

## Foreword

Over the years, the field of language contact involving Portuguese and Spanish has been fortunate enough to welcome a steadily growing body of scholars, which has greatly increased the depth and breadth of the research undertaken. This expansion can also be witnessed from the well participated meetings of the *Associação de Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola* (ACBLPE - <http://www.acblpe.com/en>), which was officially founded in 2004 and has been holding its annual meetings since 2001, mainly in Europe (Amsterdam, Coimbra, Cologne, A Coruña, Graz, Lisbon, Orléans, Paris, Porto, Stockholm), but also overseas, in Aruba, Curaçao, Praia, São Paulo, and Ziguinchor. Throughout the years, ACBLPE has frequently partnered up with the *Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* (SPCL), the *Society for Caribbean Linguistics* (SCL), and the *Associação Brasileira de Estudos Crioulos e Similares* (ABECS), with obvious mutual benefits from the perspective of exchange of knowledge and expertise. In 2009, the consolidation of ACBLPE led to another milestone, namely the birth of *Revista de Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola* (RCBLPE), which has recently been relabeled as *Journal of Ibero-Romance Creoles* (JIRC), a regular open-access online publication constituting yet another sign of the vitality of this research field.

The increasing success of Portuguese- and Spanish-related contact linguistics would definitely have taken a different direction if it weren't for a number of scholars who over the past decades have greatly contributed to laying out the foundations that allow this research field to thrive and to whom this volume is dedicated: **Alan Baxter, J. Clancy Clements, Mauro Fernández, Alain Kihm, Jürgen Lang, Philippe Maurer, Dulce Pereira, Jean-Louis Rougé, and Ian Smith**. While it would be frankly impossible to do justice to all the reasons why the field is profoundly indebted to these colleagues, we would still like to highlight a few. In the first place, the large body of work they produced over the past decades constitutes an invaluable contribution to both the knowledge and the status and corpus planning of many Portuguese and Spanish-related contact realities, many of which are facing the threat of extinction. Their contribution includes pioneering fieldwork-based descriptive grammars, grammatical and sociolinguistic descriptions and studies, lexicographic work, as well as an active role in the development of language policies. Secondly, most of these scholars have been intrinsically connected to the life of ACBLPE, not only as participants in its organic development and

management, but of course also as most welcome “regulars” at the association’s annual meetings. In the third place, and above all, their life and work make them role models whose production, expertise, dedication, and generosity are a constant source of knowledge and inspiration, especially for those, such as the contributors to this volume, who have had the privilege of connecting directly with these scholars, professors, colleagues, friends. They have been living lives in contact in a very inclusive way and for that we cannot thank them enough.

This special volume of the *Journal of Ibero-Romance Creoles* aims to attest to the vitality and diversity of research on Spanish- and Portuguese-related contact languages by including fifteen original papers on several aspects of language contact in the Atlantic, Asia, and the Pacific. We are greatly indebted to the authors of the papers for their enthusiasm to participate in this collective endeavor. While it was of course tempting to invite our well-experienced colleagues to whom this volume pays tribute to be part of the peer-review process, we could not afford to lose the surprise effect. Therefore we gratefully acknowledge all the anonymous reviewers who kindly took on this task and thereby contributed substantially to the quality of the papers. The fifteen papers are organized as follows.

**Eeva Sippola**’s study sets the pace of the volume by surveying a number of published studies on Chabacano to reflect on the impact of language ideology – including the focus on linguistic purity, authenticity, and standardisation – on authors’ data-collection techniques and descriptive approaches. While Chabacano is the specific topic of this study, its cautionary remarks apply to all language documentation endeavours, but especially those focusing on contact languages or multilingual communities.

**Hugo Cardoso**’s paper surveys the synchronic use and diachronic development of a number of cognate forms used in a few Asian-Portuguese creoles to establish nexus of cause, reason, and purpose. These forms, he argues, are ultimately derived from the Portuguese *por via de* (literally, ‘by way of’), which, as demonstrated, has similar readings in diachronic and dialectal corpora of Portuguese and has clearly contributed causal operators in the West-African Portuguese-based creoles.

**Tom Güldemann** and **Tjerk Hagemeijer** discuss the contribution of the different linguistic strata to the genesis of the typologically marked discontinuous/final negation patterns that spread from the proto-creole of the Gulf of Guinea to its four daughter languages. It is argued that the syntax and functions of the final negation marker was triggered by the early Nigerian substrate and further grammaticalized due to heavy secondary contact with languages of the Kongo cluster.

**Chiara Truppi** provides a description and discussion of copulas in Kriyol (Guinea-Bissau Creole), focusing on their semantic-syntactic functions and the criteria underlying copula selection. She further compares Kriyol copulas to those of the closely related Upper Guinea Creole varieties of Santiago Capeverdean and Casamancese, and to substrate languages, Wolof and Mandinka, in order to assess the contribution of these two languages to the emergence of the copular system(s) in the Upper Guinea Creoles.

**Nicolas Quint** and **Karina Moreira** undertake a comparative study of African-derived lexical items in a number of insular and continental varieties belonging to the Upper Guinea Creole group. This lexical survey highlights the contribution of substrate languages such as Mandinka and Wolof to the emergence of proto-Upper Guinea Creole. The results lead to new insights into the phylogenetic relationships between the Upper Guinea Creoles.

**Dominika Swolkien** and **Alexander Cobbinah**'s contribution analyzes the understudied Capeverdean variety of Santo Antão, providing a socio-historical sketch and analysis of certain phonological features found in this variety, such as metaphony and consonant assimilation. The authors propose that the outlier status of Santo Antão among the Capeverdean varieties is the result of the early settlement of the island, its geographical conditions and consequent isolation of the communities, as well as its late contact with Portuguese.

**Christina Märzhäuser** analyzes language contact between English and Capeverdean since the 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> centuries using a corpus of anglicisms drawn from different linguistic descriptions, dictionaries and glossaries, including also more recent loans from songs, as well as digital and oral sources. It is shown that these loanwords are the result of different periods and contexts of language contact and provides meta-linguistic comments about their sociolinguistic acceptance and use.

**Fernanda Pratas** describes a preliminary design for future research on the effects that a current contact situation – with English, in the United States of America – may have on some Capeverdean properties. The features in question are the different morphological markings for certain mood and aspect combinations, which, for the language spoken in Cabo Verde, she analyzes as a case of underspecification between some (functional) lexical items and the morphological forms, as related with some diachronic factors.

**Marlyse Baptista** uses a Swadesh list as a tool to establish lexical and morpho-phonological variation in five islands of Cape Verde: three from the Sotavento (leeward) group and two from the Barlavento (windward) group. She brings a new perspective to the study of language-internal variation, showing

that the traditional connection between those groups of islands, which, respectively, host the so-called basilectal and the acrolectal varieties, must be completed with other points of analysis, in particular the role of sociolects and idiolects.

**Nélia Alexandre** provides a comparison between a number of morphosyntactic properties of Capeverdean spoken at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and those found in the contemporary language. She bases her analysis on a Capeverdean play written in 1881 by A. J. Ribeiro, the first Cape Verdean informant of Hugo Schuchardt, and concludes that this play already exhibited the influence of Portuguese and also that the language did not change substantially over time.

**Márcia Oliveira, Maria de Lurdes Zanolli, and Marcelo Modolo** revisit different concepts of Brazil's *Língua Geral* using the framework of contact linguistics, arguing for the status of this language as a creole, given the evidence that it is more closely linked to the type of development observed in the formation of new languages than to language shift. The authors also advocate that *Língua Geral* is part of a pidgin-creole *continuum* based on Tupinambá, which they consider a pidgin, against the standard view in the field.

**Dante Lucchesi** argues that, in comparison to the plantation societies in the Caribbean, the socioeconomic specificities of Brazil in the colonial period, in particular a lesser degree of segregation/isolation of the substrate language speakers, inhibited the kind of rupture in linguistic transmission that in other places led to the development of creole languages. Instead, in the case of Brazil a process of irregular linguistic transmission resulted in a variety of Portuguese whose features reflect a process of language change through contact.

**Carlos Figueiredo** presents a sociolinguistic study on the use of the definite article in the Portuguese variety spoken in the Almojarife community of São Tomé, which has Santome as a substrate language. He provides a detailed analysis of the productions of 18 speakers based on a number of linguistic and extra-linguistic variables. He further establishes comparisons with other Portuguese varieties in São Tomé and in Brazil, arguing that the results hint at a language *continuum* which connects Africa to this South American country.

**Eduardo Tobar** provides a corpus-based description and analysis of 675 morphologically productive and lexically opaque instances of reduplications found in written productions of Chabacano Zamboangueno. The items under analysis are organized and discussed according to the word categories and semantic domains they belong to and with respect to their phonological, semantic, and iconic properties, which also leads the autor to

briefly address the putative relation of a subset of these forms to the domain of ideophony.

**Mário Pinharanda Nunes'** closing paper on Makista, the Portuguese-lexified creole of Macau, is a corpus-based survey of the form *logo*, which has traditionally been classified as a future marker but, according to this study, is best interpreted as an *irrealis* marker with a complex range of functions extending into the expression of habituality, continuity, immediacy, or the apodosis of conditionals.

Lisbon, April 2019.

The guest editors,

Tjerk Hagemeijer, Chiara Truppi, Fernanda Pratas, Hugo Cardoso & Nélia Alexandre