The Iberian Challenge: Creole languages beyond the plantation setting.
Edited by Armin Schwegler, John McWhorter & Liane Ströbel.
Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana-Vervuert, 2016. Pp. viii,
273 Paperback $39.60 To order, visit https://www.iberoamericana-
vervuert.es/.

Reviewed by J. Clancy Clements (Indiana University-Bloomington)

As the title suggests, this collection of scholarly articles deals with non-plantation
creoles, covers individual creoles, creoles in a region, creoles lexified by Spanish,
palenques as the locus for creole formation/development, and archival documents
as a source for better understanding the formation and development of Por-
tuguese-lexified creoles in West Africa.

In 'The missing Spanish creole are still missing: Revisiting Afrogenesis and its
implications for a coherent theory of creole genesis' (pp. 39–66), John McWhorter
again weighs in on the complex question of the origins of these contact languages,
with a focus on the Spanish-based creoles. Using socio-historical data and com-
paring the evolution of various English-, French-, Portuguese-, and Spanish-lex-
ified contact vernaculars, McWhorter lays out the hypothesis that these did not
begin on plantations but rather in slave castles in West Africa, and were then
transported to places where plantations already existed. For the Spanish creoles,
this thesis is of particular relevance because in the last decade sociohistorical
research has shown that there are increasingly fewer former Spanish colonies
where one might expect a plantation creole to have emerged. One additional point
seems relevant: the reason that there are no Portuguese-based creoles in Brazil (a
question McWhorter raises at the end) may be due to what Schwartz (1985) doc-
uments earlier in colonial Brazil: many African slaves worked in smaller commu-
nities and had greater access to Portuguese.

McWhorter's hypothesis regarding Afrogenesis is challenged (or comple-
mented) by Alain Kihm and Jean-Louis Rougé's study entitled 'Once more on the
genesis of West African Portuguese creoles' (pp. 13–37), in which the authors pre-
sent evidence and arguments in favor of the view that the Portuguese-based cre-
oles of Africa began with the variety of Portuguese spoken by the African slaves
in Portugal itself. This variety was then transported to Africa. The documentation
they use in support of the 'Out-of-Portugal' hypothesis is based on demographic
evidence (tens of thousands of Africans were taken to Portugal between the end
of the 15th and the beginning of the 17th century), written literary documents

portraying *Língua de Preto* 'black speech', and documentation of transport pathways along which this variety could have been taken back to West Africa to then serve as a model for communication that would have been later creolized in both Upper Guinea and the Gulf of Guinea. The authors appeal to the concept of Klein and Perdue's (1992, 1997) 'Basic Variety', which itself is based on an extensive study of the speech of 40 naturalistic learners of ten different source languages and five different target languages over a two and one-half year time period. One of Klein and Perdue's conclusions was that, independently of the source or target language, there seemed to be basic principles governing pragmatics, semantics, and syntactic structure. Such principles would have been at the basis of *Língua de Preto* in Portugal, but would just as well been operative in Africa where creolization ultimately happened.

Ana R. Luís and Paulo Estudante's study 'Documenting 17th-century Língua de Preto: evidence from the Coimbra archives' (pp. 85–112) contributes new and rich data for a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of *Língua de Preto* in the 17th century. Placing the findings within the appropriate historical context, the authors present and discuss literary representations of the Afro-Portuguese contact variety extant in Portugal and spoken by African slaves. Comparing the 17th-century representations to literary representations of an Afro-Portuguese contact variety from a century earlier, they show that texts from both centuries share phonological similarities, but also display differences in that the 17th-century representations contain definite articles and plural marking, which are absent in 16th-century representations. Luís and Estudante also discuss parallels between these morphosyntactic features and those found in Brazilian Portuguese and second-language varieties of Portuguese. These newly discovered *vilancicos* add substantially to the understanding of the varieties of Afro-Portuguese spoken during the 17th century, and open new avenues of investigation for Portuguese-based creoles.

In 'On the relevance of Classical Portuguese features in four Atlantic creoles' (pp. 66–83), Bart Jacobs and Nicolas Quint examine lexical and phonological features shared by Cape Verdean Creole (CVC), Guinea-Bissau Creole (GBC), Papiamentu, and Saramaccan, making a strong case for identifying CVC as the source for these shared features, all of which are from 15th/16th century Portuguese. Crucial for this view are the sociohistorical data: GBC, Papiamentu, and Saramaccan emerged in situations in which social conditions for creolization were not present till around the 17th century. Thus, the features must have a source other than 17th-century Portuguese, because by then the features were no longer found in Portuguese. The authors detail the connections between Cape Verde on the one hand and, on the other, the places where each of the other three creoles came to be spoken. An illustrative example of a 15th- to 16th-century Portuguese trait shared

by the creoles in question is the affricate [ʧ] (*chegar* [ʧe-ˈgaɾ]), which by the 17th century its lost its affrication, becoming [ʃ] ([ʃe-ˈgaɾ]) (Teyssier 1984:53). All creoles under examination share the affricate, which would not be the case if GBC, Papiamentu, and Saramaccan had formed when in contact with 17th-century Portuguese. The authors also cite other phonological and lexical correspondences, in addition to noting that all four creoles share similar functional elements. In all, they argue cogently and convincingly in favor of positing CVC as a source of features for the other three creoles.

In the study 'Macau Pidgin Portuguese and Creole Portuguese: a continuum?' (pp. 113–134), Michelle Li presents a strong case in favor of the hypothesis that Macau Pidgin Portuguese (MPP), which emerged in the 18th century due to increased trade involving the Chinese in Macau, was based on Macau Creole Portuguese (MCP). She shows that MPP lacked certain traits present in MCP (progressive marking) and exhibited variability in the pronominal system and the possessive construction. Li also presents and discusses historical evidence that MPP and MCP formed part of a continuum of Portuguese varieties, and that there was overlap in the decline of MPP and the emergence of Chinese Pidgin English (CPE), providing historical evidence that a Portuguese phrasebook and Compendium existed and that around the mid-18th century a 'broken and mixed dialect of English and Portuguese' (pp. 117) was used. Revealing is that in the Portuguese phrase book the English 1sg pronoun is included in the otherwise Portuguese-derived pronominal system, further strengthening the view that the two colonial pidgins co-existed and that the replacement of MPP by CPE was gradual.

In 'Philippine Creole Spanish ("Chabacano"): Accusative marking in Caviteño. Grammatical and discursive functions' (pp. 135–152), Marilola Pérez examines the use of the object marker *kon* in Caviteño Creole Spanish, arguing that the presence of *kon* in some cases can be accounted for by appealing to transfer from Tagalog. For example, Tagalog 'direction verbs', such as directional verbs (e.g. *dalhan* 'take/bring to') and verbs with typically human objects (e.g. *halikan* 'to kiss') are often marked in Tagalog with 'direction focus' affixes. Pérez notes a striking overlap between the Caviteño construction with *dale* 'give' (as in *dale beso* 'to kiss') and affixed directional focus verbs in Tagalog. She also argues that *kon* also marks topics, but that the marking is optional. The key contribution of the paper is that it introduces new and reasonable ways of understanding the optionality of the use of *kon* in Caviteño. The variable and inconsistent use of terms such as *dative, accusative*, terms for semantic roles, the lack of a clear definition for the term *salience*, and the presence of what seems to be a note to self ('give examples of these' [pp. 148]) detract from the merits of the paper.

Psycholinguistic studies on well documented languages such as Spanish, German, English, etc. are common. In this volume, two of what are probably among

the first psycholinguistic studies of creoles target Palenquero (PAL), spoken in El Palenque de San Basilio (Colombia). The motivation for 'Palenquero and Spanish: What's in the mix?' (pp. 153–179) by John M. Lipski is that non-Palenquero linguists have often identified in PAL a mixture of canonical creole elements with morphosyntactic features exclusive to Spanish, but little was known about native Palenqueros' own perceptions of such apparent Palenquero/Spanish mixtures. Lipski's research question is: How do native Palenquero (PAL) speakers view such cases of language mixture? To answer this question, Lipski designed (among other experiments) a language-identification task, carried out twice several months apart using four groups of PAL speakers (traditional speakers, Palenquero teachers, heritage speakers, young L2 speakers) with nine participants taking part both times. The results of the data collection are discussed in some detail; one key finding is that fluent PAL speakers possess distinct grammars for PAL and Spanish, in spite of the fact that on every level of the grammar there is ample potential for cross-linguistic transfer. Lipski also discusses the effects that language attrition, enhanced metalinguistic awareness, and a revitalized pride in the local language and culture are having on PAL speakers' perception and production of their language.

In the second psycholinguistic study, entitled 'How psycholinguistics can inform contact linguistics: converging evidence against a decreolization view of Palenquero' (pp. 181–203), authors Paola E. Dussias, Jason W. Gullifer and Timothy J. Poepsel pose the following question: Is there evidence of decreolization in the Palenquero-speaking community? To address this question, the authors carried out a cued-language switching experiment on balanced and Spanish-dominant Palenquero-Spanish bilinguals. Images of concrete objects were presented to participants and they had to name the object as soon as they heard the cue. Response times revealed comparable switch costs for both participant groups, although one group contained balanced Palenquero-Spanish bilinguals and other Spanish-dominant bilinguals. If PAL had been decreolized, one would expect differences in response times between participants of the two groups because of the respective differences in their degree of bilingualism. However, this was not the case. The authors consider the results as evidence against the view that PAL may be a (partially) decreolized speech variety. Moreover, virtually identical switch costs were obtained for the older and younger bilinguals, an outcome that they see as strengthening the non-decreolization view of PAL. The results of the study support research carried out by other PAL experts who have asserted that, independently of age, PAL-Spanish bilinguals have the same creole grammar and no 'in-between' lect exists.

With his contribution 'Reconstructing the linguistic history of Palenques' (pp. 205–229), Miguel Gutiérrez Maté calls attention to the importance of

historical documents, as well as the complexities in reading and interpreting them, which he illustrates with documents pertaining to two palenques, one in Colombia and one in the Dominican Republic. He demonstrates the importance of historical documents in reconstructing the histories of such communities and also addresses the hazards of depending on solely one or more editions of a document without consulting the originals. He illustrates this clearly by reproducing in his study facsimiles of portions of hand-written texts with commentary, including fragments of what seem to be colonial Black Spanish. Gutiérrez Maté also highlights the importance of such texts as windows into the level of linguistic awareness of white scribes who included examples of *bozal* speech and creoles in the documents they penned.

In the last study of this volume, 'Truth reset: Pragmatics in Palenquero negation', Armin Schwegler examines the pragmatics-driven use of three different verbal negation constructions in Palenquero (PAL), i.e., nu + VERB [= NEG_1], nu + VERB + nu [= NEG_2], and VERB + nu [= NEG_3]). Building on research carried out on analogous constructions in Brazilian Portuguese, Schwegler tests the extent to which the use of the aforementioned constructions in PAL is sensitive to the same pragmatic constraints, a topic unexplored for PAL. Interestingly, he finds that in both Brazilian Portuguese and traditional PAL, the use of NEG_1 and NEG_2 is sensitive to the same constraints in largely the same ways, although, as he states, it applies to PAL 'in a somewhat less systematic or obligatory fashion' (pp. 247). For its part, the use of NEG_3 is sensitive to some of the same constraints but other ones as well. The possible reason for these differences is that PAL is undergoing a phase of community-wide revitalization (also mentioned by Lipski), the result of which is the emergence of a type of prescriptivism and a related 'didactic oversimplification' (pp. 258) that has had an impact on the use and distribution of PAL negation patterns. The fact that Schwegler shows Brazilian Portuguese negation patterns to 'exhibit virtually identical morphosyntactic and pragmatic features as those of Palenquero' is striking and begs the question whether the two varieties share this particularity due to a shared history of some sort (e.g., a common Kikongo substrate), or whether this commonality is a natural outcome of general pragmatic constraints.

In all, this volume offers fresh perspectives on, along with new and rich linguistic data from, Portuguese- and Spanish-based creoles. The studies are accessible, well written, and highly insightful, for the most part. As such, *The Iberian Challenge: Creole languages beyond the plantation setting* constitutes recommended reading for all interested in language contact, language use, and language change, and required reading for those who are interested in seeing the richness of insights that creoles offer for theories of language variation/change, psycholinguistics, and pragmatics.

References

Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1992. *Utterance structure: developing grammars again*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.5

Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1997. The Basic Variety, or Couldn't natural languages be much simpler? *Second Language Research* 13(4). 301–347. https://doi.org/10.1191/026765897666879396

Schwartz, Stuart B. 1985. *Sugar plantations and the formation of Brazilian society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teyssier, Paul. 1984. *História da língua portuguesa*. Lisbon: Sá da Costa.

Address for correspondence

J. Clancy Clements
Professor Emeritus
Indiana University-Bloomington
Departments of Linguistics and Spanish & Portuguese
BH844, IUB, 1020 E. Kirkwood Ave.
Bloomington, IN 47405-7003
United States

clements@indiana.edu