

CREOLE LANGUAGE LIBRARY (CLL)

A companion series to the

"JOURNAL OF PIDGIN & CREOLE LANGUAGES"

*Editors*

Jacques Arends (Amsterdam)  
John Victor Singler (New York)

*Editorial Advisory Board*

Mervyn Alleyne (Kingston, Jamaica)	Salikoko Mufwene (Chicago)
Norbert Boretzky (Bochum)	Pieter Muysken (Leiden)
Lawrence Carrington (Trinidad)	Peter Mühlhäusler (Adelaide)
Glenn Gilbert (Carbondale, Illinois)	Pieter Seuren (Nijmegen)
George Hutter (Dallas)	Norval Smith (Amsterdam)
John Holm (Coimbra)	

Volume 22

Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh and Edgar W. Schneider (eds.)

*Degrees of Restructuring in Creole Languages*

DEGREES OF RESTRUCTURING  
IN CREOLE LANGUAGES

Edited by

INGRID NEUMANN-HOLZSCHUH

EDGAR W. SCHNEIDER

*University of Regensburg*

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY  
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

**Introduction:**  
**"Degrees of restructuring" in creole languages?**

Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh and Edgar W. Schneider  
*University of Regensburg*

I

One of the dominant topics in creole studies of the last decade has been a rediscovery and a renewed questioning of basic issues and notions in the field and, consequently, a restating of the question of precisely what it means when a given language is classified as "a creole". There is not only the question of how far extant theories of creole genesis can be harmonized; rather, the very process of creolization has turned out to be a central concern of recent research. Hall's (1966) conventional model of creolization as spontaneous language generation by a first generation of children, caused by the structurally and communicatively insufficient input provided by a pidgin, has turned out to be too idealized and untenable in the light of recent evidence. Several considerations and research directions have contributed to an increased insecurity about the fundamentals of the discipline.

Most importantly, the very process of creolization itself has come under closer scrutiny, based upon improved sociohistorical as well as linguistic evidence on early phases of such processes in certain creole communities. For instance, in contrast with classic models as proposed by Bickerton (1981) it was suggested that creolization did not happen abruptly but rather gradually (Arends 1993), and that the role of children in the formation of a new creole appears to have been greatly overestimated (cf. Singler 1996). The precise mechanisms and strategies effective in this process are still insufficiently understood. Obviously, substrates, superstrates and universals interact in creole formation; substrates and superstrates appear to offer structural possibilities from which elements of emerging structures are selected on the basis of universal preferences, typological affiliation or formal similarities. A related view was that of seeing creolization as "grammaticalization in quick motion", i.e. the emergence of missing grammatical categories derived from existing lexical items. Most recently, it was suggested that creoles can be defined on structural grounds by

identifying certain structural traits which mark them as "young" languages (cf. McWhorter this volume). In contrast, some scholars have come to give up the notion of creole as a linguistic category altogether, suggesting that what sets these languages apart as a group from others are not linguistic traits but purely sociohistorical parallels (cf. Mufwene this volume).

Another aspect that has turned out to be influential was the recognition that the intensity of creolization varied from one creole region to another. It has always been clear intuitively that certain creoles — like Saramaccan and Sranan among English-related languages, less so basilectal Jamaican and Guyanese, and Haitian among the French-based creoles as against Réunionnais, for instance — are "deeper", more "radical", presumably structurally closer to their substrates, than others which are considerably closer, relatively speaking, to their respective European superstrates. Earlier creole theory explained much of this variability as products of "decreolization", later approximations towards the superstrate of an erstwhile fully basilectal creole; but the historical reality and the sociolinguistic usefulness of the concept of decreolization have also increasingly come under fire (LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985; Rickford 1983). Thus, increasing attention was given to varieties which, clearly without ever having undergone "decreolization" (or, a more fashionable term, "debasinglectalization"), show but some of the characteristics of creoles, have been "creolized" (or "restructured", for that matter) only partially — varieties tentatively labelled "creoloids" (cf. Mühlhäuser 1998) or "semi-creoles". These include (at least) Réunionnais, Cuba's *habla bozal*, "Popular Brazilian Portuguese", the English spoken on the Cayman Islands, perhaps Bajan in Barbados, and, most probably, also African American English in the United States. Correspondingly, it has been suggested that there may be a "cline of creoleness" (Schneider 1990; 1998), "degrees" or "differential" stages/forms of creolization. In the light of such concepts creolization (and, by implication, the membership in a category of "creole languages") has to be understood as inherently scalar rather than dichotomous.

A third trend that has contributed significantly to the reorientation of creole studies discussed here has been a much more substantial diachronic empirical grounding and theoretical orientation of the discipline (Arends 1995). For several creoles, including Sranan, Negerhollands, Louisiana French Creole, the Indian Ocean French Creoles or the English-based creoles of Jamaica, Guyana, Trinidad, and Barbados, the discovery and linguistic analysis of early records from the nineteenth or even eighteenth centuries has provided an improved understanding of the linguistic processes in the early phases of a creole's evolution as well as, in general, a deepened interest in the relationship between language change and change in creole languages (Adone and Plag 1994). Again, such investigations have uncovered and frequently focussed upon changes in the "depth", the positioning between related superstrate and substrate patterns, of any given creole, or for that matter, of any of a creole's structural properties.

In the light of such considerations, we felt it timely to organize a conference to focus specifically on the issue of "degrees of restructuring" in creole languages. The present volume brings together revised versions (and in one case a follow-up study) of select papers given at that conference, held at the University of Regensburg on June 24-27, 1998. We were lucky to host a remarkable group of renowned scholars from 10 countries; of these, some we were able to invite with the support of sponsors, and others reacted to a call for papers. It was our intention to promote a better understanding of the processes of partial restructuring in creolization, to support the development of theoretical models of this process, and to encourage further and improved descriptive analyses of the varieties in question, some of which are still insufficiently documented. The questions that we asked contributors to address were the following:

- Which is the most suitable theoretical framework for the description of processes of restructuring?
- Which morphological and syntactic categories are predominantly affected by restructuring in individual creoles, and to what extent?
- In individual cases, what was the rate and which were the stages of restructuring?
- To what extent do creoles with a common base language form a continuum of varieties?
- To what extent can tendencies towards restructuring already be seen in the respective base languages?
- When seen in this light, what is the status of concepts emphasizing the hybrid character of creoles (mixed-language theory, relexification hypothesis)?
- Are there any intralinguistic features and typical structural conditions which favor or cause different degrees of restructuring?
- What is the relationship between different degrees of restructuring on the one hand and sociolinguistic conditions, e.g. varying demographic proportions between different population groups, on the other?
- What is the role of bilingualism, first and/or second language acquisition, or the numerical ratio of children to adults in the process of varying degrees of restructuring?

One aspect of our conference and its resulting discussions that has turned out to be quite fruitful was the contact between scholars working on "English-based" and "Romance-based" creole languages — despite the common ground of creole theory it appears that at second glance different traditions and different lines of thinking have evolved in the two groups that have rarely been explicitly addressed, let alone discussed. In part there may be linguistic reasons behind resulting misunderstandings — the fact that English-lexifier and French-lexifier creoles appear to have followed different paths of creolization (as Alleyne shows in his contribution).

## II

The two central concepts of the title of both our conference and this volume, "degrees" and "restructuring", respectively, are essential for the delimitation of our topic but at the same time defy uncontroversial definitions; in fact, some of the contributions to this volume make it clear that varying understandings of these notions are employed at times, or at least different aspects of them are emphasized.

As to the notion of "restructuring", so far no generally accepted definition and no uniform understanding of it have been achieved (cf. Baker this volume). It seems to be generally accepted that the term describes processes of language change which result in some sort of a reorganization of linguistic, especially morphosyntactic, structures — but there is no consensus at all with respect to the specific modalities of such processes. Are "restructuring" and "creolization" identical, or, for that matter, two sides of the same coin? What actually is it that is being restructured in such a process: the European base languages, the African (in the case of the Atlantic and Indian Ocean creoles) substrate languages, both, or even a creole itself, after its genesis? The latter view seems to be held only by Schwegler (this volume), who uses "restructuring" almost synonymously with what has conventionally been called "decreolization". On the other hand, most creolists would probably take the term to relate to the fundamental processes of structural modifications that affected and radically altered predominantly non-standard varieties of European languages as a consequence of the specific sociolinguistic conditions in former colonies. For instance, this is how Salikoko Mufwene uses the term:

As for the term *restructuring*, I use it here in the sense of "system reorganization", which makes a creole different from its lexifier. The latter was primarily the colonial variety which was spoken by the European colonists and was itself developing from the contact of diverse metropolitan dialects. [...] this reorganization often consists in modifying grammatical features selected in a creole's system from the lexifier, the language that was being appropriated by foreign populations and undergoing some changes. (Mufwene 1996: 83-4)

These processes of linguistic reorganization were triggered by the special contact situation in the former European colonies; and it is essential to state that all languages affected by the contact situation were involved in the reshaping of linguistic structures. In one sense, it was predominantly the European base languages that were restructured in the process of incomplete acquisition by the slaves. While this process certainly involved both incomplete L2-acquisition and successful structural creation, the mutual impact of these creative processes, and the way these interacted, are not quite clear (cf. Baker this volume). In any case, it is clear that the influence of African substrate languages resulted in fundamental structural changes. While it cannot be denied that to a certain

extent these changes constitute also accelerations and continuations of internal developmental tendencies of the respective base languages, it is clear that the changes that occurred in creolization were considerably more radical and fundamental than instances of "internal", "normal" language change. The outcomes of these various processes of restructuring (whose chronology may have been different in English- and French-based creoles) are novel, autonomous languages — varieties which, despite the fact that on purely lexical grounds they can be seen as "based" upon or at least "related to" a European language, are characterized by a break with many rules and principles of the base language on the level of grammatical organization. Thus it would be equally inadequate to see creoles just as (grammatically) "restructured" variants of their respective "lexifiers" as to understand them purely as modifications and "relexifications" of substrates.

Which are the linguistic mechanisms underlying these processes of restructuring, and to what extent do they correspond to or differ from processes of language change in non-creole languages?

It is widely agreed in recent research that creolization is marked by certain processes of grammaticalization, i.e., following Chr. Lehmann, processes by which a lexical item becomes a grammatical one, or a partially grammatical item becomes more grammatical (cf. Lehmann 1995: 11). Such phenomena of grammaticalization were frequently initiated already in the non-standard base varieties, and were systematized and automatized subsequently in creolization (Chaudenson 1992; Bollée and Neumann-Holzschuh 1993; Bruyn 1995). Another core notion is that of reanalysis. The classic definition of reanalysis as "change in the structure of an expression or class of expressions that does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface manifestation" (Langacker 1977: 59) allows us to understand certain processes observed in creolization. It is characteristic of natural second language acquisition (and this is what happens in creolization) that the participants of a conversation, having developed a supposition as to the presumed meaning of an utterance based upon the context of situation, attempt to work out how this meaning was encoded by the speaker. In other words, in a communicative model this is a recipient-based process in which the hearer (in the given context typically African slaves) worked out a structural analysis of an utterance sequence which up to that stage was non-transparent to them. This is a mechanism which has been pointed out by Rebecca Posner<sup>1</sup> and Salikoko Mufwene<sup>2</sup>. The contribution by

1) "I do argue *both* that French creoles continue popular French tendencies [...] and that initially substrate may have had a drastic effect on the way new speakers (here, imported slaves) understood the structure of the popular French to which they were exposed" (1985: 183).

2) "Grammaticization is of course not the full story, since other changes took place, starting with the simple selection and integration into one system of forms, structures, and principles which did not use to form one system even in the lexifier itself" (1996: 124).

Ulrich Detges in this volume constitutes a significant advancement in our understanding of such processes: departing from a cognitively and semantically based theory of grammaticalization he works out a real-life example which documents how universal processes of grammaticalization and specific processes of reanalysis interact in the formation of a creole grammar.

In the light of these considerations we suggest that the notion of restructuring should be taken to refer to all structural modifications that a lexifier language undergoes in the selection and evolution of new linguistic elements, influenced by other, competing languages, in a contact situation. The final outcome of this process is a new linguistic code which consists of a variable, fairly subtle mixture of both substrate and superstrate features.<sup>3</sup> This is achieved by the interaction of two fundamentally different processes of linguistic change which are effective in regular language transmission as well but which, due to the special contact situation in slave societies, operate considerably more intensely and rapidly: first, universal grammaticalization tendencies; and second, various processes of structural re-interpretation and selection, triggered by reanalysis and ultimately determined by cognitive mechanisms such as saliency, semantic transparency, the impact of token frequencies, and the like (cf. Plag 1994). It remains to be seen to what extent other types of language change, such as "extension" or analogy (cf. Harris and Campbell 1995), are effective, or what the role of convergence in the selection of certain grammatical patterns is (cf. Bollée 1982; Hazaël-Massieux 1993).

The familiar, frequently described structural parallels between creoles of various bases suggest the importance of the effect of certain recurrent patterns of restructuring; but on the other hand these processes appear not to have been carried out to the same extent, with the same intensity, and with the same effects in all creoles. An empirical observation that underlies the idea of "degrees" of creoleness was addressed earlier as one of our original motivations for having this question focussed upon — the fact that different creole languages vary greatly in the set of creole properties that they share. Of course, such a definition in itself stands on shaky ground, as it builds upon the existence of a set of "typically creole" structural features (which are then present in any given language to a greater or lesser extent). It seems clear that the justification for assuming such a set of features is pragmatic, not structural, in nature — it is uncontroversial that there are no linguistic features exclusive to creole languages, and one of the questions to be addressed in the present context is in fact whether, how and why a typology of creole languages differs from analyses of analytic languages in general. Nevertheless, it is clear that there are certain

3) In other words, our understanding of the term "restructuring" is a fairly narrow, specifically creolistic one. Obviously, in a wider sense "restructuring" may be taken to designate almost any kind of language change, and it may even be assumed that the restructuring of the base languages was initiated even before they reached the colonies (Mufwene 1996: 90-1).

structural properties which have repeatedly been identified and analysed as and taken to be typical of creoles, whatever the cause and theoretical justification establishing this set may have been; and creolists have commonly referred to and focussed upon such "typical" structural elements (as is done in the present volume most pointedly in the papers by Parkvall, Kautzsch and Schneider, and — with a new interpretation and classification of such features — Baker).

If it is true that creoles come in different degrees of "radicalness" (an assumption that will be shared by most but perhaps not all creolists at present), then it is implied that this fact positions any individual language on a continuum between varieties closely modelled upon substrate(s) on the one hand and superstrates (nonstandard dialects) on the other. In other words, "radical" creoles display many features deviant from their superstrate input forms and/or possibly resulting from substrate transfer; on the other hand, so-called "semi-creoles" will have many superstrate-derived properties and but a few patterns or forms derived from the substrate (or from universals). In all these cases, it is to be understood that the mixture of features should be the product of the process of original creole formation *per se*, not the outcome of a later approximation of a creole to its lexifier language by "decreolization". Several papers in the present volume (e.g. Baker, Mufwene, Winford) address the question of how in this light the process of creole formation has to be redefined.

One point that has turned out to be highly relevant is the question of what exactly the notion of "degrees of restructuring" relates to: is it really languages as entire systems (as is entailed by many of the above considerations or by labels such as "radical creoles" or "semi-creoles"), or shouldn't it rather be applied to individual linguistic features exclusively (a point made most strongly by Neumann-Holzschuh in her contribution)? In other words, can we even talk of, say, Réunionnais or AAVE being "less creole-like" than Haitian or Jamaican, for that matter, or shouldn't we use such categorizations only with respect to (for instance) the TMA-systems or the plural marking patterns of these varieties, respectively? Again, this is apparently one of the points where differences in scholarly traditions have surfaced. The former approach may have been more common in the study of English-related creoles than in the Romance tradition. In any case, it is undisputable that the amount of restructuring that characterizes creoles affects certain structural traits more than others, so that in any given variety any part of its grammar, say the TMA system, may be more distant from the superstrate (and, conversely, closer to substrates) than any other — say, NP constituent sequences.

While the points discussed so far are central to and perhaps innovative for an understanding of the idea of "degrees" in creole formation, there are several other aspects that also need to be addressed and that feed into this problem but that are perhaps more familiar from earlier publications. One such question clearly concerns the nature of the input to the process in question: What, precisely, is meant by "superstrate"/"lexifier"/"base language" (in most cases a

European language but usually an earlier dialect, or a mixture of such dialects, rather than a present-day standard variety), or by "substrate" (a specific African — or Pacific — language, a group, or mixture, of such languages, characteristics of such language families, or areal phenomena?). Also, of course, there is still the old, though currently less popular question of the role of language universals (Muysken and Smith 1986) — related to the more pressing issue of how strongly theories of Second Language Acquisition can be made fruitful for (and applied to) an understanding of the emergence of creoles. Another central question obviously concerns the causes, external or internal, of different "degrees" of creoleness. The most obvious and most frequently mentioned factor, specifically investigated in the present volume by Parkvall and also Kautzsch and Schneider, is the demographic proportion of superstrate and substrate speakers in a given community and at any given point in time (recent research has focussed strongly upon the interaction between speaker proportions and the time that has elapsed since the establishment of a new plantation society). Additional components to be considered include psycholinguistic factors (such as slaves' attitudes towards different varieties that they were faced with, and their motivation to acquire a white "target language" or any other code) as well as structural aspects (e.g. similarity effects between the structures involved).

### III

The papers assembled in this volume certainly address many of the issues raised above and provide a lively picture of and substantial contributions to ongoing debates in the field (as reflected also in many recent contributions to the Creole-LIST online discussion list, for instance). While all the papers combine general considerations with the discussion of specific structural examples, the emphasis on theoretical and descriptive aspects, respectively, varies from one paper to another, and so we have decided to arrange the contributions according to a loose thematic grouping, beginning with a state-of-the-art report and statements of decidedly general (though in essence quite conflicting) positions and proceeding with more empirically oriented investigations of English-based and Romance-based languages.

The paper by **John Holm** lays the groundwork by surveying the theoretical and empirical background of scholarship into the prototypical forms of partially restructured varieties, which he calls "semi-creoles". Beginning with Schuchard's "Halbkreolisch", he traces early references to the concept and considers terminological questions in the early phase of creole studies. The main part outlines the history of research into five putative semi-creoles, of different lexical bases, and assessments of their linguistic status: African American Vernacular English, Brazilian Popular Portuguese, Nonstandard Caribbean

Spanish, Afrikaans, and Réunionnais. In conclusion, he identifies evolutionary processes that are effective in the emergence of these varieties.

**Philip Baker** begins by addressing the question of what precisely the notion of "degrees of restructuring" may imply in three familiar models of creolization (Bickerton's "Language Bioprogram Hypothesis", Chaudenson's "Approximations of Approximations" concept, and Lefebvre's relexification model). Subsequently, he outlines his own "constructive approach", suggesting that there are two linguistic processes which account for the development of the majority of pidgins and creoles: (1) the creation of a medium for interethnic communication (MIC) and (2) the development of a medium for community solidarity (MCS). While the creation of an MIC, an emerging pidgin, builds upon the varying needs of communities coming into sustained but restricted contact and pursues the limited goal of achieving efficient interethnic communication in a minimum of time, an MCS is consciously developed by slaves cultivating an enhanced form of in-group communication. Thus, in terms of restructuring, the construction of an MIC involves a limited but deliberate language construction in contact situations, building upon morphologically reduced versions of the languages involved, while the formation of an MCS usually operates by elaborating and expanding on an earlier MIC. Thus, both pidginisation and creolisation are regarded not as instances of imperfect second language acquisition but rather as cases of deliberate language construction. Within this framework, Baker sketches possible early linguistic developments on select islands as model cases of the evolution of MIC's and MCS's, thus accounting for some linguistic differences between Mauritius and Réunion as well as working out the impact of St. Kitts upon later developments in the English and French Caribbean. In conclusion, Baker questions the use of "typical" creole features as a methodological tool for establishing "degrees of restructuring", given that these constitute an unpredictable mix of retentions and innovations.

**Salikoko Mufwene** takes issue with Thomason's (1997) claim that there are "prototypical" creoles and McWhorter's (1998) idea of specific structures identifying a "Creole Prototype", arguing instead that creole languages can be defined solely on sociohistorical, not on structural, grounds. In his view, there are no linguistic features that serve to set this group of languages apart from any other, and the relationships between individual creoles are best characterized as Wittgensteinian "family resemblances" rather than varying degrees of proximity to a "best exemplar". He claims that creoles are products of language contact in which processes of feature diffusion (from superstrate and substrate languages) and competition between such features operated in essentially the same way as in other varieties, obeying the same principles of language change and linguistic evolution and approximating the respective lexifier languages' structures as "target languages". Consequently, he suggests that creoles should be seen as "disfranchised" dialects of their lexifiers.

By contrast, McWhorter (1998) — a paper which was presented at the Regensburg conference — stirred a substantial debate by claiming that there are in fact structural properties that set off creoles, or at least a subset of them conforming to a "Creole Prototype", from other languages, making them a synchronically and structurally distinct type of languages. In the present paper, John McWhorter elaborates further on this thesis and reacts to the first responses to his earlier suggestion. Comparing creoles with other, "older" languages, he specifies precise conditions that define the three structural traits of the Creole Prototype more accurately (for instance by making clear that the absence of tone as a property of creoles relates to monosyllabic lexical and morphosyntactic tonal functions, not phonological uses of tone, or that noncompositional derivation has to be distinguished from institutionalized complex formations). In essence, his claim is that the features which creoles lack are symptoms of the aging of natural languages; but as these indicators allow for gradience in various ways, it is allowed for individual creoles to be close to the hypothesized "Creole Prototype" to varying degrees — in fact, McWhorter discusses features which determine how close a given creole will be to the prototype. Some properties of Haitian Creole and other creole and non-creole languages are discussed as test cases as to how the Prototype theory might be substantiated or, for that matter, refuted.

In a very insightful paper, Mervyn Alleyne points out a fundamental observation and difficulty that may underlie many misunderstandings in the field. Comparing sociohistorical and structural properties of English-lexifier and French-lexifier creoles of the Caribbean, and looking most closely at certain verbal structures of Haitian French Creole, he argues that there may actually be two opposite processes in operation under the single label of "creolization": English-lexifier creoles appear to have originated as very "radical" creoles, structurally most distant from the lexifier to which they approximated later on, while with French creoles the structural differences from the lexifier language have grown over time, with the most distinct creole structures being fairly recent developments rather than products of an early phase of creole genesis.

In a theoretically oriented article that can be expected to have substantial impact on further discussions of creolization, Ulrich Detges analyzes the cognitive and semantic mechanisms that underlie the formation and subsequent evolution of the tense and aspect markers in the French creoles. His central thesis is that creolization is the product of two fundamentally different types of restructuring processes: grammaticalization and reanalysis. While in grammaticalization new markers normally emerge on the basis of speaker-related linguistic forms, in creole-specific reanalysis, viewed as the result of a hearer's strategy who wants to make sense out of what he has heard, new markers are selected as a consequence of their high frequency of occurrence or their conceptual saliency in the context of situation. Detges is thus able to show that the grammatical restructuring which happens in creolization results from two pro-

cesses best analyzed within a cognitive and semantically based framework of grammaticalization. Thus, he documents that restructuring in creole languages cannot be readily equated with polygenetic universals of grammaticalization and language change but must rather be accepted as a process of its own kind, characterized by the intertwining of two different cognitive mechanisms.

Comparing the same type of language change in various creole and non-creole languages with the aim of detecting possible differences, Susanne Michaelis investigates a characteristic path of grammaticalization, viz. a tendency of free personal pronouns to develop into subject clitics (marking the following predicate as finite) and, subsequently, into verbal copulas. She argues that the cause of this tendency is the effect of token frequency, not a trend towards iconicity. The typological approach, using data from two French creoles and Tok Pisin in comparison with other languages, shows that this process of "restructuring" is by no means specific to the creoles in the sample — so the important overall claim made here is that the processes of restructuring in creoles are the same as those in other languages.

Mikael Parkvall probes into the obvious question of whether there is a correlation between demographic speaker proportions (between superstrate and substrate speakers) and the degree of restructuring in any given speech community. To that end, he develops a broad research design that builds upon demographic as well as linguistic data from a wide range of creoles of various lexical bases. For each of these languages he develops a "restructuring index", based on the presence of a certain number of linguistic features, and determines the dates and periods of settlement when certain speaker proportions were reached, trying to correlate these two factors. Indeed, he finds a mutual relationship, albeit a weak one, and argues that demographics is but one factor possibly contributing to the degree of radicalness of a creole, strongly modified by others, above all motivation to acquire the target language — but that it is valuable to have worked out the impact of this single factor in isolation.

Having set out with a consideration of the theoretical problems posed by the existence of "intermediate" varieties for creolization theory, Donald Winford presents a thorough case study of a Caribbean creole whose non-basilectal character has repeatedly puzzled creolists and triggered conflicting explanations, the English-derived variety spoken on Barbados. Winford looks closely at the historical background, dividing the history of Bajan into four phases and discussing the sociohistorical framework for language contact in each of these, and at possible sources of select structural features of Bajan, mostly in the tense and aspect system, in British dialects and African languages. His conclusion is that a West African substrate influence has resulted in the structural reanalysis and modification of an English dialectal input largely from southwestern England and also, in some instances, from Hiberno-English. More generally, he suggests that intermediate varieties of Caribbean creoles like Bajan are not accounted for adequately by a conventional decreolization

scenario but have existed alongside more "basilectal" variants from early phases in the settlement of a community. In his view, these varieties emerged through a process of language shift to the target language, dialects of the superstrate, a process during which this superstrate was reanalysed and restructured to varying degrees.

Using data from Earlier African American English in South Carolina as evidence, **Alexander Kautzsch** and **Edgar W. Schneider** suggest that the notion of "differential creolization" accounts for different degrees of creoleness that can be documented in the performances of speakers from different parts of that state. After an initial discussion of the theoretical background and of earlier assumptions on the relationship between Gullah and AAVE, they propose a "rainbow hypothesis" of variation in South Carolina, claiming that the number of creole features in idiolectal grammars decreases in correlation with the increasing distance from the coast, which at the same time correlates with a decreasing African American proportion of a sub-region's population. Both a structural analysis of several idiolects and an implicational arrangement of idiolectal grammars from three sub-regions of the state largely confirm this hypothesis, and also serve to document the special situation of Horry County on the coast, for which possible reasons are proposed. Graphic displays suggest structural ranges of more or less creolized individual and regional grammars.

**Magnus Huber** provides a rare case study of an early phase of an ongoing restructuring process. He investigates records of the "broken English" jargon as spoken in the 1810s by "Liberated Africans" (recaptives from slave ships) who settled in independent villages near Freetown, Sierra Leone. Attestations of individual structural phenomena in a missionary's notes are documented, interpreted, and compared to dates of earliest attestations of features in Krio and West African Pidgin English. It is shown that the liberated Africans' variety constitutes largely an independent development, mostly uninfluenced by and without influence on Krio. Remarkably, the emergence of this jargon is accounted for predominantly by the impact of foreigner talk on the side of the superstrate speakers involved in the contact situation — a set of words and phrases found useful for the communication with indigenous peoples.

In the light of recent phonological theory **Ingo Plag** and **Christian Uffmann** look into the phonotactic restructuring of loan words in early Sranan and, more specifically, into the causes of the emergence of paragogic vowels. In four 18th century text sources they investigate the conditions that determine the occurrence and the choice of epenthetic vowels, employing a sophisticated statistical factor analysis approach. They find diachronic changes in phonological effects and compare these to an analysis of related effects in three African substrate languages that are known to have influenced Sranan, disclosing significant parallels but also some differences. Thus, their central claim is that paragoge in Sranan satisfies syllable structure constraints (but not rules)

transferred from substrate languages, modified by universals of second language acquisition and dialect mixing.

**Peter Mühlhäusler** discusses quite a different type of restructuring process, thus opening a new perspective, viz. the evolution of lexical rather than structural patterns. He argues that ecological conditions and the social needs of a community exert an influence upon the evolution of folk classification systems. This general point is underscored by a detailed documentation of the emergence of terms for fauna and flora in Tok Pisin on five levels of generalization, based upon early word lists and dictionaries. A few general insights into the principles governing the evolution of this word field can be gained.

**Robert Chaudenson** focusses upon two communities which are of special importance in the discussion of the degrees of restructuring: Réunion and St. Barthélemy. On both of these islands basilectal creoles coexist with varieties of the base language, with the latter, the "patois" in St. Barth and a creolized variety of French in Réunion, representing earlier stages preceding the evolution of the respective creoles. To understand why creoles differ in terms of their distances to the base language, scholars must investigate not only the specific sociolinguistic and demographic histories of the respective regions, the author argues, but also the diachronic processes that have shaped creoles out of nonstandard varieties of their base languages — processes that may vary considerably from one region to another. Due to the different situations in the creolophone communities, the restructuring processes differed as to their radicalness and speed: not only are there differences between various creoles with the same base language, but usually there is also a high degree of intralinguistic variation within a single creole-speaking community. In this respect both islands provide perfect examples of the "continuum interlinguistique" characteristic of many creolophone communities.

Among the French-based Creoles Louisiana Creole is considered a "conservative" variety, given the fact that it retained more superstrate features than other creoles. In this variety the structural break with French has not been as radical as for example in the case of Haiti, where the demographic and sociolinguistic conditions were quite different. **Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh** argues that in order to measure degrees of restructuring it is necessary not only to have a close look at earlier stages of the creoles and the base languages involved, but also, as far as morphosyntax is concerned, to examine each grammatical category separately — which is what she sets out to do, focussing upon examples from Louisiana French Creole. It can be shown that in a diachronic perspective the Atlantic French Creoles display a high degree of similarity during their early stages of creolization, with present-day differences typically having emerged only later in their histories; furthermore, the "radicalness" of restructuring tends to vary from category to category. Consequently, restructuring appears as a differential process that does not necessarily affect the entire grammatical system of a language at the same time and to the same degree. A related question that



arises in this context is whether it is actually possible to measure the degree of divergence from the base language, a problem that has already been discussed in a similar vein in the study of the evolution of the Romance languages.

The central question of Armin Schwegler's article is why certain languages appear to have resisted restructuring (used by this author in the sense of "decreolization"). It has long been held that extensive, prolonged exposure of a creole to a socially dominant superstrate necessarily causes decreolization or restructuring. Palenquero is one of those rare creole languages which appear to have escaped decreolization or restructuring altogether. Analyzing a series of Palenquero phonetic and grammatical features, Schwegler is able to show that Palenquero indeed appears to have remained surprisingly stable in spite of the 300 years of heavy Spanish/creole bilingualism: There is no continuum, no "in-between" in terms of lects. Palenque presents a situation of language abandonment rather than language change. The local creole is simply dying out, without suffering the natural effects of gradual neglect. As regards degrees of restructuring, Palenquero is a troublesome case: Given the prolonged heavy bilingualism and centuries-old intensive code-switching, the Palenqueros have had ample opportunity to "adjust" the structure of their local language to the superstrate — yet they have not done so, having kept the systems neatly separate for at least a century. Palenquero has not become more heterogeneous by introducing variant hybrid elements.

The subject of John Lipski's contribution is the Afro-Hispanic bozal language as spoken in various places in the Caribbean. He claims that the *habla bozal* was by and large a transitory phenomenon, emerging in different guises in each Afro-Hispanic speech community and reconverging with native varieties of Spanish within a single generation. In his view, claims to the effect that Afro-Caribbean bozal Spanish, particularly from 19th century Cuba, coalesced into a true creole are in large measure overstated, although creolization undoubtedly occurred in isolated slave barracks and maroon communities. The study addresses the difference between restructuring and creolization of bozal Spanish by examining the beginnings of a new verb system, based on a combination of Yoruba-like constructions and hybrid combinations, which emerged in Cuban bozal Spanish during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, only to disappear as subsequent generations of Afro-Cubans acquired Spanish natively. Due to its limited spread as a native language, Afro-Hispanic bozal language never underwent complete restructuring. In its least coherent form Caribbean *bozal* was a structurally reduced variety of Spanish sharing features with other learners' modes and not likely to coalesce into a stable creole. By treating contact-induced bozal Spanish as a steadily evolving interlanguage rather than as the product of interrupted transmission which produces creolization, a more accurate picture of events shaping 19th century Afro-Caribbean Spanish can be obtained.

Jürgen Lang examines restructuring within Capverdian Creole, demonstrating that certain structures in its verbal system can be assigned to either of two different levels, the "center" or the "periphery". According to Lang, this bipartite verbal system is a product of two different kinds of reanalysis. During creolization slaves were exposed to a linguistic system they were not familiar with. Faced with urgent communication needs, they analysed these patterns in the light of structures they were familiar with. This kind of "reanalysis" has produced structures which may still evoke the original Portuguese forms on the surface but are much closer to corresponding substrate structures on the semantic and functional level. These structures constitute the center of the creole grammar, with others, borrowed at a later time when the creole already existed, remaining much closer to the lexifier in both respects. Thus, divergences between Portuguese and Creole are relatively deep within this central stock of forms, while at the "periphery" the creole and its base language tend to converge structurally.

For a variety of reasons, several other papers given at the Regensburg conference do not appear in this volume; these include the following:

- Dany Adone (Northern Territory University): "Restructuration and innovation in creolization";
- Jacques Arends (Amsterdam): "Sociohistorical factors in the development of complementation in Saramaccan and Sranan";
- Angela Bartens (Helsinki): "Existe-t-il un modèle de semi-creolisation qu'on puisse déceler à partir des systèmes verbaux du portugais brésilien vernaculaire, de l'espagnol carabéen vernaculaire, du réunionnais, de l'afrikaans et de l'anglais afro-américain vernaculaire?";
- Annegret Bollée (Bamberg): "La restructuring du pluriel nominal dans les créoles français de L'Océan Indien";
- Lawrence D. Carrington (Mona, Jamaica): "Fuzzy labels and fuzzy systems — a critical appraisal of terminology in the study of language contact";
- Hildo Honorio do Couto (Brasília): "Anti-creole";
- Katherine Green (New York/Paris): "Semi-creolization as a model for non-standard Dominican Spanish";
- Frans Hinskens (Nijmegen): "The diachrony of R-deletion in Negerhollands: Phonological and sociolinguistic aspects";
- John McWhorter (Berkeley): "Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class";
- Pieter Muysken (Amsterdam): "Restructuring in Ecuadorian Quechua";
- Matthias Perl (Mainz): "Kolonial-Deutsch as restructured German";
- Lambert Félix Prudent (Martinique): "Maturation et maturité du créole martiniquais: Retour sur quelques étapes historiques et comparaison avec des systèmes voisins";

- Norval Smith and Tonjes Veenstra (Amsterdam and Potsdam): "Synthetic compounds in a radical creole: Abrupt versus gradual change";
- Peter Stein (Regensburg): "Au milieu du gué: Quelques réflexions à propos de l'origine et de l'avenir des langues créoles";
- Sali Tagliamonte (York, UK): "Patterns of restructuring in FUTURE temporal reference: A cross-linguistic perspective on go";
- Albert Valdman (Indiana): "Lexical restructuring in French-based creoles";
- Daniel Véronique (Paris): "Négation et marqueurs pré-prédicatifs dans les créoles français: émergences et restructurations".

Having documented the breadth and versatility of the topic and the conflicting positions that can be found on various aspects, we will refrain from concluding with an overall summary, which would overstate or exclude some aspects by necessity. One thing has become clear, though: Whatever happens in the process of "restructuring", and however it can be explained that the results of this process come in varying degrees, the ultimate background for all these processes is the sociolinguistic, psychological and historical framework of the interaction between groups of human beings on a permanent basis, with all the conflicts and opportunities that this entails. In that sense, creolistics is probably best seen as but a branch of a flourishing, more comprehensive discipline of contact linguistics (Thomason/Kaufman 1988; Thomason 1996). Language contact and the social and linguistic conditions underlying it are the parameters decisive in shaping the degrees of restructuring in any instance of creolization.

#### Acknowledgements

A number of institutions, colleagues, assistants and friends contributed to the success of the 1998 Regensburg conference and to the production of this volume. We would therefore like to extend our warmest thanks to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, Bonn) and the Regensburger Universitätsstiftung Hans Vielberth for having provided funding for the conference; our support staff in Regensburg (Heidi Eidelloth, Andreas Hiltischer, Alex Kautzsch, Katharina Schwindt, Verena Sopott, Hildegard Spreider, Bettina Tragl, Christian Wagner) for having greatly helped us in organizing and running the conference and for guaranteeing a cheerful atmosphere; several student and research assistants (Karolin Heil, Michael Hierl, Magnus Huber, Alex Kautzsch, Holger Saurenbach, Regina Trüb) for having assisted in the editing of this book; and Jacques Arends as the series editor in charge of this volume for his advice and support.

#### References

- Adone, Dany and Ingo Plag, eds. 1994. *Creolization and Language Change*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Arends, Jacques. 1993. "Towards a gradualist model of creolization". In Francis Byrne and John Holm, eds. *Atlantic Meets Pacific: A Global View of Pidginization and Creolization*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 371-80.
- , ed. 1995. *The Early Stages of Creolization*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Bollée, Anneget. 1982. "Die Rolle der Konvergenz bei der Kreolisierung". In P. Sture Ureland, ed., *Die Leistung der Strataforschung und Kreolistik: Typologische Aspekte der Sprachkontakte*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 391-405.
- and Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh. 1993. "Pour une grammaire historique des créoles". In Jürgen Schmidt-Radefeldt and Andreas Harder, eds. *Sprachwandel und Sprachgeschichte. Festschrift für Helmut Lidtke zum 65. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Narr, 9-21.
- Bruyn, Adrienne. 1995. *Grammaticalization in Creoles: The Development of Determiners and Relative Clauses in Sranan*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1992. *Des îles, des hommes, des langues. Essai sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Hall, Robert A. 1966. *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hazaël-Massieux, Guy. 1993. "The African filter in the genesis of Guadeloupean Creole: At the confluence of genetics and typology". In Salikoko Mufwene, ed. *Africanisms in Afro-American Language Varieties*. Athens, London: University of Georgia Press, 109-22.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. "Syntactic reanalysis". In Charles Li, ed. *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 59-139.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- LePage, Robert and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McWhorter, John. 1998. "Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class". *Language* 74: 788-818.
- Mufwene, Salikoko. 1996. "The Founder Principle in creole genesis". *Diachronica* 13: 83-134.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1998. "How creoloid can you get?". *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 13: 355-371.
- Muysken, Pieter and Norval Smith, eds. 1986. *Substrata versus Universals in Creole Genesis*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Plag, Ingo. 1994. "Creolization and language change: A comparison". In Dany Adone and Ingo Plag, eds. 1994: 3-21.

- Posner, Rebecca. 1985. "Creolization as typological change. Some examples from Romance syntax". *Diachronica* 2: 167-188.
- Rieckford, John. 1983. "What happens in decreolization". In Roger Anderson, ed. *Pidginisation and Creolization as Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 298-319.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 1990. "The cline of creoleness in English-oriented creoles and semi-creoles of the Caribbean". *English World-Wide* 11: 79-113.
- . 1998. "Negation patterns and the cline of creoleness in English-oriented varieties of the Caribbean". In Pauline Christie, Barbara Lalla, Velma Pollard and Lawrence Carrington, eds. *Studies in Caribbean Language II. Papers from the Ninth Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics, 1992*, 204-227.
- Singler, John Victor. 1996. "Theories of creole genesis, sociohistorical considerations, and the evaluation of evidence: The case of Haitian Creole and the Relexification Hypothesis". *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11: 185-230.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 1997. "A typology of contact languages". In Arthur K. Spears and Donald Winford, eds. 1997. *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 71-88.
- and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- , ed. 1996. *Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.