

Armin Schwegler, John McWhorter & Liane Ströbel (eds.). *The Iberian challenge: Creole languages beyond the plantation setting*. 2016, 273 pp. Madrid / Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana–Vervuert.

**Reviewed by Ian R. Smith (York University)**

This volume, resulting from a workshop on creole languages that was part of a larger Hispanist conference in Münster in 2013, presents research on creole languages that, according to its editors, have often been ignored because of their non-plantation genesis. The collection encompasses a variety of approaches, including the historical, socio-historical, textual, psycholinguistic, and grammatico-analytic one. The areal representation of Iberian-lexified creoles is uneven, with nothing on the various Portuguese-based creoles of South or Southeast Asia.

In “Once more on the genesis of West African Portuguese Creoles [WAPC]” (p. 13–38), Kihm & Rougé agree with Naro (1978) that the basis for WAPC was provided by *Lingua de Preto*, the Portuguese-lexified variety spoken by African slaves imported to Portugal beginning in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century, and represented especially in the works of Gil Vicente. But while Naro claims *Lingua de Preto* developed from native Portuguese speakers’ simplification of their language for cross-cultural communication, Kihm & Rougé argue that it is a ‘Basic Variety’ developed by the slaves themselves. They further argue that it was Africans or mixed-race individuals who knew *Lingua de Preto* that were responsible for taking it to Africa as interpreters or as crew on ships, many of whom (they propose) came to settle in West Africa, thus providing a kernel from which the creole-speaking communities grew. Since these developments took place early in Portuguese colonial history, the authors further argue that the various WAPC developed independently, but with cross-fertilization.

Quint & Jacobs, on the other hand, in “On the relevance of Classical Portuguese features in four Atlantic Creoles” (p. 67–83) take the position that Guinea-Bissau and Casamance were seeded from Cape Verde. They focus on certain features found in 16<sup>th</sup> century Portuguese, but lost in the standard by now. They argue that the presence of these features in Cape Verdean Creole suggests that it emerged by the late 15<sup>th</sup>/early 16<sup>th</sup> century, and because the Guinea-Bissau and Casamance creoles did not emerge until the 17<sup>th</sup> century, i.e. too late to take some of these ‘classical’ features from Portuguese, they must have received them from Cape Verde. Similarly, the presence of some of these features in Papiamentu and Saramaccan indicates that they too must

have been influenced by the Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, and Casamance creoles.

Returning to *Lingua de Preto*, in “Documenting 17th-century *Lingua de Preto*: Evidence from the Coimbra Archives” (p. 85–112) Luís and Estudante argue that the language of the 17<sup>th</sup> century *Vilancicos de Negro*, songs composed for church performance on religious feast days, is a continuation of the *Lingua de Preto* represented in Gil Vicente’s work. They point to a number of linguistic similarities, but also to some differences that are consistent with developments in West African creoles as well as vernacular Afro-Brazilian Portuguese. These differences show that the composers of the *Vilancicos de Negro* were not simply copying Vicente, as some have claimed, but taking inspiration from more contemporaneous sources. They point out that the language of both the *Vilancicos* and of Vicente was a caricature that served to perpetuate negative stereotypes of the black community, which in reality even in Vicente’s time included fluent speakers of Standard Portuguese.

While most of the papers focus on a particular aspect of a specific creole (or group of similar creoles), McWhorter paints on a broader canvas with “The missing Spanish creoles are still missing: Revisiting Afrogenesis and its implications for a coherent theory of creole genesis” (p. 39–66). He claims that creoles develop in *Société d’habitation* conditions (rather than in plantation situations as is commonly held) and in the presence of a target pidgin. The paucity of Spanish-based Atlantic creoles is explained by the lack of a locus in West Africa for a Spanish-based pidgin to have developed. Nevertheless, he struggles to explain the development of Negerhollands Du-based Creole, suggesting that a co-existing English-based creole provided the model, and citing the development of St. Lucian English Vernacular on the basis of Kweyol for support. The situations are not parallel, however, as St. Lucian English Vernacular was developed as an interlanguage by Kweyol speakers exposed to English schooling (Garrett 2003), while the Africans that developed Negerhollands do not appear to have been speakers of an English-based creole. The paper generates some interesting hypotheses that hopefully will stimulate the detailed studies of individual contexts needed to test them.

Palenquero, the Spanish-lexified creole of Colombia, features in several papers. Lipski presents some of the results of experiments aimed at determining the nature of Palenquero–Spanish bilingualism in “Palenquero and Spanish: What’s in the mix?” (p. 153–179). While many speakers have no trouble producing “pure” Palenquero utterances, the accuracy of their answers is variable when they are presented with examples and asked to identify them

as Palenquero, Spanish, or mixed. Lipski examines what linguistic and social factors might contribute to such identification. Though some trends are apparent, a clear picture does not emerge. The paper is particularly interesting for its insights into the historical and current social factors that might be influencing judgements.

Dussian, Gullifer, & Poepsel present data from a switch-naming experiment in “How psycholinguistics can inform contact linguistics: converging evidence against a decreolization view of Palenquero” (p. 181–204). Subjects were asked to name the object in a picture in the language (Spanish or Palenquero) cued by the background color of the picture. Response times were longer when subjects were required to switch language from one trial to the next. Since this finding is reflected in many studies of bilinguals, Dussian et al. conclude that Spanish and Palenquero are separate languages in the minds of their speakers, and, therefore, Palenquero is not undergoing decreolization, despite the language mixing that is observed in everyday speech.

“Truth reset: Pragmatics in Palenquero negation” (p. 231–267), Schwegler’s meticulous analysis of Palenquero’s three negation patterns, demonstrates how the traditional use of preverbal, post-verbal, and both pre- and post-verbal negators is conditioned by such factors as discourse context (including presuppositions, both inferable and overt) and speaker perception and intent. The patterns, he notes, are very similar to those found in vernacular Brazilian Portuguese, an observation that raises the issue of how they came to be. Schwegler leaves that question for future research, though one of his suggestions, i.e. that it was language transfer from Kikongo, looks promising.

Gutiérrez Maté demonstrates how colonial documents may provide insight into the historical and linguistic development of the black communities. “Reconstructing the linguistic history of *palenques*. On the nature and relevance of colonial documents” (p. 205–229) focuses particularly on the Palenques (fortified settlements) of Santo Domingo and Colombia. He outlines similarities and differences in their early history. At various points, he emphasizes the importance of checking original documents, or facsimiles, to be sure that past interpretations and transcriptions are correct.

Two papers focus on languages outside the Afro-Caribbean area. In “Macau Pidgin Portuguese and Creole Portuguese: A continuum?” (p. 113–134) Li analyzes data from a fragment of a pidgin phrasebook containing 531 entries, at least some of which are phrasal (Li does not break the overall total down.). She argues that the pidgin developed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century from an already established creole Portuguese. Li draws what information she can

from the sparse data, showing some similarities and differences between the two varieties. She argues for a 19<sup>th</sup> century continuum from Portuguese through Portuguese-influenced creole and creole to pidgin.

In the densely argued “Philippine Creole Spanish (“Chabacano”): Accusative marking in Caviteño, Grammatical and discursive functions” (p. xx–xx), Pérez takes on the complexities of the NP marker *kon*. As an object/indirect object marker, it is obligatory with animates and seemingly optional with inanimates. Pérez shows that referentiality and topic prominence condition the marking of inanimates. She further shows the idiomatic use of *kon* to mark the discourse prominence of a few other grammatical relations. She proposes that the discourse use of *kon* results from calquing from Tagalog, specifically from the identification of *kon* with Tagalog *sa*, particularly in the class of direction-focus verbs.

It is regrettable that the only evidence of this book having grown from a workshop is found in the editors’ introduction. Nowhere does the reader glimpse the lively discussions that must have taken place. Indeed, individual papers do not cross-reference others, even when contradicting them. Nevertheless, this is an interesting collection that presents a good spectrum of scholarship, from theories of creole origins and relatedness to penetrating analyses of specific phenomena. The mainly African and Caribbean creoles represented make the volume a nice complement to the Ibero-Asian focus of Cardoso et al. (2013). It is good to see such interest in Iberian-lexified creoles. The work should be of particular interest to the readers of this journal.

## References

- Cardoso, Hugo C., Alan N. Baxter, & Mário Pinharanda Nunes. 2012. *Ibero-Asian creoles: Comparative perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Garrett, Paul. 2003. An “English Creole” that isn’t on the sociohistorical origins and linguistic classification of the vernacular English of St. Lucia. In Michael Aceto & Jeffrey Williams (eds.), *Contact English of the Eastern Caribbean*, 155–210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Naro, Anthony. 1978. A study on the origins of pidginization. *Language* 54. 314–349.