

Languages in Contact

The Partial Restructuring of Vernaculars

John Holm



PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© John Holm 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2004

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Plantin 10/12 pt. *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Holm, John A.

Languages in contact : the partial restructuring of vernaculars / John Holm.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 43051 8

1. Languages in contact. 2. Linguistic change. 3. Sociolinguistics. I. Title.

P130.5.H65 2003

306.44 – dc21 2003053216

ISBN 0 521 43051 8 hardback

Contents

<i>List of maps</i>	page ix
<i>List of tables</i>	x
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xix
1. The study of partially restructured vernaculars	1
Introduction	1
1.1 Partial restructuring versus decreolization	4
1.2 The study of African American English (AAE)	10
1.3 The study of Afrikaans	13
1.4 The study of Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (BVP)	15
1.5 The study of Nonstandard Caribbean Spanish (NSCS)	17
1.6 The study of Vernacular Lects of Réunionnais French (VLRf)	19
1.7 The comparison of partially restructured vernaculars	21
2. Social factors in partial restructuring	24
Introduction	24
2.1 AAE: the sociolinguistic setting of its development	29
2.2 Afrikaans: the sociolinguistic setting of its development	41
2.3 BVP: the sociolinguistic setting of its development	47
2.4 NSCS: the sociolinguistic setting of its development	60
2.5 VLRf: the sociolinguistic setting of its development	65
2.6 Common sociolinguistic factors	70
3. The verb phrase	72
Introduction	72
3.1 The AAE verb phrase	73
3.2 The Afrikaans verb phrase	77
3.3 The BVP verb phrase	80
3.4 The NSCS verb phrase	83
3.5 The VLRf verb phrase	85
3.6 A comparison of the verb phrase	90

4.	The noun phrase	92
	Introduction	92
4.1	The AAE noun phrase	93
4.2	The Afrikaans noun phrase	96
4.3	The BVP noun phrase	101
4.4	The NSCS noun phrase	105
4.5	The VLRf noun phrase	108
4.6	A comparison of the noun phrase	112
5.	The structure of clauses	116
	Introduction	116
5.1	The structure of AAE clauses	116
5.2	The structure of Afrikaans clauses	120
5.3	The structure of BVP clauses	123
5.4	The structure of NSCS clauses	127
5.5	The structure of VLRf clauses	129
5.6	A comparison of clause structure	133
6.	Conclusions	135
	Introduction	135
6.1	Social factors in partial restructuring	135
6.2	Linguistic factors in partial restructuring	137
6.3	Linguistic processes in partial restructuring	142
6.4	Comparative studies in restructuring	144
	<i>References</i>	147
	<i>Index</i>	166

Maps

- 1 United States: 'Coloured Population, 1900.' Originally published in Darby and Fuller (1978), *The New Cambridge Modern History Atlas* (Cambridge University Press). page 31
- 2 Southern Africa. Originally published in Holm (1989), *Pidgins and Creoles Volume 2* (Cambridge University Press). 43
- 3 'South America, 1830–1956.' Originally published in Darby and Fuller (1978), *The New Cambridge Modern History Atlas* (Cambridge University Press). 49
- 4 'Localización aproximada de áreas afro-hispanas en América.' Originally published in Perl and Schwegler (eds.) (1998), *América Negra: panorámica actual de los estudios lingüísticos sobre variedades hispanas, portuguesas y criollas* (Iberoamericana). Reproduced by kind permission of Iberoamericana. 61
- 5 (a) 'Carte de l'île de la Réunion.' Réunion Ethnic groups. Originally appeared in the Chaudenson (1998), *Créolisation du français et francisation du créole: Le cas de Saint-Barthélemy et de la Réunion* (previously unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Degrees of Restructuring in Creole Languages, University of Regensburg, June 24–27, 1998). Reproduced by kind permission of Robert Chaudenson.
(b) 'Réseau ALRé.' Réunion Lects. Originally appeared in the Chaudenson (1998), *Créolisation du français et francisation du créole: Le cas de Saint-Barthélemy et de la Réunion* (previously unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Degrees of Restructuring in Creole Languages, University of Regensburg, June 24–27, 1998). Reproduced by kind permission of Robert Chaudenson. 66

Tables

1 Degree of restructuring and social factors	<i>page</i> 26
2 Estimated population of (East) Virginia, 1685–1790	32
3 Estimated proportion of blacks in American colonies in 1750	33
4 Estimated population of South Carolina, 1685–1775	35
5 Estimated population of the Cape Colony, 1658–1798	45
6 Estimated population of Brazil, 1538–1890	50
7 Estimated proportion of whites in the Greater Antilles in the late eighteenth century	64
8 Estimated proportion of whites in various societies in the late eighteenth century	71
9 Key morphosyntactic features in partial restructuring	138

1 The study of partially restructured vernaculars

Introduction

Language is a kind of social behavior, one of the many ways in which individuals interact with those around them. Thus linguistics is a social science, and linguists take pride in thinking of themselves as scientists, with all the objectivity that word denotes. Unfortunately, objectivity is very hard to achieve, especially in the social sciences, and linguistics is no exception. It is hard to imagine any study of language which manages to put away all ideology, but in the case of the languages discussed in this book, the task is unimaginable.

African American English – also called AAE, Ebonics, or just Black English – is a good case in point. Until at least the middle of the twentieth century, the overwhelming majority of white Americans saw their country and its culture as the product of their European roots flourishing in a new land. This ideology allowed very little room for the contribution of other cultures, so that even the distinctiveness of the folk ways and speech of African Americans was attributed to their frequent lack of access to education and general ignorance – if not to their very intelligence. Thus well into the 1950s Negro Nonstandard English (as AAE was then called) was usually considered bad English in need of eradication rather than study. In so far as its origins were considered at all, it was assumed to have descended solely from British dialects that had been left untended in America.

In the 1960s the civil rights movement sharply changed this ideology: equal citizens could not logically be unequal human beings, and there was a new willingness to reconsider African Americans, as well as the development of their language and culture in the United States. By the 1970s there was widespread agreement – at least among linguists – that the distinctive features of AAE identified it as a post-creole: the descendant of a variety of English that had first been creolized or restructured when it was learned by adult African slaves on plantations (as English had been creolized in Jamaica, for example). Subsequently this speech

underwent decreolization, or the loss of many of its distinctive creole features through contact with standard English. Dillard's influential book, *Black English* (1972) popularized this view, convincing many that AAE, like its speakers, was much more African than anyone had realized. This was part of another growing ideology, supported by many blacks, that affirmed a very separate cultural identity for African Americans.

But there were problems in explaining AAE as a post-creole. Most importantly, no one could find reliable historical evidence of the widespread, stable creole from which AAE had supposedly decreolized. The known passages purporting to represent the speech of blacks in North America during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries remain ambiguous. Quite aside from the inherent problem of the authenticity of such fragments, almost all of which were actually written by speakers of standard English, there is an even greater problem in accurately identifying the kind of speech represented. Unless the purported speaker's background is documented, it is impossible to determine whether it represents the foreigner's English of Africans, the Caribbean Creole English of slaves imported from the West Indies, a pidginized variety of English from West Africa, or an indigenous creole such as Gullah, the fully restructured variety spoken along the coast of South Carolina and Georgia.

Up to this point linguists had generally assumed that decreolization could account for the varying distance between the grammatical structure of different creoles and that of the European language they were based on: AAE and Caribbean creoles based on English were viewed as post-creoles at different stages of decreolization away from some very early fully creolized variety. By the mid-1980s there were growing objections to this all-or-nothing model of creolization and skepticism that it could account for what was becoming known about the earlier structure of AAE (Hancock 1987:264–265; Schneider 1989; Holm 1991:247). Much of the most recent debate focuses on the nature the language of blacks born in North America (outside of the creole-speaking Gullah area): whether it was from its very beginning a fully restructured creole or rather a compromise between the pidgin or creole brought in by slaves from the West Indies and Africa and the regional speech of British settlers (Winford 1997; Rickford 1997, 1999), and whether partial restructuring can account for the known sociohistorical and linguistic facts concerning AAE and some other languages that apparently had a similar genesis, such as nonstandard Brazilian Portuguese and Caribbean Spanish, Afrikaans (the South African language descended from Dutch), and the vernacular French spoken on the island of Réunion in the Indian Ocean (Holm 1992, 2000).

These language varieties, which appear to have grown out of the partial restructuring of older varieties spoken in Europe that came into contact

with non-European languages, today have some 200 million speakers, placing them among the major languages of the world. They present formidable challenges not only to linguistic theory but also in practical matters like the language-related problems encountered in education by speakers of nonstandardized varieties, which include all of the language varieties discussed here, except for standard Afrikaans. These problems have shown no signs of going away. And each of these languages has been studied through the prism of particular, often local, ideologies, as Heliana Mello has shown for her own language, Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (Mello 2001).

Of course the concept of a partially restructured language as opposed to a post-creole (which was fully restructured but then decreolized through contact with its lexical source language) has its own ideological implications. If the restructuring of the English spoken by blacks in most of North America was only partial, this implies that the transmission of the English language (and, indeed, other aspects of English culture) to African Americans was much more complete than it has been fashionable to assume. The cultural separatism of the 1960s and 1970s may have distorted the issue by insisting on the Africanness of African Americans to the virtual exclusion of their Europeanness.

These languages, then, would require new study if only because our sense of identity and ideology shift with time. But there is a more pressing scientific reason for reassessing them. The genesis and development of such partially restructured languages have become one of the most important leading edges of contact linguistics as a whole. The languages discussed here have a number of the structural features of creoles but appear, nonetheless, never to have undergone full creolization. Their reduced inflectional morphology – particularly in the verb phrase and noun phrase – seems to have been transmitted from one generation to another largely like that of unrestructured overseas varieties, rather than having been reacquired by more basilectal varieties during decreolization, which distinguishes them from post-creoles. Some of the most interesting research in this area has been the effort to correlate the synchronic structure of these languages to the sociolinguistic history of their speakers: the demographic balance of native versus non-native speakers of the target language at the beginning of the speech community's settlement, their relative power, their migrations, and the nature of their contact.

There has also been a shift in theoretical perspective that is facilitating progress in this area of inquiry. More of us working in pidgin and creole linguistics are coming to see our field as only one part of a broader area of research: contact linguistics, as defined by Thomason (1997). The scope of this wider field includes language varieties that have resulted not only from pidginization and creolization (to whatever degree) but also from

such processes as intertwining (Bakker and Muysken 1994), koineization, or indigenization (Siegel 1997). Such studies promise to increase our understanding of the range of possible outcomes of language contact by encompassing varieties that fail to fit neatly into the definitional boxes in which we have often tried to restrict pidgin and creole linguistics.

In addition to the five partially restructured varieties mentioned above, which have received considerable scholarly attention, there are a number of less well-studied varieties that seem likely to have undergone a similar process, such as the nonstandard English of American Indians, Australian Aborigines, and others. There are also partially restructured varieties which appear to have evolved solely through community-wide language shift, such as Irish English. Whether these are indeed the same kind of language, which is the position of Winford (2000:216), has yet to be demonstrated. Specialists in Irish English such as Hickey (forthcoming) are not convinced (see section 2.1.1).

This chapter examines how scholarship on each of these five varieties – based on five different European languages – has taken its own course, the literature on each being largely in the corresponding standard language. Although language barriers are still surprisingly effective in limiting the horizons of linguists, there has been a certain amount of communication across these barriers so that research on one variety has sometimes cast light on theoretical problems connected with another. After surveying general views on full and partial restructuring from the earliest creolists until the 1980s (section 1.1), this chapter examines scholarship on each variety, beginning with AAE (1.2). To a limited extent (especially in more recent years) AAE studies have provided models for interpreting the historical development of the other varieties, from (a) the model of a purely European dialect reflecting general Western European tendencies such as the loss of inflections; to (b) the model of a post-creole retaining substratal features; to (c) the model of differing degrees of restructuring, varying according to social factors. This review of the theoretical underpinnings of research on AAE will then be compared with that of work on the other four varieties: Afrikaans (1.3); Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (1.4); Nonstandard Caribbean Spanish (1.5); and the Vernacular Lects of Réunionnais French (1.6). The final section (1.7) describes recent comparative research in partial restructuring.

1.1 Partial restructuring versus decreolization

The theoretical foundations for the study of fully creolized languages have been developing since the eighteenth century – particularly since the middle of the twentieth century (Holm 1988–89:13–70). However, linguists

have had more difficulty developing an adequate theoretical model for dealing with partially restructured languages – one that would allow reliable predictions about the interrelationship between the social history of their speakers and the linguistic structure likely to emerge from a particular context.

We have long known that fully creolized languages exist – languages whose linguistic structure differs radically from that of the older languages from which they drew most of their lexicon. For example, the generally synthetic structure of the Western European languages used by colonists (Portuguese, Spanish, French, Dutch, and English – which still use a number of inflections to convey grammatical information) was replaced by an analytical structure in the Atlantic creoles derived both from these European languages and from the isolating Niger-Congo languages spoken by Africans brought to the New World. There is fairly general agreement that the isolating structure of the creoles – using free rather than bound morphemes to convey grammatical information – was determined by several factors: (1) the tendency towards isolating structures that was already widespread in the European superstrate languages; (2) the almost categorical use of isolating structures in the African substrate languages; (3) the universal tendency of adults to use isolating structures when learning a second language (e.g. the pidgins that developed into creoles); (4) the internal systematicity that would have spread the use of isolating structures as the creoles developed; and (5) the converging influence of two or more of these tendencies.

Of all the structural similarities of the Atlantic creoles, the common trait that indicates most clearly the completeness of their restructuring is the completeness of their analyticity. If we leave aside the non-Atlantic creoles (which have not been compared as systematically), we find that basilectal creoles – those closest to their earliest form – seem to have very few true inflections, and that varieties that do have true inflections seem not to be the same kind of language as basilectal Atlantic creoles (Holm 1989).

The existence of fully restructured creoles (whatever they may have been called) has been acknowledged since the early eighteenth century, and references to what can only be interpreted as more and less fully restructured Caribbean varieties date from the latter part of that century:

die creolische, oder Negersprache . . . wird aber von den blanken Creolen feiner gesprochen, als von den Negern. [. . . the creole, or language of the blacks . . . is spoken better by the white Creoles than the blacks.] (Oldendorp 1777:263, quoted by Stein 1984:92)

(Of course *feiner*, translated as ‘better,’ here means more like the European source language.)

However, it was not until the late nineteenth century that a linguist observed that there were language varieties that combined features of creoles with those of non-creoles. Schuchardt (1889:480) coined the term *Halbkreolisch* (literally ‘half-creole’) for certain varieties of Indo-Portuguese and Caribbean Creole French that had taken on superstrate features:

Ueberall wo eine kreolische Mundart gesprochen wird, liegt Mischung mit der europäischen Muttersprache sehr nahe, mit anderen Worten: es stellt sich leicht ein individuelles oder gelegentliches Halbkreolisch ein. Indem wir die Bedingungen für dasselbe näher suchen, bemerken wir einerseits dass Europäer die des Kreolischen nicht wirklich mächtig sind, sondern nur dunkle Vorstellungen davon haben, such bemühen von den Einheimischen verstanden zu werden – kreolisirtes Europäisch; andererseits dass Europäer die des Kreolischen mehr oder weniger mächtig sind, irgend eine Form der Darstellung wählen, für welche das Kreolische nicht ausreicht, oder dass Kreolen die des Europäischen nicht mächtig sind, ihren sprachlichen Ausdruck zu verfeinern sich bemühen – europäisiertes Kreolisch.

(Wherever a creole dialect is spoken, mixture with the European mother tongue lies very close at hand; in other words, an individual or occasional semi-creole easily appears. When we look more closely into the underlying conditions, we see on the one hand that [1] Europeans who do not really know the creole, having only a confused notion of it, may strive to make themselves understood by the natives, producing a creole-influenced variety of the European language. On the other hand, [2] Europeans who are more or less at home in the creole may use constructions not found in it, or [3] Creoles who have not mastered the European language may attempt to refine their creole, producing a European-influenced creole).

The first situation produces a variety similar to what Mühlhäusler (1982:456–457) calls *Tök Masta*; the second situation produces a variety like the lects of Negerhollands and Papiamentu spoken by Europeans; the third produces what are now called decreolized varieties.

Schuchardt’s idea of *Halbkreolisch* was interpreted by Tagliavini (1931:834) as a language that was half-way in the process of being creolized, and so he translated the term into Italian as “lingue *creolizzanti*.” Unfortunately the present-participial ending might suggest that such languages are “creolizing” in the sense of still undergoing restructuring; Reinecke (1937:22) translated the term as “those tending toward the creole, the *creolisant* dialects.”

Schuchardt also noted that African American English seemed to be losing its creole features:

The Negro English that is most widely known is spoken in the southern United States . . . those variants which still show a creole-like character are increasingly falling into disuse by being accommodated to the English of the whites by means of an intermediate speech variety. (Schuchardt *c.* 1893, in Gilbert 1985:42)

In this view, African American English originated as a full creole that later acquired non-creole features from contact with regional English. Later Bloomfield (1933:474) reasoned that a restructured variety of English had become nativized

among Negro slaves in many parts of America. When the jargon has become the only language of the subject group, it is a *creolized* language. The creolized language has the status of an inferior dialect of the masters' speech. It is subject to constant leveling-out and improvement in the direction of the latter. The various types of "Negro dialect" which we observe in the United States show us some of the last stages of this leveling. With the improvement of social conditions, this leveling is accelerated; the result is a caste-dialect . . . It is a question whether during this period the dialect that is being de-creolized may not influence the speech of the community – whether the creolized English of the southern slaves, for instance, may not have influenced local types of sub-standard or even of standard English.

This view was not elaborated into a full-blown theory of decreolization until interest in AAE and the English-based Caribbean creoles became widespread in the 1960s. Stewart asserted that

the non-standard speech of present-day American Negroes still seems to exhibit structural traces of a creole predecessor. . . . One of the more important changes which have occurred in American Negro dialects during the past century has been the almost complete de-creolization of both their functional and lexical vocabulary. (1968:51–52)

DeCamp (1961, 1971) developed the idea of a continuum of lects for Jamaican, ranging from the most creole-like to the most English-like. Stewart (1965) applied this idea to African American English, introducing the terms *acrolect* for the variety closest to the standard and *basilect* for the variety furthest from it, with *mesolect* for those between. Later the continuum model was further refined by others (e.g. Bickerton 1973, Rickford 1987).

By the end of the 1970s there was a general assumption that decreolization explained the varying structural distance between different creoles and their lexical source language: Caribbean creoles based on English, for example, were actually post-creoles at different stages of decreolization away from a very early fully creolized variety that may have resembled the modern Surinamese creoles, which were cut off from contact with English in the seventeenth century.

The idea behind the modern meaning of partial restructuring originated in Hesseling (1897), who pointed out that "the Dutch on the Cape was on the way to becoming a sort of creole . . . [but] this process was not completed" (1979 translation, p. 12). Shortly afterwards, Vasconcellos noted that

les Portugais ont été obligés d'apprendre quelquefois les langues indigènes, et les indigènes d'apprendre la langue du Portugal. Le second fait est le seul qui m'intéresse pour le moment, parce qu'il en est résulté la formation des dialectes créoles, et d'autres variétés du portugais; entre les uns et les autres, *on peut admettre des degrés* (1901:157–158; my emphasis)

[The Portuguese were sometimes obliged to learn the indigenous languages and the indigenous people Portuguese. The second fact is my only interest for the time being because it resulted in the formation of creole dialects and other Portuguese varieties. Between the two groups, *one could say there is a question of degree.*]

The first recognition of a whole category of such languages can be found in Reinecke (1937:61):

In several instances the slaves were so situated among a majority or a large minority of whites (and there were other reasons as well for the result), that they, or rather their creole children, learned the common language, not a creole dialect; or the plantation creole dialects that had begun to form never crystallized, never got beyond the makeshift stage. This happened in . . . Brazil, Cuba and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean countries in general, and in the southern United States in general.

Reinecke was also the first to put this meaning together with the term *semi-creolized*, which he used in reference to Afrikaans (1937:559). He also pointed out that the English-based creoles of the Caribbean did not seem to have been completely restructured:

The Surinam dialects, like West African Pidgin English, are unmistakably creole dialects in the sense of being simplified to a purely analytic structure. The other West Indian dialects are not, however, so completely pruned down [. . . and] may be regarded as what Schuchardt called creolizing languages – dialects on the way to complete analytic simplification, but which for various reasons stopped a little short of it. (1937:274–275)

As recently as 1962, Stewart considered Suriname to have the only real creoles based on English in the Caribbean area: “Jamaican and other regional varieties of English are best treated as dialects of English” (1962:50–51). In a personal communication, Stewart explained that at the time it seemed more prudent to exclude these varieties from the discussion of creoles since it was unclear whether they were creoles that had acquired non-creole features or vice versa. By 1967, however, he felt confident that additional historical sociolinguistic information had made it clear that the West Indian varieties were in fact post-creoles.

However, the fact that this view came to be widely accepted among creolists does not in itself prove that Reinecke had not been right – that these varieties had never been as fully creolized as the Surinamese varieties. An additional possibility that could explain the considerable structural gap

between the Surinamese and West Indian varieties of creolized English is that Sranan may have been repidginized in the late seventeenth century, leaving it even further from English than it had been prior to 1667. Bloomfield (1933) had indirectly implied that a non-creole language might take on creole features (a process that could lead to partial restructuring) when he asked, “whether the creolized English of the southern slaves, for instance, may not have influenced local types of sub-standard or even of standard English” (1933:474).

Later Silva Neto (1950a:12) followed Schuchardt (1889) in referring to re-lusitanized Indo-Portuguese as a *semi-crioulo*. That same year he extended the use of the term to the Portuguese spoken by non-whites during the early settlement of Brazil:

constituiu-se, no primeiro século da colonização (1532–1632), na bôca de índios, negros e mestiços, um falar *crioulo* ou *semi-crioulo*. [. . . there arose during the first century of colonization (1532–1632) a *creole* or *semi-creole* language used by Indians, blacks and people of mixed race] (1950b:166)

Although Silva Neto never spelled out the sequence of social and linguistic events that may have led to the partial restructuring of a language variety from the very beginning of its existence, this possibility struck me as worth exploring when I was working on the same problem of the development of Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (Holm 1984). Thomason, who was then working on a comparative study of a number of different kinds of languages resulting from contact (Thomason and Kaufman 1988), agreed that it would be useful to reserve the term *semi-creole* for those varieties that appeared never to have been fully creolized. Therefore I contrasted the term with

post-creole varieties such as (according to some) American Black English . . . or vernacular Brazilian Portuguese. . . . Others would call these varieties *semi-creoles*, which also means that they have both creole and non-creole features but does not necessarily imply that they were ever basilectal creoles, since both creoles and non-creoles (e.g. Caymanian English . . .) can become semi-creoles by borrowing features. Thus some believe that Afrikaans . . . particularly the variety spoken by some people of mixed race . . . could safely be called a semi-creole but not a post-creole (Holm 1988–89:9–10)

The term is also used in this sense by Thomason and Kaufman in reference to Afrikaans (1988:148). Around the same time, Mufwene (1987:99) noted that

the results of half-creolization and decreolization may look alike, but the processes responsible for the structural likeness of their outcomes are certainly not the same. Whichever is the case for B[lack] E[nglish] still needs to be demonstrated.

Bickerton (1984:176–178) proposed what he called a pidginization index to explain why the structure of some creoles is quite close to that of their lexical source language (e.g. Réunionnais) while that of others is quite far from it (e.g. Saramaccan). Although the mathematical formula which he proposed to indicate the degree of restructuring proved “unworkable” (Singler 1990:645), Bickerton did recognize that creoles stand at different distances from their source languages in terms of the degree of restructuring that they have undergone, and that this differentiation could occur at the beginning rather than the end of the process of restructuring (see the introduction to chapter 2).

It was during this period that linguists began to question whether decreolization alone could adequately account for the varying distance of the structure of different creoles from that of their lexical source language. Hancock (1987) put it thus:

I do not, then, believe that, for example, Black English was once like Gullah, or that Gullah was once like Jamaican, or that Jamaican was once like Sranan, each a more decreolized version of the other along some kind of mystical continuum. . . . My feeling is that most of the principal characteristics that each creole is now associated with were established during the first twenty-five years or so of the settlement of the region in which it came to be spoken: Black English has always looked much the way it looks now . . . (1987:264–265)

The theoretical importance of gradience in creolization was signaled by a conference on “Degrees of Restructuring in Creole Languages” at the University of Regensburg in Germany in 1998, resulting in an entire volume on this topic (Neumann-Holzschuh and Schneider 2000).

1.2 The study of African American English (AAE)

The decreolization theory for the origin of Black English – the “creolist” theory that finally received the imprimatur of Labov (1982) – was a much more satisfactory explanation for that variety’s creole features than earlier hypotheses that traced its origins solely to British dialects. However, my own work on the lexicon of two much more restructured varieties – Nicaragua’s Miskito Coast Creole English (Holm 1978) and Bahamian Creole English (Holm with Shilling 1982) – made it clear to me that archaic and regional British English must have played a primary role in the genesis of all three African American varieties. Research on possible British origins of specific creole grammatical features had been unfashionable in the 1970s, but in the 1980s two such studies – Schneider 1981 (translated in 1989) and Rickford 1986 – had an important impact on the field, reopening the question of the degree to which British syntactic patterns had been preserved in African American varieties.

I was further led to question some of the basic assumptions of decreolization theory through work with several non-creoles that appeared to have acquired creole features: White Bahamian English (Holm 1980), and Caymanian and Bay Island English (Washabaugh and Warantz in Holm 1983). I concluded that

Although long contact with creolized varieties of English has influenced the English spoken by white Caymanians and their kin on the Bay Islands of Honduras, this influence seems to be confined largely to areal contact phenomena such as word-borrowing and phonological shifts. Considering the English system of verbal inflections in the speech of Utila . . . as opposed to the system of preverbal tense and aspect markers that characterizes C[entral] A[merican] E[nglish] creoles . . . the former would seem to be not a creole but rather a regional variety of English influenced by contact with creolized English, much like the folk-speech of the southern United States. (Holm 1983:15)

In 1986 there began a debate as to whether AAE and white varieties of American English were historically converging (through the decreolization of AAE) or diverging (through AAE's increasing isolation) as argued by Labov and Harris (1986) (see section 2.1.7). The latter interpretation seemed to support the implausible view of Poplack and Sankoff (1987) that early nineteenth-century AAE had been more similar to white varieties than current AAE is. However, what convinced me that decreolization alone could not account for the present structure of AAE was listening to tape recordings of the speech of former slaves (Bailey *et al.* 1991, see section 2.1.5). Even taking into account that their speech may have shifted considerably between their childhood in the mid-nineteenth century and the time they were recorded in the 1930s and later, it was clear that what I was hearing was a variety of English with some creole features rather than a variety of creole with some English features. The only honest conclusion that I could reach was that

The present study supports the view that the language of the ex-slaves, like earlier attestations of the speech of blacks in the American South, indicates in the light of the relevant sociohistorical and demographic data discussed above that the language of blacks born in North America (outside of the Gullah area) was from its very beginning a semi-creole representing a compromise between the creole of slaves imported from the West Indies and the regional speech of British settlers. While American Black English has certainly undergone decreolization over the past 300 years in the sense that it has replaced many of its original creole features with those of English, this is not actually evidence that American Black English itself ever constituted an autonomous creole system. (Holm 1991:247)

A more radical view (which seems inherently unlikely, given what is known about language contact phenomena) is that the very concept of decreolization is misguided, and that it played no role in the development

of varieties such as Gullah and AAE, which stand at differing distances from English structurally solely due to their having undergone differing degrees of restructuring. Mufwene (1991:382–383) seems to support such a view.

Schneider (1990) re-examined the idea of “creoleness” as a graded phenomenon in reference to varieties of English and English-based creoles in the Caribbean area with a view to casting light on the debate over the creole origin of AAE. He concluded that the question as to whether or not a particular variety is a creole can be very difficult to answer:

There is a variety of constitutive factors that contribute independently to the notion, and the label applies to some language varieties better than to others, without implying that the latter are necessarily “non-creoles.” We may distinguish prototypical, or full, creoles that combine all or almost all of these features from varieties that are less typical of the category. Even the notion of semi-creoles does not seem to be very helpful in this dilemma, because its applicability, if not defined too loosely, seems limited, and should not be taken to include the non-prototypical – but nevertheless true – creoles . . . In linguistic matters, more and less are frequently more appropriate responses than yes and no. (1990:105–106)

While Schneider considered the term *semi-creole* unhelpful because of the limited number of languages it could be applied to (despite the numerical importance of the speakers of partially restructured languages, as discussed above), Kaye dismissed the validity of the very notion with an analogy beyond the reach of logic:

There can be no such thing, of course, as partial pidginization or partial creolization (this is why the terms post-creole, semi-creole, and creoloid are imprecise), just as there is no such thing as partial pregnancy. (Kaye 1990:301)

More recent work on AAE has focused increasingly on those sociolinguistic factors which have long been considered relevant to the study of full creoles (e.g. demographic figures suggesting the proportion of native versus non-native speakers during the early period of language contact) but which have not been systematically explored for AAE until now. Winford (1997) traces the social histories of Virginia and the Carolinas, citing early demographic figures from Wood (1989), and compares the key structures in Gullah, AAE, and Southern White Vernacular English, concluding that “AAVE was never itself a creole, but it was created by Africans, and bears the distinctive mark of that creation.” Rickford (1997, 1999) has followed a similar methodology and reached a similar conclusion; Mufwene also suggests that AAE “may simply have resulted from a restructuring which was not as extensive as what produced Gullah” (2001). However, Mufwene (2000b) lends his credibility as a creolist to support the position of Poplack (2000:1) that “. . . the many grammatical

distinctions between contemporary varieties of AAVE and American and British English are relatively recent developments,” i.e. not the result of earlier contact with restructured varieties of English. Such a position allows for less external influence on the development of AAE than the apartheid-era linguists in South Africa allowed on the development of Afrikaans (section 1.3).

Hackert and Holm (1997) have shown that the only hard evidence ever offered for the full creolization of AAE resulted from a historical misinterpretation:

the creole nature of the folk speech on the southern Bahamian islands should not be interpreted as evidence that AAVE had been fully creolized on the mainland before 1780 (and later decreolized) since the language that was brought there was in all likelihood eighteenth-century Gullah rather than eighteenth-century AAVE.

1.3 The study of Afrikaans

Afrikaans, derived from Dutch, is spoken by some 6 million South Africans; about half are white and the rest are of mixed ancestry. Afrikaans is unique among the language varieties examined here in that it was standardized and made an official state language. Its exhaustive documentation makes it much easier to contrast its structure to that of its lexical source language, which was actually seventeenth-century regional and nautical varieties of Dutch. Also of particular relevance to tracing the development of Afrikaans are its nonstandard varieties spoken by various groups, particularly those of mixed race with little education.

The history of the study of Afrikaans and its origins has been summarized by Reinecke *et al.* (1975:323ff.) and updated and expanded by Roberge (1994), the sources of much of the following. Hahn (1882) claimed that although Afrikaans is “phonetically Teutonic, it is psychologically an essentially Hottentot idiom. For we learn this *patois* first from our nurses and ayahs. The young Africander on his solitary farm has no other playmates than the children of the Bastard Hottentot servants of his father, and even the grown-up farmer cannot easily escape the deteriorating effect of his servants’ *patois*.” Viljoen’s 1896 dissertation, focusing mainly on the phonetic system of Afrikaans, claimed it was derived from the dialects of North Holland. Hesseling (1897) provided the first extended discussion of the origins of Afrikaans. Although he recognized the influence of Hottentot (now called Khoi), he emphasized the influence of the Malayo-Portuguese creole of early Indonesian slaves and claimed that “the Dutch on the Cape was on the way to becoming a sort of creole . . . [but] this process was not completed” because of the continuing influence of metropolitan Dutch (1979 translation, p. 12). This

characterization set off a debate that continued for a century, at times with considerable heat.

Hesseling's Malayo-Portuguese theory was adopted by the Afrikaner Du Toit (1905) and later developed further by Valkhoff (1966, 1972). It was opposed by the "spontaneous development" theory initially proposed by the Dutch linguist Kruisinga (1906), who saw Afrikaans evolving early on out of seventeenth-century Dutch dialects through what was essentially normal language transmission. This model was taken up by Afrikaans-speaking linguists such as Boshoff (1921, 1959) and Smith (1927, 1952), who agreed that Afrikaans had developed according to trends already present in earlier Dutch dialects under minimal influence from other languages. The Dutch linguist Kloeke (1950), usually included in this camp, attributed a strong "founder effect" to the South Holland speech of the first Dutch colonists. The spontaneist model was later revived in a more drastic form by Van der Merwe (1963, 1968), who went so far as to claim that Afrikaans emerged within a half dozen years after the colonists' arrival (1968:66) due to accelerated drift, and ruled out the possibility that people of color had influenced it in any significant way (1968:29).

The approach of Bosman (1923, 1947) is considered eclectic by Reinecke *et al.* (1975:323), who note that "this view admitted foreign influence, chiefly from Low German colonists and Hottentots, but did not admit a situation favorable to outright creolization (unless of the Dutch spoken by Hottentots)." What den Besten (1987) calls the "South African philological school" came to prevail in that country from the 1960s until majority rule in 1994. Its leading writers were Scholtz (1963, 1980) and Raidt (1974, 1983, 1991), who concerned themselves less with the origins of Afrikaans as such than the history of specific linguistic phenomena. However, their underlying theoretical model was that of ordinary language change within varieties of Dutch accelerated by the influence of non-native speakers in a multilingual setting, whose speech was influenced by their first languages and had interlanguage features, but never underwent outright pidginization and creolization. One of the most complete histories of Afrikaans is Ponelis (1993), which stresses the restructuring resulting from imperfect second language acquisition.

During this period, both black and white South African linguists began examining nonstandard varieties of Afrikaans more closely for the light they might cast on the issue of the language's origins, including "Coloured" Afrikaans and Flytaal (Makhudu 1984), Malay Afrikaans (Kotzé 1989), and Orange River Afrikaans, including Griqua Afrikaans (van Rensburg 1984, 1989) – the last variety having been studied in a book-length work by Rademeyer (1938).

What might be called the “Amsterdam school” of Afrikaans scholars has evolved around den Besten (1985, 1986, 1993) and his colleagues, who have focused on the effects of contact with Khoi and other languages. They see the South African school as antiquatedly Eurocentric in its approach: “If a feature can possibly be European, then it must be European,” provoking the opposite caveat regarding Valkhoff’s approach: “If a feature can be a creolism, it must be a creolism” (Roberge 1994:40).

Now that South Africans are reassessing their cultural identity with the advent of majority rule, the composite identity that “creolism” suggests has become increasingly attractive, and the ideological pendulum in linguistics may now be swinging wide of the mark in that direction. At a conference workshop on Afrikaans sociohistorical linguistics at the University of Cape Town (Mesthrie and Roberge, 2001–02) a reference was made to what distinguishes “. . . Afrikaans from *other* creole languages” (Holm 2001:353).

1.4 The study of Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (BVP)

The history of the study of BVP from a language-contact perspective has been outlined by Holm (1987) and updated by Mello (1997). The similarity of some of BVP’s structural features to those of Portuguese-based creoles was pointed out over a century ago by Coelho (1880–86 [1967]), who concluded that “it shows a tendency towards creolization” (p. 170), but many Brazilian linguists still resist the view that the development of BVP involved significant restructuring. They have done studies of how the Brazilian lexicon has been influenced by indigenous languages like Tupi (Sampaio 1928; Marroquim 1934) or African languages (Raimundo 1933; Mendonça 1933 [1973]), but in general they have followed the advice of Melo (1946), who cautioned against exaggerating the importance of such external influences when parallels could be found in archaic or regional usages in Portugal. However, Silva Neto (1950b:131) asserted that creole and what he called “semi-creole” (*semi-crioulo*) varieties of Portuguese had existed in Brazil, defining the latter as closer to the European variety but not speculating as to how they had evolved. Révah (1963) discounted substratal influence on BVP in favor of a general tendency towards simplification of morphology in Western European languages, a line of thought taken up later by Naro and Lemle (1976). They assumed that BVP was in the process of losing number agreement rules, which were being obscured by certain phonological rules.

Among non-Brazilian linguists, Valkhoff (1966) identified BVP features shared by Portuguese-based creoles as evidence of the latter’s influence on it. Jeroslow did a detailed study of a rural dialect (1974) that led

her to suspect prior creolization (McKinney 1975). Guy (1981) examined the same BVP phenomenon as Naro and Lemle (1976) but reached the opposite conclusion, i.e. that number agreement in BVP was spreading as a final stage in decreolization, comparable to that of AAE in the United States. In 1981 the Brazilian linguist Celso Cunha called for the study of BVP from the perspective of modern creole studies, the goal of Holm (1984, 1987, 1992b), who concluded that partial restructuring was clearly evident in the BVP varieties of Helvécia (Silveira Ferreira 1985) and Ceará (Jeroslow 1974), and began attempting to work out the development of BVP as the product of this process.

This approach has been taken up by Baxter (1992, 1997), who evaluates the importance of creole-like features through quantitative methods, and in the recent work of some Brazilian linguists such as Couto (1997) and Careno (1997). The most comprehensive of these is Mello (1997), who concludes that

creolization and partial restructuring did not occur throughout colonial Brazil, but mainly in isolated areas which favored these processes . . . later decreolization through contact with B[razilian] P[ortuguese] occurred. In most of settled Brazil, the likeliest scenario was a process of imperfect language shift to Portuguese by the African and Amerindian populations and their descendants. This shift led to the establishment of BVP as the predominant dialect of Portuguese. However, as the shift was taking place, substratum structural features and inter-language patterns were transferred to the target language, becoming fossilized. (Mello 1997:270)

Lucchesi (2000) basically takes the same position, but calls BVP the product of “irregular language transmission” that was *mais leve* (‘lighter’) than full creolization. Bonvini (2000) describes a creole-like lect of BVP called *Língua dos Pretos Velhos* (LPV) traditionally used by Brazilian practitioners of *candomblé* religious ceremonies for the light it could shed on earlier language contact.

Studies approaching BVP from a language-contact perspective have contributed to the growth of Afro-Iberian linguistics as a distinct field. For obvious historical reasons, scholars working in Afro-Portuguese and Afro-Hispanic studies are natural allies, and there has been a movement to join the two camps since the first conference on Portuguese-based creoles was held in Lisbon in 1991 (d’Andrade and Kihm 1992). Since then the journal *Papia: Revista de Crioulos de Base Ibérica* has been published in Brazil in both Portuguese and Spanish, encouraging further research in the coalescing field. An international colloquium on creoles based on Portuguese and Spanish in Berlin (Zimmermann 1999) was an important forum for debating the role of partial restructuring in the emergence of

both BVP and NSCS, as is the recently founded *Associação: Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola*.

1.5 The study of Nonstandard Caribbean Spanish (NSCS)

NSCS is spoken by a substantial portion of Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Cubans, and coastal Venezuelans and Colombians, as well as many of the Spanish speakers of New York City and Miami. Research since the 1960s indicates that a number of features in these varieties have parallels in Spanish-based Caribbean creoles. An overview of these studies can be found in de Granda (1975, 1987, 1998) and Green (1997), the sources of part of the following summary.

One of the earliest references to external influence on a variety of Caribbean Spanish is that of Sandoval (1627), who describes the language spoken by Africans on the coast of what is today Colombia as “corrupt Spanish . . . influenced by the Portuguese they call the language of São Tomé.” This and the emergence of Palenquero Creole Spanish nearby provide sufficient evidence that a Spanish-based pidgin built on Afro-Portuguese did in fact exist in the Caribbean, but it does not confirm the speculation of Bickerton and Escalante (1970:262) that there existed “a Spanish-based creole spoken in many parts of the Caribbean during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,” since there is no evidence that pidgins or jargons spoken elsewhere in the the region ever developed into stable creoles.

One such pidgin or jargon was the *habla bozal* spoken by the large influx of Africans brought to Cuba (and elsewhere) in the first half of the nineteenth century to work on sugar plantations (section 2.4.2). Pichardo (1862: vii, iii) described their “mutilated Castilian, without concord, number declension or conjugation,” but noted that “Negroes born in Cuba talk like the local whites.” Van Name (1869–70:125) referred to it as only “the beginning of proper Creole” – an assessment later confirmed by Reinecke (1937:271). Van Name was also among the first to recognize that Curaçao’s Papiamentu was a creole language rather than a dialect of Spanish.

Although Cuba’s *habla bozal* was never nativized as a creole, it did leave its traces in the local vernacular; Ortiz (1924) documented its lexicon of African origin. Still, most linguists in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean remained reluctant to admit any significant influence of African languages on local Spanish. Henriquez Ureña (1940:130, 169), for example, described Dominican Spanish as having no more words of African origin than did general Spanish; he argued for an Andalusian origin for

the alternation of /r/ and /l/, seeing African influence only in the loss of syllable-final -s. Most linguists of this period who recognized the possibility of external influence on local Spanish, such as Wagner (1949), were not from the Caribbean. Cabrera (1954) was an exception; a Cuban anthropologist who interviewed older people of African descent around 1930, her portrayal of their Spanish is considered accurate, revealing a number of African-like features both in their normal speech and in the special language thought to resemble that of their ancestors, used in religious contexts.

An equally exceptional linguist was Alvarez Nazario (1961), who examined early texts of *bozal* Spanish in Puerto Rico, concluding it was a “criollo afroespañol” linking local Spanish (especially that of black communities such as Loiza Aldea outside San Juan) to African languages via an Afro-Portuguese pidgin. His work served to encourage others studying Caribbean Spanish from the approach of contact linguistics, and he is now recognized as one of the principle founders of Afro-Hispanic linguistics (Ortiz 1999). Another founder, de Granda (1968), identified the speech of Colombia’s Palenqueros as the New World’s other Spanish-based creole, and went on to identify features from African and restructured languages in NSCS, focusing on the theory of an early pan-Caribbean creole that gradually decreolized (1970, 1976, 1978).

Meanwhile, Otheguy (1973), working from Cabrera’s Cuban data, identified certain phonological and morphosyntactic traits in the vernacular that had survived from the *habla bozal* as being specifically creole features supporting the pan-Caribbean creole hypothesis (although he has since retreated from this position). Ziegler (1976, 1977) linked the *bozal* Spanish of Puerto Rico to that of Cuba, also arguing for decreolization. Megenney has focused on non-Peninsular features in the vernaculars of coastal Colombia (1976), Venezuela (1985), and the Dominican Republic (1990), as well as African-derived vocabulary used in religious rites in Cuba and Brazil (1999). Lipski, coming from within the creolist camp, has offered counter arguments to the pan-Caribbean creole theory (1993, 1994), seeing substratal influence as more likely to have come into Caribbean Spanish through imperfect second language acquisition, and *bozal* Spanish as never having undergone complete creolization since it was not nativized (2000).

Schwegler, another creolist but one working primarily on Palenquero (1993, 1996a), has also studied the effects of restructuring on Caribbean Spanish (1996b). Schwegler and Morton (2002) document the features of the NSCS of bilingual speakers of Palenquero CS (PS), casting crucial new light on the link between restructured varieties like *bozal* Spanish and modern NSCS. Schwegler helped to organize one of the first international

conferences on Palenquero and NSCS (Moñino *et al.* 2002) as well as the first book-length survey of Afro-Hispanic linguistics (Perl and Schwegler 1998). Perl, coming from Afro-Portuguese studies, has worked on the Cuban vernacular from a creolist perspective (Perl 1985, 1988, 1989), as have Ortiz (1998) and Figueroa (1998). Other younger scholars who have dealt with varieties of NSCS as a the product of partial restructuring include Alvarez (1990), Lorenzino (1993, 1998), and Green (1997), the last describing a hitherto unknown basilectal variety of Dominican Spanish.

1.6 The study of Vernacular Lects of Réunionnais French (VLRFF)

The vernacular French of Réunion, a small island in the Indian Ocean, is spoken or understood by most of the 500,000 inhabitants. Although locally called *créole*, its structure seems to be descended mainly from that of seventeenth-century French dialects, including maritime varieties; however, it has a number of features also found in creoles. The creole or non-creole identity of Réunionnais has long been the subject of considerable debate; this identity is the focus of the following brief review of the literature, based largely on Chapuis (forthcoming), rather than the other main point of contention, which is the historical relationship of Réunionnais to the fully restructured Ile de France creoles of Mauritius and the Seychelles.

Adam (1883) grouped Réunionnais with the French-based creoles: “Creole is the adaptation of French . . . by and for the slaves of Africa . . . in the Antilles, in Réunion and in Ile de France.” Schuchardt (1885, translated 1979:15–17) analyzed a text of Réunionnais spoken by whites as “totally French . . . foreign elements merely float on the surface [making it] . . . only an apparent creole.” Reinecke (1937:526) noted that in comparison to the creole of Mauritius, “the dialect of Reunion has not departed quite so widely from the original French.”

Valkhoff (1964:724) suspected authors of Réunionnais texts “of using an artificial and gallicized language which can be called ‘semi-creole’” and decided that the language was a form of “Creole-influenced French rather than French-influenced Creole” [“plutôt du français créole que du créole français”] and that “there are two varieties of this Creole (without counting many intermediary nuances), namely an *urban speech form* and a *popular speech form*, and the former is more gallicized.” Vintilă-Radulescǔ (1976:129) was the first to mention the the possible influence of the Indo-Portuguese spoken by the wives of the earliest settlers in Réunion. She also realized that “the mountainous relief of the islands . . . explains the

dialectal mosaic” (1967:126). Deltel (1969) proposed that there was a continuum among the different lects of Réunionnais.

The most important work on Réunionnais to date is that of Chaudenson (1974ff.), who was the first to distinguish among what are now understood to be the three principal lects: (1) the *Créole des Bas*, spoken by the coastal Réunionnais of African, Malagasy, and Indian origin; (2) the *Créole des Hauts*, used by the highland whites; and (3) the urban Creole, which is strongly gallicized. He also proposed that Mauritian and Seychellois Creole were derived from Bourbonnais (an earlier form of Réunionnais), which since decreolized due to the continuing presence of French on Réunion. He argued that there had been no substratal influence on Réunionnais, which had simply evolved out of the *français avancée* or colloquial French that had developed beyond the reach of those who would have kept it more in line with the standard.

Bollée (1977:116) argued for Mauritian and Seychellois having resulted from a “higher degree of reduction . . . than Réunionnais.” Papien (1978) provided a comparative study of the grammar and social history of all three varieties, concluding that Réunionnais represented a post-creole continuum. Valdman (1978) was the first to draw parallels between Réunionnais and the *patois* of St. Barts, a comparison later furthered by Calvet and Chaudenson (1998). Hull (1979) pointed out the difference in structure between Réunionnais and the Ile de France creoles, concluding that “Maur[itian] Cr[eole] evolved on Mauritius out of a nucleus of Pidg[in] Fr[ench], with only secondary borrowings from Réu[nionnais] Cr[eole]. Seych[ellois] Cr[eole] derives from early Maur[itian] Cr[eole], not Réu[nionnais] Cr[eole].” He noted that “Where black influence was subsequently removed, a somewhat decreolized form of Cr[eole] could remain on the island, as on Réunion, or on St. Barts. . . . But on the whole Cr[eole] and French remain psychologically distinct . . . [and] No ‘post-Creole continuum’ has formed, as in English Cr[eole]-speaking areas” (Hull 1979:211–213).

Baker and Corne (1982) also rejected Chaudenson’s Bourbonnais theory, arguing that Réunionnais settlers were not present in sufficient numbers on Mauritius during the crucial period, while “West Africans formed a majority of the slave population of Mauritius in the period 1730–35” (1982:241), explaining the striking parallels between the French Creoles of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. In the same work, Corne pointed out that the “verbal system of R[éunion] C[reole] is fundamentally ‘French’ in its make-up . . . [while its] Creole features . . . are rather marginal” (1982:102).

In more recent work, Chaudenson (1992, 1995, 2000) has described creolization as a restructuring process that is not so different from the

kind of restructuring found in normal language transmission. This would certainly account for the partial restructuring of varieties such as Réunionnais, from the perspective of the present study.

1.7 The comparison of partially restructured vernaculars

In 1991 I organized a seminar on partial restructuring at the City University of New York (CUNY), followed by another in 1996. A number of talented doctoral students participated, several of whom were themselves native speakers of partially restructured vernaculars or their source languages. These seminars led to a number of publications, ranging from conference papers to journal articles (e.g. Craig 1991 on American Indian English) and dissertations (e.g. Mello 1997 on Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese, and Green 1997 on nonstandard Dominican Spanish), one of which is still in progress (Chapuis forthcoming on Réunionnais). The goal of these seminars was to identify some of the problems that needed to be solved in developing a workable theoretical model for this linguistic process by tracing the genesis and synchronic morphosyntax of a number of partially restructured languages, comparing the results, and looking for the possible relationship between the social history of the speakers and the linguistic outcome. Some of the initial results were described in Holm (1992a) and are briefly outlined below along with some further developments that grew out of later work on these varieties.

The social factors that we considered potentially relevant to the linguistic outcome included the following:

1. the precise origins of superstrate and substrate speakers;
2. the (changing) ratio of superstrate to substrate speakers; if the latter came to outnumber the former, the length of time this took;
3. the degree of intimacy of early social relations between superstrate and substrate speakers (i.e. the likelihood of pidginization as opposed to normal second language acquisition);
4. the likelihood of either group's contact with a pidgin or creole spoken elsewhere;
5. demographic changes (e.g. immigration, emigration, wars, plagues) and the effect on intergroup relations;
6. social, economic, and political changes and the effect on intergroup relations;
7. the degree of rigidity of any racial caste system;
8. education: accessibility, actual language of instruction;
9. communications: degree of geographical isolation;
10. any changes in the variety's status (e.g. new domains of use, standardization).

Regarding the linguistic make-up of each variety, the following factors were considered:

1. the sources of lexicon: archaic, regional, or sociolectal usages in superstrate; substrate languages; adstrate languages; pidgins or creoles spoken elsewhere;
2. phonology: contrasts with superstrate; similarities to any varieties in (1) above, i.e. in phonotactic rules or actual phonemes and their allophones;
3. morphosyntax: contrasts with superstrate; similarities to any varieties in (1) above, e.g. the loss or retention of inflections in the NP (e.g. number/gender marking on articles, adjectives; possessive constructions) and VP (bound vs. free tense/aspect morphemes; uses of tense and aspect), as well as any other constructions not found in the lexical source language (e.g. use of prepositions and conjunctions; word order in main clauses; structure of dependent clauses).
4. the typological distance between the superstrate and substrate.

The study of each variety concluded with a summary of the scholarship relating to its status as a creole or non-creole, and an assessment of its status as a partially restructured language. The group's ultimate task was to compare the results of each study to determine whether the similarities and differences among these varieties would justify their inclusion in a group of partially restructured languages, and then to extrapolate the defining sociolinguistic and structural characteristics of that group.

Since partial restructuring is a graded phenomenon, any specification of what proportion of features a variety so designated must share with creoles but not the lexifier language has to be intrinsically arbitrary. As a common-sense guideline, it seemed unhelpful to designate any language that has borrowed any creole feature as being partially restructured. For example, standard American English has borrowed some lexical items and even set phrases from various creoles such as *go for broke*, but this hardly seems to be grounds for classifying it as being partially restructured. On the other hand, the number of features shared with creoles but not with British varieties of English in AAE does seem significant: it has not only lexical items but also frequently occurring phonological and morphosyntactic features.

It is difficult to measure objectively the degree of restructuring that a language variety may have undergone. Nonstandard Caribbean Spanish appears to have undergone less restructuring than either Afrikaans (in which one can say "*Ons is bly*," literally '*Us is happy*' in terms of Dutch) or Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (e.g. "*Eu chamei ela*," corresponding to 'I called *she*' in European Portuguese). Of course the literal translations into English do not provide an objective indication of the degree

of restructuring, since English speakers associate violations of standard pronominal case marking with basilectal Caribbean Creole English, which is not the impact these structures have in modern Brazil and South Africa. (Parkvall 2000 uses a more objective method of measuring degree of restructuring, discussed in the introduction to chapter 2, and another method is discussed in section 6.2). We considered ways of indicating the degree of restructuring, e.g. by designating varieties as having undergone “weak” or “very weak” restructuring if they have few features shared with creoles, and as “strong” or “very strong” if they have many. The idea was to distinguish between varieties like AAE and the nonstandard varieties used by some Southern whites, containing fewer such features (albeit significant ones such as copula deletion). Such distinctions would seem to be helpful in describing the status of vernacular lects of Réunionnais French as opposed to that of the nonstandard French of Louisiana’s Cajuns or the *patois* of St. Barts.

The criterion of distinguishing partially restructured varieties from post-creoles through the existence of basilects in the latter’s history (Holm 1988–89:9–10) proved problematical, quite aside from the very real difficulty of finding written evidence of extinct basilects. For example, while the ancestors of the Afrikaners apparently never spoke a fully creolized variety and their seventeenth-century Dutch simply underwent creole influence, the African ancestors of the so-called Coloureds apparently did speak a full creole (or at least a variety that underwent a very strong degree of restructuring, to extrapolate from modern Orange River Afrikaans). However, the modern lects of Afrikaans – both standard and nonstandard – have speakers from both groups, and there is a basilect or near-basilect in the history of these lects, although we can say that the nonstandard lects seem to be descended from this (near) basilect more directly than the standard lects.

We encountered other problems as well with our own hypotheses and those of others, but recognized that these difficulties could not be adequately dealt with until we found and organized the relevant linguistic and sociolinguistic facts and then tested our theories against them. This volume, which builds on the work of the students participating in those seminars as well as my own research and that of others, is an attempt to do that.