Susanne Michaelis (ed.) *Roots of Creole Structures. Weighing the contribution of substrates and superstrates*, 2008, XI, 425 pages. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Anthony P. Grant (Edge Hill University).

The title of the book raises the question of the correct definition of the term *substrate* (and by extension *superstrate* and *adstrate*). Not all theories of creolization subscribe to the concept substrate; the constructivist approach favoured by Philip Baker (a viewpoint which he first made explicit in Baker 1990) dispenses with them because its view of the interplay of the factors which bring about the languages which linguists classify as creoles. For readers who do not believe in the validity of the concept substrate, this book can be seen as a collection of essays which deal with the influence exerted upon creoles by features of languages which were spoken by people whose ancestors contributed to creole populations, although these ancestral languages were not the chief lexifiers of the creoles in question.

The book comprises fifteen chapters and an introduction, while five indexes of authors, language names, names of peoples, placenames, and subjects (385-425) complete the volume. Most chapters are single-author works, and only a few authors (notably Fabiola Henri, Paula Prescod and Incanha Intumbo) are themselves native speakers of the creoles under discussion. The papers are grouped into four thematic sections.

The first two papers concentrate on the use of sociolinguistic information to advance our understanding of how particular creoles developed. Silvia Kouwenberg (1-27) uses demographic, linguistic and other data to show that the assumption that speakers of Akan were the dominant substrate group in the development of Jamaican Creole is unsupported by solid evidence, as considerable amounts of lexical material from Kongo and other Bantu languages, and from other languages (incuding Gbe, Kwa and Manding languages, have also entered Jamaican Creole. The forthcoming work by Joseph T. Farquharson at the Max-Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology investigating the sources of African lexical items in Jamaican Creole should be especially useful in this context.

Rachel Selbach's chapter on the Romance-lexifier language Lingua Franca as used in the Barbary Coast (coastal Algeria, Tunisia and part of Libya) from the 16th to the late 19th centuries (29-58) is the only one which deals with substrate influences in a pidgin. Lingua Franca had a lexicon in which proportions of Italian, Spanish and maybe also French, Provençal and Portuguese elements seemed to vary from one locale or one century to another. Significantly, it does not derive the bulk of its lexicon from the dominant local language Arabic or the official Ottoman language Turkish (Taqbaylit Berber, which in any case is profoundly influenced by Arabic, was and is also widely spoken close by). One reason that Lingua Franca did not capitulate or relexify much towards Arabic is that the pidgin was already in wide use in many Mediterranean ports, so that it would have been a language held in commo by many or most of the Europeans who spent years, often in slavery, on the Barbary Coast, and many of these people would have travelled widely through he Mediterranean.

The next two papers examine the role of first and second language acquisition. Jeff Siegel's paper (59-82), defending the Cafeteria Principle of Creole feature genesis often derided by Derek

Bickerton (e.g. Bickerton 1981, a millstone in modern creolistics) shows that some structural features of Hawai'i Creole English (a language for which our information on substrate influences, and the origins, numbers of speakers, and years of immigration of speakers of contributory languages is especially full and copious) can be assigned to typological influence from particular languages. This is sometimes because they only occur in a small subset of the languages whose speakers helped shape the creole, though Siegel associates the presence of three perfect aspect markers in the language with evidence of clear influence from Cantonese, Hawai'ian and Portuguese respectively, of which the first and third are adstratal languages while the second is substratal.

The chapter by Ana R. Luis (83-121) discusses verb themes in Korlai, Diu and Daman Creole Portuguese. These languages are different from many other creoles from a sociolinguistic viewpoint, as they arose in bilingual situations (Portuguese-Marathi for Daman and Korlai and Portuguese-Gujarati in Diu), the populations who use these languages are largely not the descendants of people who were removed thither from other countries, and the creole communities are surrounded by much larger Marathi or Gujarati speech communities. Such a setting is somewhat atypical for thriving creole communities. These creoles have not only a basic verb stem, but also possess inflections marking continuous aspect, a past form and a completive form (each with the same theme vowel), all of them having their roots in inflected Portuguese forms. Since different verbs have different shapes, we can identify three conjugations for Portuguese-derived verbs and a fourth, with the verb theme *–u*, for verbs borrowed from Marathi.

These are followed by three papers which examine the attested history of creoles and what it can tell us about substrate influence on these languages. Using Optimality Theory Christian Uffmann (123-152) deals with the issue of paragogic vowels and the occasionally ensuing vowel harmony in Sranan, pointing out the strength of the substrate influence on syllable structure in Sranan. Also relevant to the furtherance of creole historical phonology is the paper by Norval Smith (153-168), which discusses the surprising reflex of original /g/ as /k/ in Saramaccan, a change which is confined to words of Portuguese origin in this language, and not to all of them. Using a wide range of linguistic, demographic and historical resources Smith demonstrates that the overwhelming likelihood is that such words came into Saramaccan from the speech of Bakongo or of Kimbundu-speakers (both of them using languages in which /g/ is absent as a separate phoneme) who had settled in Pernambuco before the Dutch took it in 1630.

In the third paper of this group (169-196), Sibylle Kriegel, Ralph Ludwig and Fabiola Henri demonstrate that the use in Mauritian Creole of *depi* (< French *depuis* 'since') to express the Path-marker 'from' can be regarded as a calque from Bhojpuri; this feature is especially prominent in the Creole usage of Indo-Mauritians.

The next six papers look at the origin and implementation of particular structures in creole languages. The paper by Claire Lefebvre (197-223) discusses the roles of substrates and superstrates and their interaction, presenting an argument of semantic mapping of substrate linguistic features upon the lexical forms of the superstrate languages in order to give rise to creole forms, as illustrated by the interaction of Fongbe semantic models with (phonologically modified) French phonological fors in order to give rise to Haitian Creole words.

I will discuss the next few papers briefly. Susanne Michaelis (225-251) discusses the rise of verb

categorisation structures in Seychelles Creole/Seselwa, showing that these structures have strong analogues with patterns of the use of applicatives in Bantu languages of coastal Tanzania and Mozambique, which were spoken by the ancestors of many present-day speakers of Seselwa. Philippe Maurer's brief paper (253-261) demonstrates that Santomense, previously assumed not to have tones, does in fact have a phonemically distinct High-Low tonal distinction, of the sort also found in its chief substrate languages Edo and Kikongo. Maurer presents some spectrographs to demonstrate its presence in short phrases but he does not say which speech analysis software package he used to develop them.

Incanha Intumbo's paper (263-278) is one of the few in the volume which has been written by a native speaker of a creole, and is a typological overview of numerous features of the noun phrase in Guine-Bissau Creole Portuguese, standard Portuguese, and another language of which Intumbo has native-speaker knowledge, namely the Atlantic Niger-Congo language Balanta, native to about a quarter of the population of Guine-Bissau. Intumbo makes a good case for influence upon Guine-Bissau Creole from Atlantic languages such as Balanta. This paper is also important because it helps alleviate the almost staggering paucity of information in print on Balanta, a language with at least 300,000 speakers. Let us hope that Intumbo provides the world with further and fuller documentation on Balanta, a task for which he is ideally equipped.

Carl Rubino (279-299) discusses the increasing use of the potentive mood (marked with *puede*, from Spanish *puede* 'it can') in Zamboangueño Chabacano. The potentive (often marked with the selfsame Spanish-derived modal) is found in the Bisayan languages which have influenced and relates to such labels as 'to be able to X', 'to manage to X', 'to accidentally X' and 'to happen to X'.

Bettina Migge and Laurence Goury (301-331) present an impressive range of cross-creole and crosslinguistic material and use both historical and contemporary sources in their discussion of the layering of influences which have given rise to the TMA system of the various Surinamese Creole Englishes, showing morphemes deriving from English (for instance anterior *ben*), Dutch (future *sa*) and Portuguese (completive *kaba*), which have been imposed upon a morphosyntactic typological pattern which has strong parallels with those found in Gbe languages. Other creoles have done this 'layering' of TMA particles too; Berbice Dutch, with its layering of later Guyanese Creole English upon Dutch upon Eastern Ijo TMA morphemic material, has done this too (see Kouwenberg 1994).

The two final papers may be seen as 'singles', since there are no other papers in the collection which relate to the same general themes. Paula Prescod (333-355) discusses polymorphemic derived words in Vincentian Creole English, arguing that several derivational morphological processes are active in the creole, and that their outputs can be words which do not occur in English. I agree entirely with her claims, and would add that the implicit or tacit assumption (held, albeit tacitly, by some creolists) that few or no complex derived words entered the lexica of the pidgins which gave rise to creoles is quite erroneous. There would in many creoles be enough partial or more complete word families inherited from the lexifier language to allow speakers to extract derivational affixes which they could then apply to other stems which had not taken these affixes in the lexifier language, and by such a process of analogy on the basis of preexisting forms they could create truly new words. I did wonder, though, why the author uses *Garifuna* as a plural noun to refer to 'Black Carib' people (people of African ethnic origin who adopted the language of the Arawakan Igneri as heir own) when the customary form is *Garinagu*.

The paper on New World French and its role in the shaping of structures in French-lexifier creole languages by Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh (357-383) is the only chapter in the book to deal specifically with the superstrate rather than the substrate languages. The author examines Acadian French subject and object personal pronouns, and also the use and syntax of *pour* 'for'. She sees the establishment of a database of earlier New World French as a desideratum for the study of New World Creole French languages, since such a resource may enable us to have a clearer picture of the varieties of French which settlers in the New World may have brought with them, and which may have served as the major input to relevant Creole French lexica.

This book is well-produced, although the page numbers in the index relating to proper names appearing in later chapters seem sometimes to be a page or two out. Some of the English in the papers is rather odd (for instance I think I know what is meant by 'hiders' on p. 307 although I would not use the word myself). The point is that academic books in English should be written in Standard English, and they should pass across the gaze of a native speaker of English at least once before production. Speakers of other languages would not readily accept cavalier attitudes to such language use on the part of non-native speakers of their own languages, although I have seen many far more egregious examples of bad academic English than this.

The question remains of just how well-conceived the exploration of substrates is. The execution of the mission of the book is fine enough; the weighing of contributions of features from various languages is certainly well conducted in chapter after fine chapter, and as a creolist of over thirty years' standing I learned a great deal from reading this book. On pp. xvi-xvii Michaelis makes clear the differences between creolist and non-creolist uses of the terms *substrate* and *superstrate*. Even so, creators of creoles do not shift to the superstrate language; they create a new language incorporating features of superstrate and substrate languages (with maybe further features independently innovated), which is then acquired by their children and by newer arrivals in the creole-forming society.

The problem for builders of overarching theories of substrate influence is that the situations in which the various creoles discussed in the book arose are unsurprisingly varied. Some creoles are endogenous and arose where they are now spoken (such as Mauritian Creole), while others are modified forms of creoles which developed elsewhere (such as Seychelles Creole). Some creoles are primordial, such as Santomense, while others have developed and diverged from pre-existing creoles. Some arose on previously uninhabited territory (which is true of both Mauritian and Seychelles Creoles), or in previously inhabited territory which creole-speakers came to dominate numerically and socially (as is the case of Chavacano in parts of Zamboanga) while others have always existed in enclaves (this is the case with Indo-Portuguese Creole varieties). Speakers of some of the superstrate languages may occasionally have learned one or more of some of the substrate languages in some cases, as seems to have been the case in the development of Berbice Dutch. Some creole languages have been in contact with their alleged substrate languages for centuries (for instance Zamboangueño has never been out of contact with one or more Central Philippine languages, and has always had some sort of contact with Spanish), and some may have been influenced by 'substrate' languages which historically are in fact adstrate languages (the impact of Balanta on Guine-Bissau Creole would perhaps qualify here if the creole is a development from Cape Verdean Creole, which it seems to be). Some creoles are spoken only or primarily by people whose ancestors shifted from their ancestral language(s) to an already formed creole which then underwent some change (even if only in terms of lexical borrowing) from their ancestral language. (One might argue that this is the case with Karipúna Creole French, for instance.) None of

these factors or criteria can be ignored when creolists examine the geneses of creole languages. The upshot of this is that the concept of substrate in creole languages is too protean (or even too vague) an entity for one set of principles, which may be typical of the genesis of some creole languages, to be applied to many or all scenarios of creole genesis with any hope that such an application will be particularly enlightening. And this much is clear from reading the disparate accounts of linguistic interinfluence which are presented in this rewarding and very rich book.

References

Baker, Philip. 1990. Off target? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 5-1: 107-120.

Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 1994. *A grammar of Berbice Dutch creole*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.