

Jürgen Lang (ed.). *A Variação geográfica do crioulo cabo-verdiano*, 2014, 321 pp. Erlangen: Friedrich-Alexander-Universität University Press. Web Edition: <https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-fau/frontdoor/index/index/docId/5537>.

Reviewed by Nélia Alexandre (Universidade de Lisboa, Centro de Linguística)

Capeverdean Creole is one of the most studied creole languages, the earliest descriptions dating back to the late 19th century (cf. Adolfo Coelho's texts from 1880 to 1886; Costa & Duarte 1886 and A. de Paula Brito 1887. For further references on anthologies, see Cardoso, Hagemeyer & Alexandre 2015). In spite of this, very few attempts have been made at describing and comparing some aspects of the linguistic structure of the three varieties under analysis in this volume: Fogo, Maio and Santo Antão. Usually, it is the Santiago and São Vicente varieties (on the Leeward and Windward islands) that are the scope of interest.

This edited book is fundamentally based on three Master's theses, supervised by Jürgen Lang, from the first *Master's program on Creoles and Capeverdean* at the University of Cape Verde, and it presents comparative research covering three understudied varieties: those of Fogo, Maio (from the Leeward group) and Santo Antão (from the Windward group). Lang had both the prowess to present the work of young Capeverdean researchers and the awareness of the need for a description of the dialectal variation of Capeverdean Creole. In essence, this constitutes a starting point for the creation of a Capeverdean Language Atlas.

The book begins with a Preface (p. 5–7) by Manuel Veiga (the coordinator of the above-mentioned Master's program) that highlights the importance of this program in underlining the need to grant Capeverdean the same official status as Portuguese in Cape Verde (in accordance with the spirit of article 9 of the Capeverdean Constitution).

The first chapter is a general introduction (p. 17–23) by Jürgen Lang, drawing attention to the lack of research on the geographical variation of Capeverdean. Here, Lang stresses that the study of different varieties of Capeverdean is of theoretical interest, since it inquires whether some varieties are driven by language contact or by a new creolization process starting from the Leeward varieties (especially Santiago).

In the chapter dedicated to the Fogo variety *Descrição isocrónica contrastiva das variedades das ilhas do Fogo e de Santiago* [Contrastive

isochronic description of the varieties of Fogo and Santiago] (pp. 27–95), Raimundo Tavares Lopes presents a comparative study of the Santiago and Fogo varieties based on (i) folk tales collected in Fogo and published in the anthology *Na Bóka Noti* (Silva 1987); (ii) fieldwork in Fogo; and (iii) native speaker intuitions. Lopes begins with an overview of the geography and the settlement history of both islands and the formation of the Creole spoken here. In section 2, he compares and distinguishes the two varieties phonetically, illustrating this in a table with 285 etymologically similar words (pp. 45–57). In section 3, he considers some morphological differences between the Fogo and the Santiago varieties, although most of the items considered are merely phonetic variants (e.g. the prepositions *pra* and *te* in Fogo versus *pa* and *ti* in Santiago; the adverbs *gosin* from Fogo versus *gosi* from Santiago; the interrogative pronouns *kuzê* used in Fogo versus *kusê* in Santiago). In section 4, Lopes examines syntactic variation between the Fogo and the Santiago varieties beginning with the distribution of the aspectual perfective marker *dja* ‘already’. According to the author, *dja* occurs always in pre-subject position in Santiago, while it can follow the subject pronoun in Fogo (e.g. *el dja rasebê...*, p. 70). However, Pratas (2007) shows that *dja* may also follow the subject pronoun in the Santiago variety as long as the subject is a free (i.e. non-clitic) pronoun. Therefore, it is not the distribution of *dja* that is at stake in the two varieties, but rather the status of the subject pronouns, which is not addressed in this book. In section 5, Lopes marks the lexical contrasts between the Fogo and Santiago varieties providing a table with 263 semantically equivalent words (pp. 76–92). He concludes (section 6) that both varieties have a more or less marked divergence in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, and he justifies this variation on the basis of (i) the existence of a commercial route from Lisbon to Fogo and directly to the African coast (not via Santiago), and (ii) the isolation of Fogo island.

In the subsequent chapter *Descrição da variedade da ilha do Maio* [Description of the variety of Maio] (pp. 99–180), Ana Karina Tavares Moreira contrasts the Maio variety with that of Santiago. This chapter too begins with a short history of the settlement of the island (uninhabited until the mid-16th century) and addresses relevant geographic and socio-economic factors. Moreira describes her data collection methodology (section 1.3) and the changes she made to the Capeverdean spelling convention (ALUPEC) in order to account for some phonetic specificities of the Maio variety. In section 2, she conducts a detailed phonetic-phonological description of this variety, notably including the phenomenon of metaphony (section 2.2.6) observed in words ending in closed stressed vowels (mainly [i], but also [u]). According to

Moreira, in the Maio variety, these words display a sound change in which the vowel of the pre-stressed syllable is influenced by the quality of the stressed vowel in a process of assimilation, as in *kotxi* ‘break the corn in a bruising way’ pronounced [kuˈtʃi] in Maio, but [ˈkotʃi] in Santiago (p. 128). Hence, this is an innovative pattern within the Leeward varieties although it is found in Guinea-Bissau Creole as well (e.g. [muri], *mori* ‘die’, p. 128).

In section 3, the author demonstrates how derivational morphology is productive in Capeverdean, specifically in the Maio variety, considering the usage of suffixes like *-ura* or *-d* in, respectively, nonexistent derivational contexts in Portuguese, as *sabura* ‘joy’ < *sáb* ‘good’, and African verbal bases, as *genged* ‘bended’ < *gengê* ‘bend’ (pp. 146–147). In section 3.6, Moreira lists conjunctions and reports that only in the Maio variety can *pamodi* ‘because/to’ introduce a complement clause. However, this behavior is not exclusive to the Maio variety, since it is also possible in Santiago, as in *N atxa rabés pamodi bu ka kume nha kumida* ‘I regret the fact that you don’t eat my food’ (Alexandre 2009: 85). The difference between the two varieties lies in the co-occurrence of *pamodi* and *pa* ‘to’ in Maio, as in *N trabadjâ tud Bóka Rubera pamod pa N djudâ marid* ‘I’ve worked everywhere in Boca Ribeira to help my husband’ (p. 163).

A significant contribution of this chapter is the transcription of two interviews of Moreira’s informants, one transcribed using ALUPEC and the International Phonetic Alphabet (section 2.5), and the other one transcribed in ALUPEC and translated into Portuguese (section 3.8).

Moreira concludes (section 5) that the Maio variety, when compared to that of Santiago, exhibits both conservative and innovative patterns. Some of these conservative patterns are found in Guinea-Bissau Creole (e.g. metaphony in verbs and the relative/interrogative pronoun *ku* ‘that’), whereas the innovative features are shared with the Windward varieties (e.g. deletion of the unstressed final vowels [i] and [u]).

In the chapter devoted to the Windward variety of S. Antão, *Descrição fonológica da variedade da ilha de Santo Antão* [Phonological description of the variety of Santo Antão] (pp. 183–250), Maria do Céu dos Santos Baptista begins by discussing the history and geographic situation of the island, highlighting the fact that in the early 18th century it was already the second most populated island of the archipelago. The author describes the methodology used in her data collection, stating that the study is based on the spontaneous oral production of 15 consultants. The interviews were transcribed using ALUPEC, which was adapted by Baptista to account for S. Antão phonetic specificities. Before addressing the phonological features of

the S. Antão variety, Baptista presents a very informative bibliography concerning this Capeverdean variety from the 19th century to the present (section 1). In sections 2, 3 and 4, Baptista analyzes the phonology of S. Antão Creole. My attention was drawn to the complex spectrum of syllable patterns (exactly 16, pp. 228–229), which shows that creole languages do not necessarily have ‘simple’ consonant–vowel (CV) syllable structures. The chapter ends with 5 texts in the S. Antão variety (pp. 234–250) transcribed in ALUPEC and translated into Portuguese.

Capitalizing on the previous chapters and several other academic papers on Capeverdean, Jürgen Lang offers us an overview of the archipelago in a final chapter entitled *Esboço de uma geografia linguística do crioulo caboverdiano* [A sketch of a linguistic geography of the Capeverdean Creole] (pp. 234–297). The author begins by endorsing the unity of Capeverdean Creole, stating the common features of all varieties, namely, (i) the distinction between stressed and unstressed subject pronouns; (ii) the existence of pre-verbal Tense, Mood and Aspect (TMA) markers; (iii) the occurrence of double object constructions; (iv) the expression of reflexivity and reciprocity by *kabésa* ‘head’ and *kunpanheru* ‘companion’, respectively; and (v) the differentiation between *ki/k* ‘that’ and *kumâ/ma* ‘that’ when introducing relative and complement clauses. Nevertheless, Lang does not neglect the question of internal (geographic) variation of Capeverdean, which shows the vitality of the language. Thus, he draws our attention to linguistic variation even within the same variety (for instance, in Santiago and in S. Antão). He also reminds the reader of the fact that some of the Capeverdean varieties are dying (e.g. that of Boavista) due to certain current socio-economic factors. He ends this introductory section by referring to several academic surveys conducted on each Capeverdean variety (p. 258). However, the section lacks certain references to specific topics of these varieties, e.g. Pratas (2004, 2007), Pina (2007), and Alexandre (2009, 2012) for the Santiago variety, and Lopes (2012) for S. Nicolau.

In section 1, Lang lists a number of clear-cut contrasts between the Leeward and Windward varieties, such as (i) forms of address; (ii) the verb *ten* ‘have’; and (iii) coordination. He concludes this section by stating his uncertainty regarding the nature of the distribution of the coordinative conjunction *ma* ‘and/with’ in Windward varieties. A survey of the uses of *mais* ‘more/and’ in (contemporary) European Portuguese might possibly shed some light on this issue (cf. Colaço 2005). Moreover, the uses of *mais* in Northeastern rural Brazilian Portuguese (areas whose first slaves came from Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and Senegal), specifically in *Helvécia*, *Cinzento*,

Sape and *Rio de Contas*, also show that this item has more functions than those of an intensifier, both marking coordination and subordination (cf. Gomes 2014).¹ Furthermore, a look at data from the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (WALS; Dryer & Haspelmath 2013) highlights quite strong typological parallels in the West African substrates.

In section 2, Lang emphasizes the variation within the Leeward varieties, some of them behaving more like the Windward varieties (e.g. displaying unstressed final vowels and verbal stress). In section 3, the author emphasizes the linguistic differences between the Windward islands (e.g. velarization of stressed [a] by metaphony, changes in the pre-stressed [ɐ] also by metaphony, stressed syllable in verbs ending in *-a* from Portuguese *-ar*, expression of anteriority, subjunctive mood, and negation), with the exception of Boavista, which seems to exhibit the Leeward pattern on some points. Each section is illustrated with a comparative table. In section 4, Lang condenses these features, pointing out (i) the unclear nature of the variety of Boavista, which lacks sufficient studies to support its inclusion in any one group of varieties, (ii) the prominence of the S. Antão variety with respect to all other varieties, and (iii) the uniformity of the Leeward varieties.

At the end of this chapter (section 5), Lang proposes a hypothesis concerning the emergence of this variation in Capeverdean. In his view, the (socio-economic) history of the settlement of the archipelago is the bedrock of the observed differences. In this respect, he identifies three settlement periods: first, Santiago and Fogo (as of 1466); second, Brava, S. Antão, S. Nicolau, Maio and Boavista (after 1640); and third, S. Vicente and Sal (after the 18th century, but mainly in the mid-19th and mid-20th centuries, respectively). The volume ends with two *indices*: a general index with proper names, place names, languages, and terms (pp. 307–320), and a map index.

Overall, this is a very carefully organized volume, with a crystal clear goal, leading the reader from one variety to the next, always taking the Santiago variety as the point of departure. Therefore, the book makes a relevant contribution to the field of creole studies, especially to the study of Capeverdean. I strongly recommend the detailed descriptions of the data (especially those concerning the phonology), the data transcriptions, and the crucial overviews of the sociolinguistic circumstances within which these varieties developed. I can only hope that the studies presented in this book encourage other researchers to continue this kind of survey, contributing to an increasingly detailed linguistic map of Cape Verde.

¹ I acknowledge Alan Baxter for indicating me this reference.

References

- Alexandre, Nélia. 2009. *Wh-Constructions in Cape Verdean creole: extensions of the theory of movement*. Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa doctoral dissertation.
- _____. 2012. *The Defective copy theory of movement: evidence from wh-constructions in Cape Verdean Creole* (Creole Linguistics Library 41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baptista, Marlyse. 2002. *The syntax of Cape Verdean creole: The Sotavento varieties* (Linguistics Today 54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brito, António de Paula. 1887 [1967]. Dialectos crioulos-portuguezes. Apontamentos para a gramática do crioulo que se Fala na ilha de Santiago de Cabo Verde revistos por F. Adolfo Coelho. Reimpressão em Jorge Morais-Barbosa (1967), 329-404.
- Cardoso, Hugo, Tjerk Hagemeijer & Nélia Alexandre. 2015. Crioulos de base lexical portuguesa. In Maria Iliescu & Eugeen Roegiest (eds.), *Manuel des anthologies, corpus et textes romans* (Manuals of Romance Linguistics 7), 666–687. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Costa, Joaquim Vieira Botelho da & Custódio José Duarte. 1886 [1967]. O Crioulo de Cabo Verde. Breves estudos sobre o crioulo das ilhas de Cabo Verde oferecidos ao Dr. Hugo Schuchardt. Reimpressão em: Morais-Barbosa, Jorge (1967), 235-328.
- Colaço, Madalena. 2005. *Configurações de coordenação aditiva em português europeu: tipologia, concordância e extracção*. Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa doctoral dissertation.
- Dryer, Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). 2013. *The world atlas of language structures*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info>, Accessed on 2016-10-11.)
- Gomes, Débora. 2014. *O Uso variável do MAIS no português afro-brasileiro: coordenação e subordinação*. Bahia: Universidade Federal de Bahia Master's thesis.
- Lopes, Francisco. 2012. *Para uma análise sintática das construções relativas no crioulo da Ilha de São Nicolau – Cabo Verde*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo Master's thesis.
- Pina, Emanuel. 2007. *Aspectos da estrutura da frase e da negação frásica no Cabo-verdiano (variante de Santiago) e no português europeu: um estudo sintático-comparativo*. Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa Master's thesis.
- Pratas, Fernanda. 2004. *O sistema pronominal do Caboverdiano (variante de Santiago): questões de gramática*. Lisbon: Colibri.
- _____. 2007. *Tense features and argument structure in Capeverdean predicates*. Lisbon: Universidade Nova de Lisboa doctoral dissertation.
- Silva, T. V. (Ed.). 1987. *Na Bóka Notí*. Praia: Instituto da Biblioteca Nacional e do Livro.