given that obligatory number on the noun does not exist:

éne dizéf (un oeuf) 'an egg'

dizéf ((un) oeuf, l'oeuf) 'egg, the egg'

dizéf (les oeufs, (des) oeufs) 'the eggs, eggs'

Hjelmslev postulates the same continuity of building material, but difference of grammatical system for Latin vis-à-vis French. This perception is in line with Saussure's ([1916] 1996) idea of language as a closed system, in which the signifiers derive their value through the difference to other signifiers within the system. With respect to the building materials, this idea implies that while they can be diachronically traced to the lexifier language, their exact function or value within the system (and Hjelmslev reserves the term morpheme for that systemic function) has necessarily changed since it can only be determined within the system as a whole. If we go back to the example above, we can see how he points with his translations towards grammatical distinctions of noun phrases such as generic/non-generic, specific/non-specific, but notes that the way these distinctions are expressed within the system is different in French compared to Mauritian creole: while French uses the indefinite, definite article and a partitive construction with *de*, Mauritian creole expresses these distinctions with the difference between indefinite and zero article.[21]

[20] Generally spelled in a more phonemic, less 'frenchified' spelling as *en* today.

[21] There is also a determiner developed from the postponed demonstrative *–lá* (*sat-la* 'the cat'), which exists in a number of other French creoles. It is generally used as a definite and anaphoric NP marker and often serves to delimit the noun phrase (cf. Posner 1985:180). In American French creole, but not in the Indian Ocean Creoles, it can also be used to delimit restrictive relative clauses (cf. the discussion in section 4.1).

What is difficult to explain in this theoretical framework is the change from one stable system to another and Hjelmslev's (1938) comments are vague in that respect. While in general, he argues that genetically related systems are diachronic continuations of each other, which follow along the lines of the inherent dispositions of the initial system (p. 281), he then claims in relation to the change from Latin to French that the latter is 'un système contraire au système abandonné et né d'une réaction brusque qui conduit à l'extrême opposé' [a system contrary to the abandoned system born from an abrupt reaction, which led to the extreme opposite] (Hjelmslev 1938:285). In the case of creoles, interestingly he resorts to a tabula rasa metaphor (p. 286), from which a so-called virginal system was created, which presents an optimum of the base language and therefore is related to its essential properties, the 'disposition inhérente à ce système' [disposition inherent in that system] in Hjelmslev's words (p. 281). The two examples of the Latin/French and French/Creole genetic relations seem to suggest a weakening of the explanatory power and thus theoretical role of genetic affiliation if it can subsume cases of 'extreme opposite' and 'tabula rasa' within the idea of genetic continuity. Instead his discussion seems to indicate that the investigation of language as a closed system gains more and more prominence and thus establishes a focus on how grammatical relations interact within that system.

The discussion of creole languages as a continuation of the structures inherent in the French system, is similar to more recent discussions of popular French as representing the natural tendencies of language change inherent in the French system, while the standard has essentially preserved an older, obsolete state of the language (cf. Hunnius 1988, 2003; Koch 2004). I return to this question in the last section.

I have argued in the previous section that it is precisely the systemic approach of structuralism with its focus on natural language, which is at the heart of the emergence of

Pidgin and Creole Studies as a discipline allowing for creoles to be perceived as independent of their lexifers. However, we also saw that the recognition of creoles as full-fledged autonomous languages went hand in hand with defining them as a group by their development from a previous non-native pidgin. Accordingly, what theories of creole genesis had to explain, is the supposed similarity of creoles as a group instead of any derivational patterns from the lexifier to the creole as Hjelmslev still does. A special focus of comparisons lay always on the system of preverbal TMA markers, which are combined with invariant verb forms. Compare the following examples from different Romance creoles for progressive/habitual aspect:[22]

i	ka	manjé		(Lesser Antilles French creole)
3PS.SG.	TMA	eat		'he is eating, eats'
li	pé	gèt	lisien	(Haitian creole)
3PS.SG.	TMA	watch	dog	'he is watching the dog'
bo	ta	kaminá		(Palenquero)
2PS.SG.	TMA	walk		'he is walking, walks'
mi	ta	lesa		(Papiamentu)
1PS.Sg	TMA	read		'I am reading/read'
n	ta	bibi	binyu	(Kriyol (Guinée-Bissau))
1PS.SG	TMA	drink	whine	'I drink wine'

Furthermore, most creoles show invariant verb forms used without a preverbal marker. Those usually show a distinction between stative and non-stative verbs, whereby stative verbs

[22] Examples from Pfänder (2000:89), Valdman (1978:213), Schwegler (1998:256), Maurer (1998:162) and Kihm (1994:93). Cf. Pfänder (2000:200-09) for detailed tables for French, Iberian and English-based creoles and

without preverbal markers are generally interpreted as a present state, while non-statives receive a punctual, completed action interpretation (cf. Holm 1988:150f.).[23]

Interestingly, Mufwene (1996:87f.) points out that in the 1970-80s the genesis debates evolved around substrata versus universals (cf. the respective title of the edited volume Muysken and Smith 1986), while superstratist theories were overlooked despite their prominence between the 1920-60s. This should not surprise us given our discussion of the paradigmatic changes underlying the emergence of Pidgin and Creole Studies. Indeed, we can see that Hall (1958), who cemented the pidgin-creole life cycle in his manual *Pidgin and Creole Languages* (1966), was among the superstratists adopting a similar line as Hjelmslev on their genetic relation, while also acknowledging substrate influence. However, his insistence on Bloomfield's (1933) distinction between non-native pidgins and nativized creoles formed the basis for theories seeking autonomous beginnings for languages that were increasingly seen as a group apart.

3.2 Ur-Kreole: the monogenesis theory

The first genesis theory to attempt to define creoles as a distinct group is the monogenetic theory (Whinnom 1956; 1965), which tries to explain perceived similarities across creoles by a common ancestor of all European creole languages in a Portuguese pidgin widely used in Westafrica and in Asia, which was then relexified, hence the term 'lexifier',[24] by the respective European colonial languages.[25] Whinnom (1965:517) mentions particularly the

---

critical discussion.

[23] This is, however, not a clear-cut pattern and European languages show the distinction to some degree as well as Holm (1988:151f.) points out.

[24] Cf. Goodman's (1987:261f.), who gives a good account of the history of the monogenesis theory.

[25] This is not to say that Schuchardt had not commented previously about the need to compare Romance and Germanic creole languages. However, there is no systematic attempt of a genesis theory to be found in his work, which is rather driven by the overarching aim to define the working of language mixture across languages.

system of preverbal markers with invariant verb forms (cf. the examples above), an intensifier with the meaning 'very' derived from 'too much' (*tu machi* in Pidgin English, *demasiado* or *masiao* in the Philippines and masiá in Papiamentu (cf. Spanish *demasiado*), *tro* in Dominican French creole (cf. French *trop*)) as well as some Portuguese functional lexical items (the preposition *na* (cf. port. *na* 'in the') and the postverbal particle *kabá* to emphasize the completion of an action (cf. port. *acabar* 'to finish').[26]

The theory originated in Whinnom's analysis of the Philippine Spanish Creoles (1956), in which he establishes a link of its four varieties with a Portuguese pidgin, which he thought to be the basis for the first contact between Spanish garrison soldiers in the Moluccas, thus providing a model for the developing pidgin then rapidly creolized and brought to the Philippines. The historical evidence is extremely scarce and Whinnom (1956:10f.) acknowledges as much in the following citation, which describes the stipulated scenario: 'I have devoted a good deal of space to the hypothetical history of Ternateño, a language of which no text or sample exists, whose name I have coined, and of which no mention is made in any save one document. But Ternateño is important, simply because in the history of any contact vernacular the most important consideration is the problem of genesis, and one fact at least is certain: that the first of the Spanish contact vernaculars in the Eastern Seas arose in Ternate, and had already achieved creolization before the evacuation of the island by garrison and Christian inhabitants.'

His historical argument depends on one document mentioned in this citation, in which reference is made to a 'corrupt Spanish' spoken on Ternateño (Whinnom 1956:4). Whinnom interprets this as an indication that there was indeed a Spanish creole spoken in Ternateño, since today people from Manila still refer to the Spanish creoles there as 'corrupt Spanish'.

[26] Cf. critical discussion in Chaudenson (2001:48f.) in relation to French creoles.

There are, however, a number of problems with this hypothesis, which relies heavily on an interpretation of one historical source in the light of the pidgin-creole life cycle. While Whinnom first cautiously refers to the language in question as a 'contact vernacular' (p. 4), he then adds a scenario by which he assumes the existence of a Spanish pidgin, modelled on the supposedly still existing local Portuguese pidgin, used between the Spanish soldiers and their indigenous wives, which in turn would have been creolized by their children. However, reference to the existence of a 'corrupt Spanish' certainly does not warrant such far-reaching conclusions as our previous discussion demonstrates. While it is not unreasonable to assume some knowledge of Portuguese in these Christian communities, whose religion combined with their low caste had isolated them from their surroundings, it does not seem necessary to seek extraordinary explanations for a rapid language transmission given the intimate family relations of the soldiers with local women. There is also no proof that the children born into these relationships radically altered the structure of the vernacular spoken between their parents, since the only reference we have is to the existence of a 'corrupt Spanish', which is a term, as we have mentioned before, that was also applied to varieties of Spanish not considered creole. In addition, Whinnom (1956:2f.) himself highlights the social difference between the uneducated garrison troops, often Mexican *mestizos*, and members of the lesser aristocracy, which formed the class of administrators and colonists. These circumstances probably sufficed to explain linguistic and other prejudice as well as linguistic differences between the two different groups resulting in descriptions such as 'corrupt Spanish'. What is clear from our discussion is that quite scarce historical documentation has been interpreted in the light of contemporary theoretical notions of the pidgin-creole life cycle.

Nevertheless, Whinnom (1965) expands his theory of monogenesis eventually to all creoles adding the mechanism of relexification to account for the existence of French, English,

Portuguese or Spanish creoles. He concludes that a stable Portuguese pidgin must have existed in all the Portuguese possessions by the end of the sixteenth century, which was also used as a trade language by other foreigners in the area. While Whinnom (1965:513) acknowledges that many of the documents 'speak simply of "Portuguese"', he still holds that the reasonable assumption is that the documents refer to a 'stable Portuguese contact language'. However, this is the same reinterpretation of historical descriptions in the service of contemporary theory noted before. Furthermore, there is little indication to propose the identity of the Asian Portuguese variety with that spoken in West Africa other than Whinnom's claim (p. 513) that it spread too rapidly and in too stable a form. He acknowledges that the first texts in a Portuguese creole from India date only from the end of the seventeenth century, while direct evidence of the form of the African and Asian pidgin does not exist. Despite any direct lack of evidence, he further adds Sabir or the so-called Lingua Franca to the genealogy to explains the pidgin's presumed simplicity and uniformity.[27]

The sweeping claim of this hypothesis did not attract too many followers, maybe not least because of the change of paradigm in the discipline, which made for a stronger focus on synchronic description rather than historical derivation. In addition, more detailed knowledge of the historical situations in which creoles arose cast doubt on the possibility of general widespread knowledge of a Portuguese pidgin among the slaves shipped to the new world. Alleyne (1971:179) cites historical sources pointing out the need for interpreters on the slave ships. However, a number of people have argued for a revised version of the monogenetic theory by pointing out the importance of a Portuguese pidgin for the Spanish creoles in the

[27] Cf. Schuchardt's (1909) analysis of the historical records available on the Lingua Franca, which he discusses as yet another example of language mixture without claiming any direct relation to pidgin or creole languages.

Caribbean as well as for the possible existence of a formerly widespread restructured variety of Spanish particularly in the Caribbean region (cf. Schwegler 1999 for detailed discussion).

Goodman (1987) makes a detailed assessment of the Portuguese lexical influence that had been taken as evidence for the monogenesis and points out how limited it was in most instances or that it could be better explained by other more local influences, including the role of Dutch plantation owners settling in other parts of the new world after their expulsion from Brazil and the particular contribution of Sephardic Jews with Portuguese in their linguistic repertoire in this context (cf. also de Granda 1974).[28] This affects particularly, Papiamentu, Sranan Tongo and Saramaccan, where the Dutch had a clear presence in the development of the creole languages. His conclusion is that there might have been some influence of the Portuguese pidgin through the currency it had among people involved in the slave trade. However, these influences certainly do not justify the wide claims of the monogenesis theory.

Furthermore, as Mufwene (1986:130f.) notes, the monogenesis theory does not ultimately explain the emergence of the Portuguese pidgin or the Lingua Franca, on which the development of all creoles ultimately rests in this theory. Naro (1978) seemingly attempts to fill this gap in this important article by claiming that the beginnings lie with the Europeans, who deliberately modify their speech when speaking to foreigners. In a careful analysis of literary depictions of Africans speaking Portuguese, he concludes that the documentation shows clearly that the beginnings of the Portuguese pidgin lie in the hands of the European speakers, who deliberately simplified their speech in interactions with African slaves, which they encountered in Portugal as a result of the coastal explorations. His evidence consists of early records of a stereotyped 'corrupt' Portuguese, which is used in Portuguese plays to

[28] Chaudenson (2001: 48f.) points out in his criticism that *na* are not attested for the French creoles (CHECK!!) and that no equivalent of the word 'thing' is used as an interrogative.

depict Africans. However, the lack of similar documents in Africa does not necessarily prove that there was no language transmission at work there, nor that the Portuguese were the ones who invented this pidgin (Naro 1978:339; '[…] it was the 15th-century European who taught the African "how to speak" […]'), but rather gives testimony to the social conditions of the colonial enterprise, which unsurprisingly did not directly feed into any artistic and literary activities by the mostly illiterate Portuguese involved on the ground. In his analysis of the procedures used by Europeans to modify their speech, Naro (1978:340f.) then ultimately invokes behavioural principles underlying the formation of pidgins, which he calls the factorization principle, whereby all basic units of meaning are expressed by phonologically separate, stress-bearing units, thus accounting for invariant verb forms, stressed invariable pronouns, a single stressed negative phrase and the loss of the 'essentially meaningless' copula. It is interesting to note that while Naro follows the historical argument and cites circumstantial historical evidence to trace back the Portuguese pidgin, he ultimately invokes universal principles to account for the concrete make-up of the pidgin, which he says are characteristic of the unnatural change that pidgins represent.

3.3 Nativization run full circle: the bioprogram and the relexification hypothesis

The next attempt at a big theory of creole genesis was Bickerton's bioprogram (1981; 1984) and it picks up precisely where Naro's theory of pidginization stops by explaining the natural workings that lead from a non-natural pidgin to a natural, full-fledged language, which the creole was considered to be. Bickerton's explanation rests on the defining characteristics of creoles as nativized pidgins by claiming that the qualitative differences found in creoles vis-à-vis pidgins from which they developed were due to the first generation of children who expanded a pidgin into a full-fledged language by following a bioprogram that represents the

minimal characteristics of natural language. This set of default structures is activated when children are faced with the supposedly rudimentary and incomplete linguistic input of their parents' speech.

Bickerton's (1981:7-9) analysis rests on data from Hawaii, where according to his calculations a pidgin emerged in the first decades of the twentieth century and a creole developed from that pidgin in the next generation of speakers. Interviews made in the early seventies would therefore guarantee access to the pidgin variety of older speakers and the creole variety of younger speakers. Bickerton tries to show the fundamental difference between the pidgin and the creole by analyzing word order and movement rules, the determiner system, *for-to* complementization, relativization and the system of preverbal markers.

An important point of the analysis was the claim that the exact distribution of preverbal particles (Bickerton still calls them verbal auxiliaries) found in all creoles is part of the universal bioprogram. The preverbal particles express the marking of tense, mood and aspect (therefore TMA [TAM to be added to list of abbreviations]) and can be combined – so Bickerton claims – only in that order.

On a structural level, Muysken (1988), among others, raised doubts about the homogeneity of creoles by showing differences between some of the creoles cited by Bickerton in relation to serial verbs and predicate cleft-constructions, which he shows to pattern with substratum influence. However, he also demonstrates (p. 300) that the existing phenomena are more restricted than in the possible substrate languages, thus pointing out the need for clearer mechanisms on substrate influence. Even the prototype of the TMA system did not stand up to closer examination: firstly, there are postverbal markers (for example *–ba* and *–ja* in the Upper Guinea Portuguese Creoles and *–za* in the Gulf of Guinea Portuguese Creoles, cf.

Holm 1988:267) and one of these *–ba* is a tense marker, thus clearly violating the presupposed order TMA when combined (cf. also Maurer 1998). Moreover, more detailed analyses of the verbal systems and their semantics of expressing the anchoring of an event indicate that these systems show much more variation than a minimal bioprogram hypothesis would suggest and rather point towards an intricate relation between substrate and superstrate influence, as well as independent grammaticalization processes that follow more general trends of language change.[29]

A more general criticism levelled against the theory concerns the way in which it reifies the notions of pidgin and creole. Mühlhäusler (1986) demonstrates that expanded pidgins such as Tok Pisin show a remarkable degree of stability and structural complexity, which matches that of creoles. This proves that the structural developments of creoles cannot depend purely on the first language acquisition by children. In addition, the sociohistorical circumstances in many plantation economies suggest that children could not have played the determining role, given that the constant influx of new slaves and the high mortality rate suggest limited possibilities for child rearing (Arends 1995; Mufwene 1996). Thomason and Kaufman (1988:164) highlight the improbability of the whole linguistic scenario of generationally divided speech communities as follows: 'When Bickerton poses the question of how a child can "produce a rule for which he has no evidence" (1981:6), he is, in our view, asking the wrong question. We prefer to ask how a child can create grammatical rules on the basis of input data received which is much more variable than the input data received by child in a monolingual environment.'

[29] Cf., for example, Pfänder (2000) for French Creoles; Kihm (1994) for the Upper Guinea Kriyol; also Baker and Corne (1986), who relate the complex system of distant and proximate past and future in Mauritian Creole to Bantu influence; Detges 2000 for a discussion of different processes of genesis for preverbal markers in French creoles.

This unlikely scenario does not only overestimate monolingual scenarios as the norm (cf. Le Page 1988:29), it also stipulates an essential stability of adult language behaviour, which seems to be incorrect (Thomason 2008:248).

While universalist and substratist have often been on opposite sides theoretically (cf. the introduction in Muysken and Smith 1986), the relexification theory forms the perfect complement to the bioprogram hypothesis in making differences between non-natural and natural language acquisition as solely responsible for the genesis of creole languages. While Bickerton sees the natural L1 acquisition of children with insufficient input from their parents' non-natural pidgin as the trigger for creole genesis through the activation of the bioprogram, Lefevbre claims that the carry-over of substrate structure is a necessary result of the restrictions of L2 acquisition, in which the foreign lexical input is processed strictly through L1 structures. She thus claims that in the L2 acquisition, which creole genesis ultimately represents, learners will acquire the lexical forms of the target language only (hence relexification) while maintaining the syntactic and semantic properties of their native language (Lefebvre 1998:9). While relexification is not the only process in creole genesis according to this theory (reanalysis and dialect levelling are assumed to act on the lexical entries created by adults through relexification), she does claim that all the essential grammatical properties of the creole are ultimately derived from the substrate. On a par with the bioprogram hypothesis, this strong claim seems too exclusive, and has also led to criticism (cf. DeGraff 2005a; Mufwene 1996, 2001).

Most other proponents of substrate theories had more modest aims (cf., for example, Holm 1988/89) and it seems right to acknowledge that their perspective has long been ignored (cf. also our discussion on substrate influence in the historical-comparative paradigm). Alleyne (1986:303), one of the proponents of substrate influence in the genesis of creole languages,

points out that the focus on 'concepts such as degenerate pidgins preceding creoles, superstrate languages as historical points of departure, children as the generators of creoles, the disuse of indigenous/substrate language, and Universal Grammar as some kind of tyrannical force rather than an inferred abstraction' have put researchers arguing for substrate influence on the defensive. While Alleyne is certainly right about the longstanding neglect of substrate influence, he ignores the appeal of Bickerton's theory as well as the monogenetic theory, which lies in the fact that it tries to explain the existence of creole languages as a group, which strengthens the coherence of the discipline of Pidgin and Creole Studies. Substrate theories generally go against this uniformity since they must predict important differences between Pacific and Atlantic creoles.

While Alleyne (1980) is most interested in the African contribution to Caribbean creolization (*Comparative Afro-American* is the title of his influential study) and thus continues the focus of the early twentieth century Pidgin and Creole Studies and their local focus on the Caribbean perspective, Holm (1988/89) relates the study of substrate influence to systematic differences between Atlantic and Pacific varieties. Similarly, subgroupings for creole language with the same lexifier according to the differing substrate influence have been made for French creoles (Baker and Corne 1986), for Portuguese creoles (Stolz 1998) and for Spanish creoles (Lorenzino 1993).

3.4 Modifications of the pidgin-creole life cycle

In more recent years, it seems that creole studies have shown less appetite for grand schemes,[30] and Alleyne (2000:125) summarizes the general mood neatly as follows: 'One must admit that there has been of late a waning in what was a relentless search for a single

hypothesis to account for the genesis of "creole" languages. There has been a growing awareness that these languages, at least those of the Caribbean, demonstrate well-known, "normal" processes of language change, both internal non-motivated and externally motivated change; rather than, or at least in addition to the special exclusive process or processes that traditionally have been assumed to be involved.'

Detailed historical research showed that the strong hypothesis of a deterministic pidgin-creole life cycle largely driven by a one-generational language creation process had little foundation in most of the sociohistorical settings where creoles emerged. Alleyne (1986:306) points out that the idea of a simple pidgin of adults which children transform according to their cognitive needs is much to simplistic and goes against the historical records, which paint a much more nuanced picture of different levels and styles of language use by different groups of slaves (p. 307). Both the bioprogram and the relexification hypothesis seem to stem from a conceptualization of speakers as essentially monolingual: one the one hand Bickerton assumes that the slave populations immediately abandon their native languages and are therefore monolingual in pidgin, while the relexification hypothesis assumes that the native language essentially determines the structural make-up of the emerging creoles, therefore assuming that speakers can only gain very limited access to languages other than their native language. Both ideas seem to place too much emphasis on the native language and ignore existing multilingualism in many parts of the world, which makes language contact a much more frequent scenario than previously acknowledged. This has led to an increase in research on language contact, in which pidgin and creole languages are seen as part of a range of contact phenomena from borrowing and code-switching to language shift and contact-induced change (cf. for example Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

---

[30] See, however, McWhorter's (1998, 2001) discussion about the creole prototype and its supposed simplicity.

Other research showed the importance of more accurate sociohistoric contextualizations and the importance of demographics. Chaudenson (2001:96-129) introduced the important distinction between the early homestead phase and the later plantation phase, which marked quite different levels of population distribution and hence access of slaves to the language of the colonizers. It was thus only after the plantation economies were fully established that the ratio between black and white people changed dramatically. Chaudenson (2001) concludes from this distinction that the creoles were formed as approximations of approximations of the superstrate language as direct access to it became increasingly more difficult.

Furthermore, Arends (1995) points out the internal hierarchies within slave plantations, which explain that there were different levels of access to European culture by different slave populations and that the more integrated house slaves and overseers probably played an important role in the transmission of language to field slaves. Similarly, Chaudenson (2001:89-94) describes the cultural and linguistic adaptation of new slaves, which clearly shows that linguistic integration was an important aim and an organized process, at least in some areas. Mufwene (1996) uses detailed information on population statistics in the making of Caribbean creoles to discuss different outcomes of the restructuring process.

Even the widespread claim that the slaves had no way to communicate in African languages due to the multiplicity of languages and the policy of ethnic mixing of slave populations to avoid revolts has received some corrections. Arends draws on historical work (Eltis 2001) identifying systematic geographical patterns among the slave populations destined for different regions, observing how: 'rather than drawing slaves from all over coastal West and West Central Africa, specific regions in the New World recruited their slaves from specific regions in Africa.' (Arends 2008:313).

This gives us a clearer idea when looking for likely substrate influence. On the other hand, it

remains a point of discussion how long African and other languages coexisted in exogenous plantations. Bonvini's (2008) analysis of the Brazilian situation demonstrates the long retention of African languages in Brazil, partly due to missionaries' language policies both in Angola and in Brazil to use general languages similarly to the general languages on Amerindian basis used in Iberoamerica. This adds a further factor to determining different outcomes of creolization and highlights the need for a more realistic picture of the multilingual beginnings of creole languages.

4. Scales of creoleness: decreolization, partial restructuring and theories of language change

In this section, I shall discuss recent issues in Pidgin and Creole Studies, which seem to me most relevant to the history of Romance languages and to general theories of language change. Despite Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) insistence on the impossibility of defining the genetic relation of pidgin and creole languages due to their irregular pattern of transmission, the most interesting contributions to Pidgin and Creole Studies in recent years seem to be investigations which relate language change in creoles to that of other languages and thus ask questions about the nature of language change and the role of contact in it. In fact, this is precisely what Thomason and Kaufman (1988) are doing with their book-length presentation of contact phenomena, even if they try to draw a line about how much contact-induced change a normally transmitted language can have, before it becomes genetically untraceable. Thomason (2008:257) explicitly discusses the difficulty to define 'the borderline between a mixed language, on the one hand, and on the other hand a language that is not mixed under this definition but that has undergone quite a bit of ordinary contact-induced change'. However, she ultimately maintains the position that mixed languages such as pidgins and

creoles cannot be genetically traced and are therefore unclassifiable to historical linguistics. It seems, however, unsatisfactory that contact-induced change, which is frequent, as Thomason and Kaufman (1988) show, remains an exceptional phenomenon that does not fit the model of historical linguistics. It seems to us that historical linguistics requires a theory of language change that is able to account for all instances of language change. Recent developments in research seem to focus precisely on the borderline areas discussed by Thomason by looking at 'intermediate' forms of Romance and other creoles as well as contact-induced change in 'non-mixed' languages. I shall look at some recent developments which try to shed new light on processes of language change as well as research on 'intermediate' forms of Romance creoles. This discussion will lead us to reconsider the question whether creoles can be considered Romance languages or rather what their status is in the history of the Romance languages.

4.1 Koineization and degrees of restructuring

In a provocative article entitled 'Jargons, Pidgins, Creoles, & Koines', Mufwene (1997) calls into question the fundamental difference between pidgins and creoles as opposed to other varieties of European languages, for which some contact-induced change has been claimed. Particularly, he questions the usefulness of the term koiné, which had a revival in recent sociohistorical research showing the influence of dialect mixing for processes of levelling and simplification in some urban and colonial varieties (cf., for example, Trudgill (1986, 2004) for English or Tuten (2003) and Fontanella de Weinberg (1992) for Peninsular and American Spanish, respectively).

Tuten (2003:25) also discusses the relation between koineization and creolization and tries to mark a clear difference between them. He suggests that difficulties in communication were not an issue in koineization as opposed to creolization due to the mutual intelligibility of the

dialects involved in the former process. However, mutual intelligibility is a quality which is hard to pin down. It has often been taken as a criterion for differentiating the lexifier from its creole varieties by claiming mutual intelligibility of the latter, but not of the creole varieties with the lexifier, but this claim has likewise been disputed repeatedly. Chaudenson (2001:40f.), for example, notes that often the French standard has to serve as a medium of communication for creole speakers from different countries instead, which is precisely the function one would expect from a shared standard language.[31] Mufwene (1997:45) points out that some of the so-called koinés have arisen from the contact of speakers, who clearly do not consider their languages as related to each other and hence certainly not as mutually intelligible.

Mufwene (1997) argues that the possibility of distinguishing between koinés and pidgins and creoles depends on the possibility of drawing a line between languages and dialects, which has proven notoriously difficult on purely structural grounds. Furthermore, Mufwene (2001) points out that unequivocal multilingualism and therefore contact between clearly unrelated languages has played a role in the formation of European languages and their colonial varieties as well due to population movements and migration and he therefore proposes a unified approach to all these varieties as contact-induced restructuring. Interestingly, very similar principles for different types of contact-induced change have been proposed independently in the past. Siegel (1997) compares a number of approaches to pidgin and creole languages, second language leaning and interlanguages, indigenized varieties and koines and shows that they converge on principles such as unmarkedness, regularity, transparency and frequency. The mixing process is mostly seen as a pool of competing

[31] Cf. Mufwene (2001) for a genealogy of different varieties of English according to their communicative functions.

features, from which some are selected or levelled out according to the above-mentioned criteria. This idea is probably easier to conceive for phonetic and phonological change, however, research on substrate transfer of morphosyntactic structures (Boretzky 1983) shows that there needs to be some match of features or structures for them to be selected into the contact variety. Furthermore, theories of koineization and creolization also coincide in claiming a process of autonomization (Chaudenson 2001) or focusing (Trudgill 2004). Chaudenson interprets the fact that these varieties were named as *créole* at some point instead of the previous corrupt French as an outer sign of that process. Trudgill (2004) takes up Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) insight that a variety needs to become a point of communication and identification for a community in order to jell as an independent language.

Taking Mufwene's argument seriously means that the historical comparison with the varieties of the base language that were present in the language mix at the time of contact comes to the fore, but without neglecting the possible contribution from substrate languages also present in the contact situation. Universal principles such as transparency and unmarkedness would come into play with respect to selection of some features over others. Posner (1985) follows this path of research with an analysis of complementizer and relative clauses in French creoles compared to seventeenth-century popular French and popular varieties of Canadian French. Her analysis shows that with respect to complementizers French creoles clearly follow the tendency of popular seventeenth-century French for deletion:

1	On	disait	c'	était	un	vieux	bâtard	(Posner 1985)
	One	said	it	was	an	old	bastard	

2 Moin coue i bon (Jourdain 1956, cited in Posner 1985)

Me think he good

With respect to relative clauses, she notes that French creoles have followed the tendency of popular French and other Romance languages for generalized relative complementizers. However, while Montreal French shows only occasional deletion of the relative complementizer, French Caribbean creoles show quite systematic deletion except for subject position. Posner (1985:179) argues that this development can be explained by the Accessibility Hierarchy and is a change, which is in no way specific to creolization. The Indian Ocean creoles seem closer to popular French with the widespread use of the general *ki* complementizer with only occasional deletion in non-subject position.

In addition, she points out a further grammaticalization process in the Caribbean creoles (including Guayana), but not in the Indian Ocean creoles. In the Caribbean varieties the definite postverbal marker *LA*, derived from the French distal adverb *-lá* is used to delimit relative clauses by analogy with the demarcation of the NP. Compare the two examples below cited in Posner (1985:176; 180):

3 a Nõm la moin ka palé a … (Martinique; Jourdain 1956:309)

man =LA me PROG speak to

'the man I'm talking to'

b Fãm –lã blãʃ (Haiti; Sylvain 1936:41)

woman =LA white

'the woman is white'

c Fãm blãʃ –lã

woman white =LA

'the white woman'

Posner (1985:182) notes that this grammaticalization process is furthest developed in Haitian creole, were the construction is used now for all restrictive relative clauses substituting for the more 'frenchified' model. She cites (p. 18f.) substrate influence from Ewe, which has a postverbal definite marker *lá* also delimiting restrictive relative clauses, in combination with the widespread use of *lá* in Quebec as a deictic and to mark the end of sentences as possible sources for this development.

This type of careful crossdialectal historical analysis, which takes substrate influence into account, was also at the focus of a volume edited by Neumann-Holzschuh and Schneider on *Degrees of Restructuring in Creole Languages* (2000). A number of the contributions in this volume deal with restructuring processes in subsystems of the grammar of creole languages in a similar way to Posner (1985) and carefully delineate similarities and differences of scale in individual processes. Neumann-Holzschuh (2000) for example shows the relatively conservative character of Lousiana creole by analyzing historical and modern data from different French creoles. Compare the following examples (p.394) on the position of the negative particle *pa*:

chimen		té	pa	bon		(Guyana creole, 1872)
way	TMA	NEG	good			'the way was difficult'
afin	i		té	pas	laide	(Guadelope creole, 1923)
in the end	3PS.SG		TMA	NEG	help	'in the end, he did no help'
mé roi	là	té	pas	olé		(Lousiana creole, contemp.)

but king=DET TMA NEG want ‘the king did not agree’

In modern Lousiana creole the anterior marker precedes the negative particle and this form is also attested in older texts from Guyana and Guadelope. The generalization whereby the negative particle precedes all TMA markers in most modern French creoles therefore seems to be a later innovation, which Lousiana creole does not share.

Michaelis (2000) shows different stages of a grammaticalization process for subject pronouns developing into predicate markers in Seychelles creole and Reunion creole. She sees the starting point for this type of development in left-dislocation constructions, where *Pierre, il chants* ‘Pierre, he sings’ develops into *Pierre i chante* ‘Pierre sings’ and cites historical evidence for examples with a resumptive pronoun (p.167). In Seychelles creole, the marker is obligatory in all 3rd person contexts with a full NP subject, but not with personal pronouns (p.164f.). Compare the following examples:

lakaz i zoli
house TMA nice ‘the house is nice

Marcel i dir (…)
Marcel TMA says ‘Marcel says’

Bann danm i danse
PL woman TMA dance ‘the women dance’

However, she notes that the *i* does not occur in the context of negation or together with other verbal particles (p.165).

In Reunion creole, on the other hand, *i* combines with all persons and with both full NPs and

pronouns, some of which contract with the particle. Cf. the paradigm from Michaelis (p.168):

1SG	*mi **i** manz*	*(mi < moin + i)*	1PL	*nou **i** (ni) manz*	'I eat' etc.
2SG	*vi **i** manz*	*(vi < vou + i)*	2PL	*zot **i** manz*	
3SG	*li manz*		3PL	*zot **i** manz*	

As in Seychelles creole, the particle cannot be used together with other verbal particles. She argues that the distribution of the particle *i* in the two French creoles can be interpreted as ongoing grammaticalization which functionalizes a high frequency pronoun (3SG) as a verbal marker to indicate present tense and finiteness. While in Seychelles creole, this process has not expanded to all persons yet and is restricted to affirmative contexts, in Reunion creole the marker has lost all traces of agreement and has developed into a full-fledged present tense marker.

Neumann-Holzschuh (2000:403) concludes her analysis by pointing out that the problem of scale of difference from the base language is similar in the case of creole languages and Romance languages, where the distance to the base language can only be defined in relation to individual parts of the grammar. Defining a prototype is elusive (cf. Thomason's criticism (2008:244) of McWhorter 1998), since the changes take place in different subsystems of grammar and can have different extensions across dialects. However, the careful analysis and comparison with developments in related and unrelated languages certainly provides a rich testing ground for historical developments in the Romance creoles.

4.2 Partial restructuring, decreolization and standardization

Holm (2004) takes on a similar issue, but from a comparative creole perspective by comparing African American English, Afrikaans, Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese, Nonstandard

Caribbean Spanish and Vernacular Lects of Réunionnais French (mostly called Réunionnais creole or simply *créole*, cf. Chaudenson 2001:30). The creole status of all the above varieties has been disputed in the past.[32] Holm (2004, preface) acknowledges the controversy surrounding the terms: while semi-creole was first introduced by Reinecke (1938) for Afrikaans, the big debate surrounding African American English and decreolization occupied an important place in the American beginnings of the discipline of Pidgin and Creole Studies as we discussed earlier (cf. also Holm 2004:1f.; Mufwene 2001:86-98). According to this view African American English developed from a formerly widespread English creole spoken across the southern parts of the US, which subsequently underwent decreolization, which is understood as a loss of creole features and hence an approximation towards the lexifier. However, the term was used by Reinecke in a different sense, as Holm (p. 7) indicates, namely as an incomplete creolization process. Holm adopts the term partial restructuring in this sense and in line with the discussion on degrees of restructuring (p. 10), but the use of the term 'partial' seems to indicate that restructuring is a process with a clearly defined end product, while the discussion above of Neumann-Holzschuh and Schneider (2000) and Posner (1985) indicated the possibility to see the restructuring processes of creole languages in a wider perspective of language change (cf. also Mufwene 1997:58f.). I shall return to this question after discussing some of the data Holm presents on Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese and relating it to the paradigmatic changes that Brazilian Portuguese is said to have undergone according to Roberts and Kato (1993) and Kato (2000).

I now return relative clauses (all data are taken from Holm 2004:125-27 unless otherwise indicated). Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese exhibits the relative complementizer discussed

[32] Cf. for example Naro and Scherre (1999) for Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese, Lipski (2005) for Afro-Hispanic including non-standard Caribbean varieties, and Baker (2000) for Réunnionais.

above for Romance as first systematically addressed by Tarrallo (1983). He discusses the following three existing forms:

4 a A menina **com quem** falei
the girl with whom I-spoek

b A menina **que** eu falei **com ela**
the girl that I spoke with her

c A menina **que** eu falei[33] [34]
the girl that I spoke
'The girl I talked to'

While the first variant exists almost exclusively in writing, the variant with a resumptive pronoun is highly stigmatized. The most widely-used option in educated speech is the variant with the general complementizer and no resumptive pronoun (cf. Bagno 2000:185-98). Holm (2004:125f.) cites examples from Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese for the variant with a resumptive pronoun and data from Baxter (1987) who notes that relative clauses with an invariant relative complementizer and a resumptive pronoun are common in Portuguese- and Spanish creoles,[35] in fact they seem to be the general strategy for relativization of PPs:

[33] Holm (2004:126) omits the subject pronouns from the original data in the vernacular forms. However, as Kato (2000) discusses, Brazilian Portuguese has lost its positive null-subject parameter setting similar to French and thus shows overt subject pronouns as creole languages and other forms of vernacular Spanish, particularly Caribbean (cf. also the discussion in Holm 2004:128).

[34] This version is generally referred to as a relative clause with deleted resumptive pronoun.

[35] I cannot discuss the debate surrounding the origins of Papiamentu and its status as a Spanish- or Portuguese-based creole (cf. Munteanu 1996; Martinus 1997). Papiamentu and Palenquero do share a number of features with some West African Portuguese creoles, however, this might not be wholly unexpected given the structural proximity of Spanish and Portuguese and in some cases shared substrate.

5 a ome **ku** zõ sa ka fla **n-** **e** (São Tomense)

man who John PROG talk about him

'the man that John is talking about'

b OmE **ki** m ba **kw** **E** (Angolar (São Tomé))

man that I went with him

'the man who I went with'

c kel ome **ke** n fala **k'** **el** (Kabuverdianu)

that man that I spoke with him

'that man who I spoke with'

d N mora na kasa **ku** bu mora-ba **n** **el** (Kriyol (Guiné-Bissau))

I live in house that you live=ANT in it

'I live in the house that you used to live in'

e E homber **ku** m' a papia **kun' e** a papia malu (Papiamentu)

the man that I PAST speak with him PAST speak bad

'the man that I spoke with spoke badly'

Holm notes that the generalized complementizer with and without a resumptive pronoun does exist in colloquial European Portuguese as well. It seems that the creole languages have simply gone furthest in generalizing the complementizer with a resumptive pronoun as the relativization strategy for PPs. On the other hand, Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese has only partly gone down that path while keeping the variant without resumptive pronoun, which is in fact the most widely-diffused variant (cf. Kato 1996:224)[36]

[36] She reports Tarallo's historical data. A quantitative study, particularly in isolated areas would be interesting to relate this phenomenon to similar restructuring in the Portuguese creoles.

There is indeed a further complication: Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese differs also in the distribution of relative clauses with or without a resumptive pronoun and invariant complementizer. While both European and Brazilian Portuguese exhibit the deleted version with a PP, this does not seem to be the case for the creole languages. On the other hand neither European Portuguese nor Portuguese creoles show resumptive pronouns for the direct object position as Brazilian Portuguese does (cf. Holm 2004:125; Maurer 1998:181; Kihm 1994:177):

6 Esse rapaz, **que** eu conheci **ele** **(**Amaral 1928:78)
this guy that I know him
'This guy, who I know'

Holm cites this example from Amaral's dialect study on the *Dialecto caipira* spoken in the hinterlands of the state São Paulo. He marks the example with a comma presumably indicating a pause. Kato (1996:230) cites a similar example without comma:

O buraco que taparam ele outro dia
the whole that covered=3PL it other day
'The whole that they covered the other day'

Interestingly, she relates this structure to the left-dislocation structure in the following example:

Esse $buraco_i$, taparam ele_i outro dia

this whole they-covered it other day

'(as for) this whole, they covered it the other day'

Referring to Pontes (1987), she notes that this structure, which represents a topic/comment organization, is very frequent in spoken Brazilian Portuguese. Tarallo (1983, 1989) and Kato (1996, 2000) relate these phenomena to wider changes that Brazilian Portuguese has undergone, namely the loss of the subject parameter, which has resulted in overt subjects (Duarte 1996) and the loss of clitics, which are substituted by full pronouns or by PPs in the case of indirect objects (Cyrino 1996). Moreover, this change has led to a general weakening of the object position, which can often be deleted. While direct object deletion does occur in European Portuguese as well (Raposo 1986), it is much more widespread in Brazilian Portuguese and is part of a set of compensatory strategies to make up for the loss of the clitic while avoiding the stigmatized full pronoun (Duarte 1989; Bachmann in press; see also chapter 8 (volume 1), §3.4.).[37] Compare the following examples:

7 a Achei o livro que você me indicou, mas ainda não ***o*** li
I-found the book that you me=showed but still not it=I-read

b Achei o livro que você me indicou, mas ainda não li ***ele***
I-found the book that you me=showed but still not I-read it

c Achei o livro que você me indicou, mas ainda não li ***Ø***
I-found the book that you me=showed but still not I-read

d Achei o livro que você me indicou, mas ainda não li esse livro

[37] Schwenter and Silva (2003) have shown that animacy plays a role in the distribution of full pronouns. Note that the resumptive pronoun in the example above also refers to a person.

I-found the book that you me=showed but still not I-read this book

'I found the book you recommended to me, but I haven't read it/that book yet)

Duarte (1989) shows that the use of these variables is highly dependentd on school education as well as monitoring in speech. Clitic use and the use of compensatory lexical NPs rise dramatically for educated speakers when they know that the use of clitics is tested. Bachmann (in press) develops this idea further and shows that in quality evening news programmes on television news presenters and reporters avoid the use of clitics, which is considered pedantic in spoken language, but make wide use of lexical NPs and passive constructions, which eliminate the direct object position, to construct direct object anaphoric reference.

This discussion of the interaction of linguistic norms with variation in language brings us back to the issue of decreolization. While the discussion above showed the validity of the idea of degrees of restructuring for creole languages, particularly when we take historical and current popular forms of the base languages as a point of departure, the discussion about Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese also shows a lacuna of current research on creole languages and partly restructured varieties, to stay with Holm's terminology for the moment. While Holm (2004:125) refers to colloquial European Portuguese as opposed to standard Portuguese, the term Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese remains vague. On the one hand, some examples are taken from isolated areas (Helevética Portuguese, Céara), while he acknowledges that the general pattern of resumptive pronouns and deletion does exist more widely, even though we do not know the exact quantitative patterns. Interestingly, Holm (p. 126) compares the deletion strategy to decreolization: 'Such deletion of a stigmatized construction resulting in a structure that is still nonstandard [viz. constructions with prepositional phrases; I.B.] is characteristic of decreolization.

If we accept that creolization, just like creole languages, is hard to pin down by structural features alone, it might also be better to discuss issues of decreolization as a more general phenomenon of influence from a coexisting standard variety. The continuum model tried to address this issue by relating existing sociolinguistic variation to decreolization by showing the possibility of progressive assimilation to the superstrate (De Camp 1971b; Rickford 1988). De Camp's and Rickford's research showed a continuum in Jamaican Creole between an acrolect (Jamaican Standard English) and a basilect (the deep creole variety), on which ideolects patterned systematically around clusters of features. On the other hand, Ferguson (1959) cites Haiti as a classical case of diglossia, because the functions of French and Haitian Creole are clearly distinct and therefore prevent the type of assimilation process (or decreolization) typical for a continuum situation. Fleischmann (1986) notes that part of the reason for the stability of the Haitian diglossia is rather related to the fact that many speakers in Haiti are monolingual in Haitian creole and that there is therefore no possibility of assimilation due to a lack of exposure to French (cf. also the discussion of diglossia in creoles in comparison to Romance in Schlieben-Lange 1977:88-90). On the whole, however, sociolinguistic studies remained the exception in Pidgin and Creole Studies, despite De Rooij's (1995:53) comment that 'there is no escape from addressing the problem of variation'. This lacuna might be related to the disciplinary nature of the field. As Bickerton (1976:180) points out: 'In particular, they have shed extensive light on the hitherto puzzling process of "decreolization"—that by which a creole in contact with its superstrate may progressively loose creole characteristics and eventually come to appear as no more than a rather deviant dialect of the superstrate. I turn, an understanding of decreolization has helped to change radically the prevailing opinion about the origins of Black English […].'

The sociolinguistic research related to decreolization served the aim of rehabilitating African

American English as a language related to a creole rather than being a 'deviant dialect' of English. Similarly, part of the aim of Pidgin and Creole Studies was to rehabilitate these varieties as full-fledged languages independent of their base languages. However, the discussion of a possible continuum or processes of decreolization seemed to call into question that independence by putting the creole language back into a space of variables blurring the line between the lexifier and the creole.

However, if we think in terms of degrees of restructuring resulting from contact-induced change and accept that the language/dialect boundaries are harder to determine than we might wish, we can think of decreolization as contact-induced change through the coexistence with the superstrate language. This process does not seem different in quality, but rather in degree, from the situation of, for example, French in France or Portuguese in Brazil, where popular varieties, restructured to varying degrees, are in contact with a written standard, which penetrates language practices to different degrees.

We can also see an example of this in the use of relativization variants in Papiamentu, which has undergone a process of standardization. Maurer (1998:181) points out that beside the general complementizer *ku*, which also serves as preposition and a conjunction for coordination, other more hispanized variants are in use such as *kende* 'quien', *kendenan* 'quienes', *lokual* 'el cual', *loke* 'lo que' [who, who PL, which, that], which can be combined with prepositions. In that way relativization with resumptive pronoun can be avoided as the following examples from Maurer (1998) show:

8 a Nan no konosé e hende *ku* m' a papia kuné
they not know the person that I PERF speak with.pron.3SG

b Nan no konosé e hende *ku* *ken* m' a papia

they not know the person with whom I PERF speak

'They don't know the person who I spoke with'

It seems likely that these constructions have entered Papiamentu through writing, since the syntactic expansion associated with creating a written *Ausbau* variety often takes recourse to the lexifier Spanish, with whom many literate people are familiar and to the national language Dutch (cf. Martinus 1990; Joubert 2002). Likewise, Pountain (2006) mentions the more 'exact' relative pronouns *cuyo* 'whose' and *el cual* 'which' as areas of syntactic borrowing from Latin,[38] and a similar process seems in fact likely for the high register Portuguese variants discussed above. The important question is in how far these variants have spread more widely. This discussion seems to indicate that similarly to creolization, which we discussed in the context of more general phenomena of contact-induced restructuring, decreolization can be seen as a phenomenon not specific to creole languages, but related to changes brought about by the contact with a standard language.

As the last example shows, this requires some further specification. Pountain (2006) shows how syntactic borrowing needs to be related to a distinction of register in language and concludes that the ease with which features can migrate downwards seems to depend on the relative distance between the written and the spoken code. This brings us back to the process of focusing described by Trudgill (2004) for new dialect formation and as acts of identity by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) for Caribbean creole languages. It seems that while focusing leads to an autonomization of language forms, the processes described in decreolization can lead to a destabilizing of that very autonomy by leading to progressive

[38] The parentheses are his, because relative constructions with a resumptive pronoun are obviously just as precise.

merger with a prestige variety (the acrolect). It seems that we do not yet clearly understand what is involved in these processes of jelling versus a gradual loss of autonomy and, indeed, if the contact phenomena described above are different in nature from the contact-induced restructuring described earlier. However, it seems clear that a deeper understanding of the communicative situation including the use of standard varieties in different media is crucial to determine its nature.

Pfänder (2000), for example, relates the more aspectual use of the preverbal markers *ka* [Imperfective] and the non-marked invariable form in Guayana French Creole to the way the narrative is constructed in oral discourse in this specific society if obviously also related to universal tendency of marking of tense and aspect. Interestingly, Pfänder (2000:233) suggests that writing seems to play a role in changes in the verbal system in the coastal areas of Guyana where people have more access to French as the written language. There the particle system seems to loose some of its aspectual force and develops the more abstract anchoring of the temporal dimension similarly to the French creole of Martinique where access to the French language is generally more widespread. The conditions for this type of language contact seem to imply opening the scenario of language change from the face-to-face communication, which was at the heart of Herman Paul's conception for sound change, to other forms of language circulation.

5. Conclusions: creolization as a heuristic term

I have shown the change of perspective in the research agendas for creole languages from nineteenth-century Romance Philology and historical-comparative grammar to the emergence of Pidgin and Creole Studies in the context of twentieth-century American Structuralism. In the nineteenth-century creole languages were analysed essentially as derivations of their base

language and their study emerged in the context of a wider interest in dialectal variation. Pidgin and Creoles Studies, on the contrary, focused on creoles as independent language systems and the comparison of creole languages as a group. This allowed for a conceptualization of creoles as full-fledged languages, but at the expense of loosing sight of the important function of their lexifiers, particularly in contexts where they still coexist with the creole often serving as the written standard and prestige variety.

It has become clear that the way creole languages were conceptualized depended on their insertion in these different research paradigms which shaped the research focus to a certain extent. Particularly, I have showed how theories of creole genesis have been shaped by these underlying conceptualizations. If we therefore ask the question if creoles are Romance languages, the answer is necessarily related to disciplinary aspects as well. Neumann-Holzschuh and Schneider (2000:3) touch on this aspect when they note 'different traditions and different lines of thinking' for English versus Romance creoles. This might partly be related to the fact that a substantial part of the research on Romance creoles is still done by researchers within the discipline of Romance linguistics or Modern Languages departments of the respective lexifiers, often with training in historical linguistics. On the other hand, the clearer move towards general linguistics departments in the United States certainly favoured the comparative creole perspective at the expense of the role of the lexifier. Finding researchers with a solid expertise in the relevant substrate languages, who focus on the study of creole languages has long been a challenge.

My discussion in the last section hopefully shows that I believe that the study of creole languages can greatly contribute to research questions that are important for the development of the Romance languages, particularly the importance of contact-induced change. Since creole languages form part of the European colonial expansion and consequently arose at the

same time as other European varieties in the Americas, Africa and Asia, it seems essential to understand similarities and differences in the development of all these Romance varieties.

As Schlieben-Lange had already noted in the article 'L'origine des langues romanes – un cas de créolisation', a contribution to the old and controversial debate about whether the origins of the Romance languages lie in creolization, this seems to be asking the wrong question. Rather, she concludes, we should understand creolization as a heuristic process that helps us ask the right questions about processes of change. She distinguishes the following factors that research on creole languages has taught us to consider when it comes to language change (pp. 94-99): the historic situation, the types of linguistic contact, the consequences of the contact situation (coexistence with base language (diglossic or not), complete shift, commercial language as go-between, etc.), and types of development (genesis and transmission). This seems still a reasonable conclusion and we have seen that some of these suggestions are already being put into practice

Iris Bachmann (no prelo): 'Creoles', in: Martin Maiden, J.C. Smith, Adam Ledgeway, Cambridge History of the Romance Languages (CHRL). Vol 2. Contexts. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.