SSLA, **27**, 441–463. Printed in the United States of America.

REVIEW ARTICLE

Albert Valdman
Indiana University

DOI: 10.1017/S0272263105050199

LA CRÉOLISATION: THÉORIE, APPLICATIONS, IMPLICATIONS [CREOLIZATION: THEORY, APPLICATIONS, IMPLICATIONS]. *Robert Chaudenson*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2003. Pp. 479. 39.5 € paper.

Robert Chaudenson is arguably the leading specialist on French-based creole languages (FBCs). His first major work in the field of pidgin and creole linguistics (creolistics)—Chaudenson (1974)—still stands as the unrivaled lexicological study of any FBC or, for that matter, of any creole language. In addition to providing a model for expert etymological research, that initial work (a *doctorat d'état* dissertation[1]) already contained the nuclear elements of an original theory of creolization that he would fine-tune in the course of the next three decades. Because Chaudenson's prolific publications are written in French, his name is not a household word among the international community of creolists; however, thanks to the efforts of Salikoko Mufwene, Chaudenson's other major book-length publication outside of the work reviewed here—*Des îles, des hommes, des langues: Essai sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle* (1992)—appeared in English under the adapted title of *Creolization of language and culture* (2001).[2]

Narrowly, the volume discussed in this review article, which I shall refer to as *La créolisation*, may be viewed as Chaudenson's response to an article that appeared in an issue that I edited (Valdman, 2002) of the main publication outlet for studies on FBCs, *Etudes Créoles*, jointly authored by McWhorter and Parkvall (2002). In that article, these authors first characterized Chaudenson as the leading exponent of what they label the old superstratist hypothesis, first put forward by pioneering creolists such as Coelho (1880), Faine (1937), and Hall (1958) and defended by currently active specialists of FBCs, including myself.[3] Although these modern scholars generally posit a structural break between French and FBCs, they hold that FBCs reflect more the structure of French than that of the substrates, the native languages (L1s) of the creators of FBCs. McWhorter and Parkvall also suggested that Chaudenson's views on

© 2005 Cambridge University Press 0272-2631/05 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

creolization are heavily influenced by his research on Reunion Creole, a language that Chaudenson admits has undergone basilectal erosion; that is, it more closely reflects the structure of French than its congeners. In *La créolisation*, as the author puts it humorously, he proposes playing the game on his challengers' home court by broadening his database to all FBCs and to some Portuguese-based creoles to boot.

Chaudenson's theory of creolization is best encapsulated by his own definition, which, although stemming directly from research on FBCs, is meant to apply to all creole languages:

> Born in the 17th and 18th centuries, in the socio-historical context of the slave driven plantation whose work force consisted of linguistically heterogeneous immigrant populations, the French creoles are the result of the unguided appropriation of approximative varieties of French, already having undergone koneization during the preceding freehold stage. Creolization is thus, in fact, an exceptional phenomenon to the extent that, under specific socio-historical and sociolinguistic conditions (plantations with immigrant work forces) free of socio-cultural constraints and any normative pressure, free rein was given to linguistic processes (essentially autoregulation and strategies of second-language acquisition) manifesting themselves in many other circumstances, to different degrees, in the languages involved, specifically French.[4] (pp. 205, 448)

This theory of creolization breaks with the two theoretical currents that have dominated creolistics since the 1960s, both of which view the genesis of creoles as triggered by exceptional cognitive and linguistic processes.

The first current, based on the notion of the life cycle (Hall, 1966), conceives the development of creoles as a two-step process. First, a linguistically heterogeneous population adapts the socially dominant language to devise a highly variable rudimentary linguistic object that serves limited communicative needs. In his extensive comments on papers contained in the edited proceedings of the influential Mona (1968) conference on pidginization and creolization, Hymes (1971) focused on these two processes rather than on linguistic objects (pidgins and creoles). He considered pidginization and creolization as mirror-image processes situated in a social context propitious to hybridization consisting of, respectively, simplification versus complexification of outer form, reduction versus expansion of inner form, and restriction versus extension of communicative functions. This view implies that creolization, although it entails complexification vis-à-vis a previous pidginized stage, yields outputs that are simpler than the original input from the linguistic target. It is precisely their origin in pidgins that leads McWhorter (1997, 1998) to claim that as "young" languages, creoles have not developed complex morphosyntactic machinery and, consequently, they constitute a special class of languages defined by a small set of prototypical features—specifically, minimal use of inflectional affixes, little or no use of tone for contrastive purposes, and semantically transparent derivational processes. The most radical version of the two-step reduction and subsequent complexification model, Bick-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

erton's (1981) bioprogram theory, dominated the creolistics scene in the 1980s. On the basis of his comparison of a pidgin used in Hawai'i among imported indentured plantation laborers in the late 19th century and an English-based creole that survived throughout the 20th century, Bickerton proposed that, when children growing up in the plantation context were faced with a degenerate and unlearnable linguistic object (their parents' pidgin), they resorted to an innate set of universal linguistic principles—the bioprogram—to produce a proper language, the creole.[5] Bickerton argued further that it is their common origin in the bioprogram that accounts for what he perceived as striking structural similarities among creole languages derived from different languages in widely separated parts of the world.[6]

The second current in creolistics views creolization as a special type of second language acquisition (SLA) that involves massive transfer from the creole creators' L1s, the substrates. Adherents of this view, termed substratists, fall into two groups. Most posit partial transfer primarily at the morphosyntactic level (e.g., Alleyne, 1980; Boretsky, 1983; Holm, 1988). A smaller group of substratists claims total transfer involving, in effect, retention of the linguistic form of the substrate but acquisition of the substance of the superstrate. In effect, this entails clothing the substrate semantics and morphosyntax with the lexicon of the superstrate (i.e., relexification). The latter notion has a long history. It was first put forward with strong racist overtones by a Frenchman, L. Adam (1883), in an aptly entitled book: *Les idiomes négro-aryens et maléo-aryens: Essai d'hybridologie linguistique*. More extreme versions of relexification were proposed by the Haitian linguist Sylvain (1936/1979), who characterized Haitian Creole as French cast in the mold of African syntax, specifically that of Ewe, and in recent years, by C. Lefebvre (1998), who preferred Fongbe, a member of the Kwa group like Ewe, as the substrate language.[7]

Chaudenson's definition of creolization contains the three main themes dealt with in *La créolisation*. First, contra McWhorter's notion of the creole prototype, creole languages do not differ structurally from other natural languages nor are they necessarily simple, but they do differ from them in two regards: (a) One can accurately pinpoint the period when they emerged and (b) Their genesis is inextricably linked to the social context of the plantocratic setting of insular colonies. The second aspect of the definition claims that the input to the creators of creoles is not a variety similar to the present-day standard languages, but vernacular varieties of the colonial period. Finally, the cognitive and linguistic processes that lead to creolization are identical to those assumed in tracing the diachronic development of natural languages and those that determine unguided SLA. These three themes are reflected in the organization of *La créolisation* and will serve as headings for the main body of this review article, together with issues of substrate influence.

La créolisation comprises eight chapters regrouped into two parts. The first part (chapters 1 through 5) deals with such issues as the inappropriate use of the terms *creole* and *creolization*, some misconceptions about the languages and the processes that led to their emergence, and general and methodologi-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cal problems of the field of creolistics. Part 1 lays out the sociohistorical context in which FBCs were spawned. The second part provides exceedingly well-documented support for the two sets of cognitive and linguistic processes that account for creolization: (a) autoregulatory processes already present in French, which the colonial distantiation from the normative institutions of the metropolis has allowed to operate more freely; and (b) processes of unguided, natural SLA. Chapter 7, comprising nearly one-third of the book, focuses on morphosyntax. Data drawn from available descriptive studies and early documentation of FBCs—especially but not by any means exclusively those of the Indian Ocean (IO) zone—are marshaled to show that, although not absent, transfer from substrate languages played less of a role in shaping the development of these languages than the input and processes of SLA. *La créolisation* also contains an extensive preface by Mufwene, who comments on his main points of agreement with the author's views on creolization and minor differences of opinion, particularly concepts linked to his own notion of the ecology of language evolution (Mufwene, 2001).

THE SOCIOHISTORICAL SETTING FOR THE EMERGENCE OF FBCs

In the presentation of his model for the sociohistorical setting for creolization, Chaudenson applies the metaphor of the three components (*trois unités*) familiar to all students of French classical literature (p. 73). That notion was a rule formulated in the 17th century by Boileau as a basic rule for the classical tragedy: in a specific place, in 1 day, a single action. The prototypical place for creolization is an island. Although it certainly did not take place in 1 day, it operated relatively rapidly. The action component consists of the economic, demographic, and social factors inherent in the large-scale plantation. Chaudenson also compares the genesis of creoles to a witch's brew whose concoction depends on the presence of a single essential ingredient, be it a toad's spit or earth from a cemetery. In the case of the FBCs, that ingredient consists of the integration of an alloglot population numerically superior to the population speaking the target, socially dominant tongue.[8] He shows that this ingredient is lacking in a variety of contact situations in which French was involved: the imposition of direct French rule in Algeria, the colonization of sub-Saharan Africa, and the settlement of North American diaspora communities—Acadia, Quebec, and Louisiana.

Central to Chaudenson's sociohistorical model is the two-phase development of the plantocratic colonial plantation system: the preliminary *societé d'habitation* "freehold society" and the second step *societé de plantation* "plantation society." He stresses the fact that colonial plantations, particularly those producing sugar, were, in effect, agroindustrial establishments that required a large servile labor force. These plantations could not be established from scratch but required the progressive development of a complex infrastruc-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ture: capital, means of communication, administrative organization, and so forth. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the term *habitation* was polysemous. It referred to a type of freehold, a small-scale farm usually located on a leased track of land, as well as a plantation with White overseers and several hundred slaves. It is the first sense of that term that Chaudenson retains to label the first stage in the establishment of plantocratic societies. On what was to become the pearl of the Antilles, the most profitable insular European plantocratic colony, French Saint-Domingue (at present, Haiti), the initial settlements were primitive affairs that involved paired partnerships (*matelotage*) set up to hunt wild livestock and cure the meat to sell to seafarers. These buccaneers (from *boucan*, the fire to cure meat) might be assisted by an indentured servant or a slave. These rudimentary establishments diversified to the cultivation of cash crops that required neither a complex infrastructure nor a large workforce: tobacco, indigo, and coffee. A typical *habitation* would be comprised of a White family and a few indentured servants and, at a later stage, slaves. In this social context, conducive to reduced physical and psychological distance (Schumann, 1978), target input was relatively available and the alloglots' interlanguage did not diverge widely from the speech of the speakers of French. Although the first alloglots were integrated into the colonial society, the other essential ingredient for creolization, their demographic preponderance, is not present at this stage.

It is present, however, at the subsequent plantation stage that Chaudenson places 30 to 60 years after the initial settlement. The masses of newly arrived slaves (the bossals), most of whom were assigned to work in the fields or the sugar mills, had few opportunities to receive direct target language (TL) input. Their models were mainly the acculturated slaves, some of whom—the *creoles*—were born in the colonies and had acquired approximative versions of the TL of varying distances from the model. As Chaudenson puts it, this situation represented SLA twice or several times removed, and it resulted in approximations of the original to the *n*th degree. To support his claim that some of these approximative interlinguistic varieties were not far removed from the target input, he offers the testimony of Jesuit priests who declared that the slaves' linguistic adaptation was rapid, so much so, according to Mongin (1679/1984), that many metropolitan French could learn French from them. It should be borne in mind that in the first linguistic survey conducted in France during the Revolution (the Abbé Grégoire Survey), it was reported that at most one-sixth of the population spoke Standard French (SF) with any degree of fluency.

Chaudenson's two-step sociohistorical context for the genesis of FBCs rules out the possibility of a prior pidgin stage, developed either in situ or imported from Africa. Regarding the possible transplantation of a French-based pidgin learned by slaves in West Africa, in the absence of any concrete evidence, the burden of proof falls on its proponents. At most, during the early years of the establishment of plantocratic societies, newly arriving bossals might use highly deviant approximations of French that Chaudenson labels the beginner's jar-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gon (*le jargon des commençants*). Later-arriving bossals would be exposed to the local creole that by then would have acquired an autonomous norm. Unless they had subsequent opportunities to have close contacts with speakers of French, they would have no reason to think that the creole was a language distinct from French.

All theories of creolization based on an essential prior pidgin stage assume a preponderant linguistically diverse servile population early in the establishment of a plantation colony. However, Chaudenson offers convincing demographic data demonstrating that in most French plantocratic colonies, the European segment of the population of plantation islands remained statistically dominant for at least the first 30 years of the settlement. Although he remains a staunch defender of the polygenetic origin of FBCs and of the lack of mutual intelligibility between those of the IO and the Atlantic-Caribbean zone (ACZ), he identifies a small core lexicon shared by the two groups, the *vocabulaire des isles* "vocabulary of the islands." He adds that this points to administrative and commercial links between the two zones of the French colonial empire. Many sailors, traders, public officials, and some colonists who landed at Bourbon Island (present-day Reunion) and Isle de France (present-day Mauritius) had gained their first colonial experience in the Antilles. Additionally, one has to reckon with a certain degree of diffusion, at least within each zone. In a long-standing disagreement with Baker (1987), who claimed an independent genesis of Isle de France Creole, Chaudenson presents both demographic and linguistic evidence in support of his notion of at least partial diffusion: In terms of demographics, he cites the sending of experienced slaves from earlier developed Bourbon to jumpstart a fledgling plantation economy and, in terms of linguistics, he notes the uniquely shared structural features—for example, the incipient pluralizer *bane* (from French *une bande de* "a lot"). The transfer of technical expertise from older to newer colonies served to shorten the *habitation* stage and, because this transfer was accompanied by the importation of expert personnel who spoke the creole formed in the older colony, that variety influenced at least in part the endogenous variety that would develop in the newer territory. Thus, Mauritian Creole, the heir of Isle de France Creole, constitutes a second-generation creole. The varieties spoken in the Seychelles and Rodrigues Island based on Mauritian Creole are third-generation creoles. In the case of the islet of Saint-Barthélemy (St.-Bart), the local creole constitutes a second-generation one imported from Guadeloupe and Martinique or a third-generation one if it can be demonstrated that Guadeloupean and Martinican Creoles owe a considerable part of their structure to a variety imported from Saint-Kitts, the first French plantocratic colony in the Antilles.[9]

The crucial factor in Chaudenson's sociohistorical model is demographic: the relative proportion of speakers of the TL and alloglots. More specifically, the higher the proportion of the former, the less likely is the emergence of a creole. For Chaudenson, this explains the absence of Spanish-based creoles in Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Although plantation economies flour-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ished there, they were instituted much later than in the British and French insular New World colonies, after several centuries of the existence of fully integrated Spanish-speaking communities. In his preface, Mufwene supports this view with an account for the absence of a Portuguese-based creole in Brazil explained by differences in the nature of sugar plantations, despite the large demographic African influx. Unlike the large-scale agroindustrial establishment of the West Indies, smaller Brazilian plantations remained at the *habitation* stage during the formative period of the colony.

Chaudenson's sociohistorical model suggests that the plantocratic colonies were monolithic entities. However, the history of the establishment of a French colony in Louisiana suggests a more complex picture. As Klingler (2003) showed, that territory must be viewed as consisting of several subunits showing different social structures and, as a corollary, different mixes of alloglots and speakers of the TL. Although Louisiana remained essentially a *societé d'habitation* throughout French rule, in the first decades of the colony, a few large-scale plantations coexisted with small freeholds. On the other hand, Chaudenson's model gains support from the relative freedom of movement of plantation slaves, many of whom engaged in petty trade in New Orleans and thus interacted with TL speakers. This fact also suggests that the model needs to take into account the effect of the intermingling of slaves, freedmen, and Europeans (especially the transient sailors and soldiers) in the urban centers essential to the infrastructure of the *societé de plantation*.

THE NATURE OF TARGET INPUT: VERNACULAR FRENCH

A major weakness shared by creolistics and SLA studies consists of the lack of empirical research on the exact nature of the input available to the acquirers; as a result of this lack, researchers often arbitrarily select the standard variety of the TL as the target. As Chaudenson's exhaustive review of the morphosyntax of FBCs demonstrates, the structural distance between SF and vernacular and dialectal varieties of the language is considerable—in some instances, greater than between FBCs and vernacular varieties. In the case of FBCs, Chaudenson accounts for the reductionist choice of SF by the lack of knowledge of vernacular, everyday varieties of the language on the part of foreign creolists. That is undoubtedly partially true, but the problem is rooted in large part on the relative paucity of studies on nonstandard varieties as well as on the shortcut taken by creolists in the identification of both the superstrate and the substrate languages in creole genesis. Indeed, native speakers (NSs) of French are not exempt from this reductionist shortcut. On several occasions Chaudenson expresses his profound surprise at the choice of SF as the input in the development of Haitian Creole on the part of Lefebvre (1998), who is not only a NS of Quebec French (a variety containing more nonstandard features than metropolitan vernacular varieties) but who, more importantly, has conducted pioneering empirical studies on the vernacular form of her own dialect.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rigorous research on the *termimus a quo* of FBCs represents a signal contribution of Chaudenson's to creolistics and permeates *La créolisation*. His contention—substantiated by empirical studies (Calvet & Chaudenson, 1998; Chaudenson, Mougeon, & Beniak, 1993)—is that it can be reconstructed from the numerous available descriptions of diaspora varieties of French in the Americas and of French regional speech and local dialects. Of particular interest are those in surviving isolates that serve as reservoirs of features lost in current varieties exposed to the pressures from SF (Valdman, 1979, 2005a). The comparison of Mauritian Creole *mo pa pou dansé* "I will not dance" to SF *je ne danserai pas* leads one to the conclusion that creolization led to drastic restructuring involving a shift from the use of inflectional morphology to the use of function words and changes in the position of the semantically salient negator *pas*. The difference becomes less striking if the basis of comparison chosen is Quebec French *moi, ch'us pas pour danser*. Reference to the classic work on the periphrastic expression of tense and aspect in vernacular and dialectal varieties of French (Gougenheim, 1929) indicates that the verbal system of FBCs, which consists of a bare stem and preposed verb markers, derives from a wide variety of periphrastic constructions all of which occur in various overseas French dialects. In fact, some of these constructions are still attested in regional varieties in France, as is illustrated by a comparison of semantically matching forms of Haitian Creole and vernacular French that express progressive and future events, respectively: *m ap (pe) danse* and *je suis après danser* "I'm dancing;" *m a (ava, va) danse* and *je vas (vais) danser* "I'll dance." Chaudenson points out that this periphrastic future construction occurs even in a literary 17th-century text: *Rome s'en va renaître* "Rome will be reborn" by Corneille. Its French origin is reflected by its presence in all FBCs. In the nominal system, substratists claim an African origin for the postposition of the definite determiner *la* because it matches semantically equivalent forms found in Kwa languages of West Africa (Lefebvre, 1998; Sylvain, 1936/1979). All vernacular varieties of French—especially those of North America—exhibit the use of the deictic adverb *-là* "there" postposed to noun phrases containing the preposed definite determiner for emphasis: *l'oiseau là* "the bird." However, a structure identical to that of FBCs has been observed in the French of the Old Mines (Missouri) dialect (Carrière, 1937; Valdman, 2005a) as a variant of the SF construction *dans tas d'pierre-là* "in the pile of stones:" *m'as casser ta tête avec baton-là* "I'll break your head with the stick" versus *l'p'tsit sifflet* "the little whistle."

In addition to his broad knowledge of vernacular and dialectal varieties of French, Chaudenson brings to the identification of the *terminus a quo* of FBCs his fieldwork experience in St.-Bart (Calvet & Chaudenson, 1998). The linguistic situation of that tiny island has long remained an enigma. It holds the distinction of being one of the rare islands of the West Indies to be inhabited by a nearly exclusively White local population whose roots go back to the middle of the 17th century. The enigmatic aspect of the linguistic situation of St. Bart is that part of the population speaks a creole and the other a French

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dialect. Chaudenson explains this surprising linguistic division with reference to conditions on St.-Bart: Because the island did not provide the suitable ecological conditions for the establishment of a plantation economy, it remained at the *habitation* stage except for an attempt to introduce cultivation of cash crops on the windward part of the island in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Slaves were imported in that part of the island but left after emancipation. The White population of the windward area shifted to creole and, because of a high level of endogamy, it has maintained its linguistic distinctiveness.

The linguistic situation of St.-Bart informs research on FBCs in two important regards. First, of all the American vernacular varieties of French, the leeward St.-Bart dialect best reflects the colonial koinè that served as the TL for imported slaves; however, Chaudenson cautions that this dialect should not be viewed as a relic form of that koinè. Second, the total shift to the imported creole on the part of the windward population suggests that this language had become its exclusive means of communication and the symbol of its identity. There is considerable evidence of that role of FBCs in other former French colonies. In Louisiana, a significant proportion of Whites uses Louisiana Creole rather than Cajun French (Klingler, 2003), particularly in regions where poor Whites and Black slaves worked side by side. Additionally, as Chaudenson points out, White children on a plantation were placed in the care of slave nannies and interacted with Black playmates (for details on the Saint-Domingue and Louisiana situations, see Valdman, 2005b). In a sense, after their stabilization, FBCs became the lingua franca of French colonies. This situation reduced the servile population's access to French: On the one hand, it allowed for the internal evolution of the particular creole, but, on the other, it introduced a wide range of variation reflected today by the distinction between mesolectal and basilectal forms and the presence of relic forms reflecting earlier stages of the creole (Fattier, 2000; Valdman, 2004).

One aspect of the koneized colonial French that is not clearly delineated in *La créolisation* is whether the koneization process took place in the colonies or in France. An issue that divides specialists in North American French, especially Quebec French, and one on which Chaudenson touches somewhat (p. 187), is whether the relatively uniform variety of French that emerged in New France (present-day Quebec Province) derives from the contact between various dialects of northern France (Barbaud, 1984) or from a koinè not very divergent from the vernacular varieties used in urban centers and the harbors from which settlers embarked. In a recent article, Canac-Marquis and Poirier (2005) updated a notion first put forward by Faine (1939). After obtaining a description of Mauritian Creole, this self-learned Haitian linguist abandoned his initial theory of a Picard origin for Haitian Creole and posited the existence of a nautical dialect transported by settlers of the Indian Ocean and of the American plantocratic colonies. His main evidence was a large set of what he took to be nautical terms whose meaning was extended—for example, *amarrer* "to tie up a boat" > "to tie;" *haler* "to move a boat forward by pulling" > "to pull." This theory was recast more narrowly by Hull (1979), who

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

invoked a "maritime" French he located in the Atlantic harbors of Nantes and La Rochelle. Canac-Marquis and Poirier retraced the influence of French seafarers in the denomination of American fauna and flora beginning in the late 15th century and in the constitution of what Chaudenson, inspired by Arveiller (1963), calls the *vocabulaire des isles*, a lexicon containing many loanwords gleaned along the coasts of the Americas from Brazil to Newfoundland (e.g., the naming of mosquitoes *maringouin* from Tupi and *moutique* or *moustique* from Spanish). However, although they detailed the contribution of fishermen and sailors to the formation of the initial lexicon of overseas French varieties, they stressed that the phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features of their everyday speech were not restricted to seafarers but, instead, reflected the usage of ordinary speakers and constituted a precolonial koinè that they label *français populaire véhiculaire* (i.e., the everyday speech of ordinary folks).

SUBSTRATAL TRANSFER

Rightly, Chaudenson decries the inappropriate meaning assigned to the antonymous pair substrate/superstrate that creolistics adapted from the field of historical linguistics. In its original sense, the term *substratum* referred to the language of local populations undergoing language shift toward a language imported by a socially and politically dominant group. The *superstratum* was a newly imported language whose speakers, although politically dominant, were acquiring the previously imported language modified by speakers of the substratum. Starting with the base of Gallo-Roman—an approximation to Vulgar Latin initially acquired by the urbanized Gallic elite and then by all Gauls who interacted with them and Roman tradesmen and soldiers—Romanists refer to transfers from the local Gallic tongues that perdure as substratum items but changes induced from the languages of later arriving Germanic tribes that gained political hegemony as superstratum influence. From that perspective, in the formation of FBCs, there existed no substrate languages because, in the IO, the French colonists found uninhabited islands and, in the ACZ, the aboriginal populations had been previously eliminated by and large. If anything, it was French, approximative versions of which were being acquired by later-arriving alloglots, that constituted the substratum, and the African languages introduced massively after the formative period of the colonies that constituted the superstratum.[10]

Like most of his so-called superstratist colleagues, Chaudenson does not deny the influence of substrate language, but he poses severe constraints on explicatory resort to them. First, in castigating the appeal by many substratists to the "cafeteria" principle (which consists of attempting to derive arbitrarily particular features of creoles distinct from the putative TL input from any substrate language that shows them), he insists on a clear identification of a specific substrate language on the basis of sociohistorical data.[11] Thus, Sylvain's (1936/1979) and Lefebvre's (1993, 1998) selection of Kwa languages

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as primary sources of transfer is contradicted by Moreau de Saint-Méry's (1797/1958) dismissal of the demographic contribution of Gulf of Benin ports in favor of Bantu-speaking areas.[12]

In the case of heterogeneous servile populations, it must be further shown that speakers of the particular substrate language selected were either demographically or culturally dominant among their peers. For the FBCs of the ACZ, that is a challenging task given the ambiguity of the term *nation* used in accounts from the colonial period to describe slave groups. Chaudenson contends that such labels as *Arada*, assigned to speakers of Kwa languages, referred neither to ethnic nor to linguistic groups but instead to the region of embarkation in Africa. Second, transfer should be invoked only after attempts to relate apparently innovative features to the TL have failed. For instance, Taylor and Keller (1963) derived the Haitian Creole word *moun* [mun] "person" from *mun-tu* "human being," a word in Kikongo, a Bantu language. A more plausible origin is the French word *monde* "people," pronounced [mõn], appearing in isolation or in compounds (*petit monde* "child," *grand monde* "adult") in a wide variety of French dialects, particularly those in North America. Third, at least for the FBCs (because they are found in two geographically distant zones and have developed with different substrate inputs) comparison must be performed across the two groups of creole (for a wide variety of West African languages in the ACZ and chiefly Malagasy in the IO) in order to discount the influence of the shared TL or common restructuring processes.

For Chaudenson, transfer from the substrates is most likely at the phonological level and at areas of the morphosyntax where the TL and the substrates converge. In a phrasing reminiscent of Andersen's (1990, p. 62) transfer to somewhere principle, he states that morphosyntactic transfers cannot force their way into interlinguistic systems; the TL must contain some homologous feature. At the phonological level, the application of the third constraint mentioned previously—namely comparison between ACZ and IO creoles—identifies the only uncontroversial case of substrate transfer: the replacement of palatals by corresponding sibilants (*manger* "to eat" > *manzé*; *changer* "to change" > *sanzé*) in the IO attributable to transfer from Malagasy. However, Chaudenson points out that this opposition is one of the unstable areas of the French phonological system, as attested by alternations between members of the two sets of phonemes in vernacular and dialectal varieties (e.g., *chaze-femme* "midwife" alternating with *sage-femme*). However, he fails to consider prosodics and intonation that constitute levels of phonological structure where extensive transfer is likely. Casual observation of the speech of English- or French-speaking West Indians shows striking similarities in these two central areas of phonology that remain inadequately explored in all creoles.

Substrate influence is relatively minor at the lexical level. Chaudenson indicates that substrate transfer accounts for about only 7% of the lexicon of Reunion Creole. A sampling of Haitian Creole shows an even lower proportion, about 4%. Calquing is one lexicogenetic process where substrate influence is likely, but Chaudenson provides several examples of the failure of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

substratists to look at the TL carefully enough before claiming transfer. For example, Parkvall (2000) attributed compounds such as *caca nez* "snot" (nose dirt) and *caca yeux* "rheum" (eye dirt) to African languages, yet these also occur in the IO. The choice of *doigt de pied* "toe" (finger of the foot) and *trou de nez* "nostril" (hole of the nose) is even less felicitous given that these are widely used in vernacular French.

By applying his constraints at the morphosyntactic level, Chaudenson identifies several cases of transfer in the pronominal system. Haitian Creole is the only FBC that has merged the 1st- and 2nd-person plural pronouns in the direction of the former: *nou* [nũ] from French *nous* [nu]. The presence of the 2nd-person *unu* in English-based Jamaican Creole points to an African transfer. He cautiously suggests that the merger of the 2nd- and 3rd-person pronouns to *zot* (from French *vous-autres* "y'all" [2nd person plural] and *eux-autres* "they") in the IO is facilitated by phonological similarities between corresponding forms in Malagasy: 2nd-person *ianareo*, *anareo* versus 3rd-person *izi ireo*, *azy ireo*.

There are numerous cases at the morphosyntactic level of both broad and specific convergences between the TL and substrate languages. For the former type, in the analytical expression of verbal time and aspect by combinations of preposed independent forms and invariables, the TL (the colonial vernacular koinè, not present-day SF) and African languages concord, as do autoregulatory and SLA processes. An interesting case of convergence is provided by the interrogative adverb *kofè* "why." Harris (1973, p. 100) traced the semantic model for that form to the combinations "why" + "make" of Ibo or Yoruba, which is also reflected in other Atlantic English-based creoles: *wa mek* in Jamaican Creole and *mek* in Gullah. However, he also found the combination *quoi* "why" + *faire* "make" in the western French dialect Saintongeais and in Cajun French: *Quoi faire vous dit ça?* "Why do you say that?," but he decides on a transfer from these African languages. Whereas substratists are prompt to stop looking as soon as they find a substrate influence in such cases, Chaudenson and other superstratists would dig further into sources related to the TL. In the final analysis, Chaudenson considers the structure of substrate languages as serving as a filtering device that focused the attention of alloglots on certain features of the TL. For example, the fact that their L1s express verbal tense and aspect with preposed free forms led African alloglots to select French auxiliaries and modals rather than highly diverse inflected forms, which also occurred in the TL.

CREOLIZATON PROCESSES

Autoregulation

For Chaudenson, the term *autoregulation* subsumes a set of processes that lead to linguistic variants that are the precursors of diachronic change. Variation does not affect all features of French but only certain sensitive zones

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whose aggregate he labels *français zéro*. As it were, variation is swept under the rug by such institutions as the school system and the French Academy, whose role is to institute a uniform norm, particularly in the written mode. He acknowledges a debt to Frei (1929/1971), whose classic description of variable tendencies in vernacular, lower-class French (aptly entitled *La grammaire des fautes*) identified five processes triggering variation in spoken usage: assimilation, differentiation leading to greater clarity, economy, invariability or regularization, and expressivity.[13] In the case of French, autoregulation is most clearly observable in varieties exported to the 17th- and 18th-century overseas colonies. Separated from metropolitan institutions that reinforced exposure to SF and not sufficiently evolved to develop a cultural infrastructure that would relay the standard norm, overseas colonies provided an optimal context for the unfettered operation of autoregulation.

As discussed in an earlier section entitled The Nature of Target Input: Vernacular French, settlers in the overseas colonies used vernacular varieties that showed a certain degree of uniformity. However, these contained variants emanating from regional dialects of northern (*oïl*) French. For example, dialects in the northern and western regions of France from which most settlers originated show two different present tense systems. In the first and most widely distributed, verbal person is expressed by subject pronouns, except for the 2nd-person plural. In the second system, characteristic of the regions bordering the Atlantic Ocean and best reflected in the Acadian dialects of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the opposition of singular versus plural in the 3rd person tends to be expressed by inflection. Compare the present indicative paradigm for *chanter* "to sing," shown in (1).

(1) a. System I

je chante	/ʃãt/
tu chantes	/ʃãt/
il, elle chante	/ʃãt/
on chante	/ʃãt/
vous aut' chante	/ʃãt/
ils (eux aut') chante	/ʃãt/

b. System II

je chante	/ʃãt/
tu chantes	/ʃãt/
il (i), elle (a, al) chante	/ʃãt/
je chantons	/ʃãtõ/
vous chantez	/ʃãte/
ils chantont	/ʃãtõ/

Alternations between these two systems still exist in Acadia and Louisiana.[14] Differences of that sort tended to be leveled out and the vernacular colonial French that served as input in the process of creolization constituted a koinè.

In his survey of the morphosyntax of FBCs, Chaudenson provides a variety of examples of autoregulatory processes that operate in the *français zéro* zones

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that he uses to counter proposals of substrate transfer. The evolution of the demonstrative determiners illustrates the operation of processes leading to invariability and salience. First, invariability led to the elimination of the distinction between near and remote deixis, expressed in SF by the contrast between *-ci* and *-là*: *ce livre-ci* "this book" versus *ce livre-là* "that book." Chaudenson notes a universal tendency to eliminate the distinction in favor of the form expressing remoteness. Indeed, in American varieties of French, *-là* tends to eliminate *-ci*, and in dialects such as Acadian that preserve the distinction, nearness is marked by a more salient form, *isit*. Second, the preposed demonstrative determiner inflected for gender and number in SF is replaced in vernacular varieties by an invariable phonologically reduced form: *ce garçon* versus *c'te garçon* "this boy," and *cette fille* versus *c'te fille* "this girl" (SF and vernacular variants, respectively). The postposed *-là*, optional in SF, becomes obligatory and carries the deictic force; in some varieties—for example Cajun French—it alternates with or is even reinforced by a second deictic form derived from the indefinite pronoun *ça* "this, that:" *cet argent-ça* "this money," *dans ces temps-ça-là* "in those days." Interestingly, the same pattern occurs in child L1 acquisition: *ce so(l)dat cassé là* "that broken soldier," *le ga(r)son-ça* "this boy" (Grégoire, 1937). The fact that postposed demonstratives occur in Kwa languages (e.g., Ewe's *-sia* singular and *-si-a-wo* plural cited by Sylvain, 1936/1979) attests at best to a convergence between the input and the substrate, particularly given that the form *-sa-la* occurs in both the ACZ and the IO; for the latter, any direct influence from West African languages is extremely doubtful.

Chaudenson states that autoregulation operated on French chiefly at the *habitation* period (p. 182).[15] This is an assertion whose validation by empirical evidence would be problematic, for it is most unlikely that chroniclers who incorporated samples of the nascent and established FBCs would deem it interesting to note down samples of French speech they considered deviant relative to SF. Vernacular variant features were so abundant that they were beyond their perceptive threshold. Because support for autoregulation is provided mainly from French dialects and vernacular American varieties, most of which did not become acquisitional targets for servile alloglots, it would appear that that complex of processes also operated earlier both in France and in the individual colonies before the importation of alloglots.

SLA Processes

The link between the formation of creoles and adult SLA was established, at least informally, during the emergence of the field of pidgin and creole studies (creolistics) in the late 19th century.[16] The issues discussed by modern researchers in this field (e.g., the relative contribution of transfer from previously acquired languages as opposed to universal linguistic and cognitive processes or whether the input consisted of the unmodified TL or a simplified

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

version of it [foreigner talk]) were already the subject of debate during the second half of the 19th century among the pioneers of the field: Adam (1883), Coelho (1880), Hesseling (1979), and Schuchardt (1883). Although studies of pidgins and creoles were revived in the 1950s and the 1960s after being somewhat dormant for more than a half century (Hall, 1953, 1966; Taylor, 1960; Whinnom, 1965), it was not until the 1970s that the link between creolistics and SLA was treated in an explicit manner. A powerful stimulus for this reorientation of creolistics was the concomitant emergence of the notion of the approximative interlinguistic system pioneered by Corder (1967) and Selinker (1972) and its application to unguided or natural SLA by children in bilingual education programs in the United States (Krashen, 1981) and migrant workers (*gastarbeiter*) in Germany (Clahsen, Meisel, & Pienemann, 1982).

For Chaudenson, SLA strategies are crucial in creolization, which takes place at the plantation stage according to his two-stage model. In fact, he proposes a terminological innovation that allows encompassing processes of both L1 and L2 acquisition. He coins the hyperonym *appropriation*, which subsumes L1 acquisition and what he terms L2 learning. Creolists like Bickerton defined creolization as a particular type of L1 acquisition, whereas substratists implicitly define it as a type of SLA in which the source language, that which the learners bring to the creolization process, plays a dominant role. Accordingly, Chaudenson deplores the relative neglect of SLA research on the part of substratists. He specifically mentions the European Science Foundation multinational project involving the long-term longitudinal observation of unguided SLA, which, incidentally, is in sharp contrast to the bulk of American research that has focused inordinately on guided SLA with cross-sectional or pseudo-longitudinal designs.[17] The usefulness of the cover term appropriation has the advantage of revealing parallel, but not identical, developments in L1 acquisition and SLA. Common to both is a stripped-down basic language characterizing early approximations in SLA—for example, the expression of time and aspect with temporal and calenderic adverbs.[18] Successive approximation will be less context dependent and develop more complex morphosyntactic devices.

In his analysis of the development of morphosyntax, Chaudenson appeals to both types of appropriation. FBCs exhibit two different systems of possessive determiners. Louisiana, French Guyana, and IO use preposed forms reflecting corresponding French forms (e.g., *mo papa* [mon père] "my father"), whereas Haitian and Lesser Antilles creoles employ postposition reflecting French tonic pronouns (e.g., *papa a mwen*, *papa mwen* [le père à moi] "my father"). Citing Grégoire's (1937) classic study based on the acquisition of French by his two sons and that of his own granddaughters, Chaudenson shows that L1 acquirers replace preposed forms with more salient postposed ones introduced by various prepositions: *la couyè à bébé* "baby's spoon," *la crème de moi* "my cream," *des parents de moi* "parents of mine." The occurrence of an apparently intermediate form featuring both prepositions and postpositions, such as Louisiana Creole *mon père à moi* "my father," as well as related

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vernacular constructions such as *le père à Jean* "John's father," suggests a two-way evolution from an early variant: In Haitian and Lesser Antilles creoles, less phonologically and semantically salient preposed forms were replaced by more salient ones, whereas the other FBCs retained the original preposed ones. Another example of the focus of L2 acquirers on salient forms is the replacement of the semantically void prepositions *à* and *de* that function as syntactic operators in favor of more semantically fuller and phonologically more substantial ones. Chaudenson cites, among others, the replacement of *à* by *pour* "for" or *avèk* "with" in Reunion Creole (*zégui pour koud* [aiguille à coudre] "sewing needle," *pou mwen* [à moi] "mine") and in Secheylles (*i di sa avèk sa zom* [à l'homme] "he said that to the man"). He also cites the replacement of *avec* "with" by *ensemble* "together" in Haitian Creole as well as the use of zero preposition in Reunion Creole *sapo la pay* (chapeau de paille) "straw hat."

Another important process identified by Chaudenson involves the elimination of marked features. From a typological perspective, front rounded vowels are marked. As teachers of French are too well aware, they constitute one of the most difficult aspects of the phonological system to acquire. In all FBCs, they are merged with unrounded corresponding phonemes.

Internal Restructuring

Differences among FBCs that result in the lack of mutual intelligibility even among those in the same zone stem from different intakes from relatively similar TL input and especially from independent internal evolutions occurring under different ecological conditions—for example, the languages with which they came into contact. Another important variable is the duration and intensity of contact with French. For example, Louisiana White speakers of French were as numerous as African slaves throughout the colonial period and several demographic influxes—Acadians in the late 18th century and Napoleonic refugees in the early 19th who maintained their respective variety of French well into the 20th century—have contributed to the continued presence of the original TL. As a result, like its Reunion congener, Louisiana Creole is closer structurally to vernacular varieties of French than Haitian Creole, although it does share many features with it, such as the verb markers and the postposed definite determiner and pluralizer.

As Chaudenson points out, an understanding of the internal restructuring of FBCs has been hampered by the failure to take variation into account and the resulting arbitrary selection of variants that support particular theories of genesis. A moot area in comparative research involves the degree of agglutination of etymological determiners in the various creoles. Because of their low saliency, French determiners were incorporated either fully, as in *diri* (from *du riz*) "rice," or in part, as in *zwazo* (from *les* or *des oiseaux*) "birds." For example, Baker (1984, p. 112) listed 664 cases of full agglutinations in Mauritian Creole versus only 113 in Haitian Creole and 180 in the most basilectal

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

variety of Louisiana Creole—that is, the variety most distant from French found in the parish of Pointe Coupée (Klingler, 2003, p. 160). By comparison, Neumann (1985) reported only 82 cases in the variety spoken in the Atchafalaya Basin area, which has experienced more contact with Cajun French. Klingler suggested that the large discrepancy reported by Baker between Mauritian Creole and the ACZ creoles might be a function of the extent to which variation was taken into account. What complicates comparative studies in the case of this feature is that agglutinated material was reanalyzed in later stages and the agglutinated syllable reanalyzed to carry new semantic functions. For example, in Haitian Creole, the reflex from French *le* "the-SING" or *les* "the-PL" retains the original use with calenderic nouns, but it has split into two distinct morphemes: One occurs as the variants *le/lè* with days of the week—*le/lè dimanch* "on Sundays"—and the other as *le* with days of the month—*le 29 avril* "the 29th of April." In some cases, the form containing the agglutination takes on a more abstract meaning than the variant without the agglutination: *bank* "bank" versus *la bank* "banking as an institution." In Dominican Creole, the putative agglutination *la* appears to have taken on a progressive and durative meaning: Compare *yo fẽ yon bèl chas* "they had a good hunt" with *yo lachas* "they're hunting" and *i ka pase jounen i ka sèpe* "he spends his day cutting grass" with *tout la jounen i ka sèpe* "he spent the entire day cutting grass."

The study of internal restructuring depends crucially on knowledge of the earliest documented stages of the particular creole. Unlike some creolists who claim that European travelers or local White (creole) observers were likely to distort authentic speech, Chaudenson puts faith in the accuracy of early texts and has edited a collection of material documenting the earliest attested stages of IO creoles (Chaudenson, 1981). Unfortunately, for the ACZ, there are no extensive texts providing information for the formative stage of the creole. For example, it is not until the middle of the 19th century, more than a century after it emerged, that texts appear that permit the reconstruction of the structure of Louisiana Creole. Attestations from the early colonial period are fragmentary and, at best, reveal highly deviant approximations of French, what Chaudenson calls the *jargon des commençants*. The situation is better for Haiti. The first document that might reflect a crystallized Saint-Domingue Creole, the ancestor of Haitian Creole, is an intriguing manuscript containing a Creole adaptation of the Passion of Jesus Christ, *La Passion de Notre Seigneur selon Saint-Jean en Langage Nègre*. Hazaël-Massieux (1994), who had first access to the manuscript and devoted several years to elucidating its origin, placed it between 1750 and 1760, about a century after the original settlement of Guadeloupe, Martinique, and Saint-Domingue. He assumed that it was authored by a Jesuit missionary priest or group of missionaries whose identity remains problematic.[19] Comparison with a wide variety of texts published toward the end of the Saint-Domingue colonial period (Chanlatte, 1818; Ducœurjoly, 1802) reveals that the *Passion* text provides clear evidence of the crystallization of an FBC in the ACZ; it also shows variants, some of which led to dialect differentiation and some of which persist today. An example of the second type of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

variants are the three alternants of present-day Haitian Creole of the definite future verb marker: *va*, *ava*, *a*. These occur in a series of dialogues designed to teach Saint-Domingue Creole to future plantation owners (Ducœurjoly, p. 292): *m va* ale "I will go," *lè m a afini m av achte on lòt m a mèt ladan* "when I will finish, I'll buy another to put inside."

CONCLUSION

La créolisation offers the reader an original interpretation of creolization buttressed by solid and broadly ranging empirical evidence. It differs from the other influential theories of the last three decades (Bickerton, 1981; Lefebvre, 1993, 1998; McWhorter, 1997) by its grounding in the reconstruction of the sociohistorical context in which creoles were spawned. In a sense, this book's objectives are modest, for they limit themselves to accounting for one set of creoles and not the totality of languages that have received that label. Yet, FBCs are central to an understanding of the processes that lead to creolization, for not only do they have by far the largest number of speakers but they are located in widely separated parts of the world. Moreover, although they are the product of essentially the same economic and social factors, the demographic groups involved in their original formation and subsequent development differ considerably. This fact facilitates comparative research necessary to tease out the relative contribution of the TL and the languages of those of the populations who transformed that input into a linguistic tool capable of meeting all of their linguistic needs. For Chaudenson, FBCs are autonomous entities that, even in each of the two zones where they are spoken, are not mutually intelligible and are evolving in different directions. In addition to the original two-stage model for creolization that it proposes, *La créolisation* stresses the importance of a precise identification and description of the *terminus a quo*, the TL upon which creolization processes operated. Operating primarily on materials from vernacular varieties of French undergoing koneization, processes of autoregulation and SLA found in other situations of language contact and appropriation led to autonomous systems that—after their initial crystallization—evolved in different directions.

However, if FBCs did not come "out of Africa," the convergences between semantically and morphosyntactic congruent features of the TL and the languages of the servile alloglots show a considerable effect of the languages they brought over from Africa. However, that effect is subtler than that assumed by substratists, especially those that posit total relexification. It is therefore reductionist to paint substratists like Chaudenson and most of the specialists of FBCs—this writer included—as deniers of the influence of Africa on FBCs of the ACZ. Perhaps the best—and subtlest—generalization offered for the effect of French and African languages in the formation of creoles of the ACZ was that offered by the eminent Martinican writer Aimé Césaire: "Le créole

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

est une langue dont le corps est français mais l'âme africaine."[20] He left it to creolists to argue about what the body and the soul of a language are.

Written in a style that has made Chaudenson an engaging speaker and a redoubtable debater, peppered with references to French literature and original phrasing, *La créolisation* will delight connoisseurs of good French prose who appreciate expository writing that avoids the turgid nature of academic jargon. His witty barbs and trenchant comments will also be appreciated by all readers except the substratist targets of his criticisms. The absence of indexes and occasional inconsistencies in the citation of references within the text contrast with the rich documentation and the breadth of the bibliography. However, these minor infelicities, attributable in large part to the less than rigorous editing of the publisher (L'Harmattan) do not detract from the signal and original contribution of the author to the field of creolistics. It is hoped that some mainline American or British publisher will commission a translation of *La créolisation* and make available in a better edited format to the wide audience it deserves what will surely stand as the classic work on FBCs.

NOTES

1. The *doctorat d'état*, unlike the American Ph.D., was conceived as a scholar's major mature work that qualified the holder for a position as *professeur* (full professor) in the national French university system. It has been superseded by a degree equivalent to the Ph.D. but followed by a presentation of the professorship candidate's sum of works defended formally in the same manner as the former *doctorat d'état*, the *habilitation*.

2. Among Chaudenson's article-length writings in English are Chaudenson (1977, 1986). A major publication presented to an international readership, his review article of Bickerton's *Roots of Language*, appeared in this journal (1982).

3. In my first monograph on FBC (Valdman, 1978, p. 386), I made it crystal clear that there exists a structural break between these languages and French and that Haitian Creole represents an autonomous linguistic variety. "Mais c'est précisément sur le plan morphosyntaxique, le plan central d'une langue que se situe une rupture structurale qui fait du créole une langue à part entière et non pas un dialecte du français [But it is precisely on the level of morphosyntax, the central level of a language, that there occurs a structural break which makes Creole a full-fledged language and not a dialect of French]." The same view was expressed in the Valdman (1983) publication cited in McWorter and Parkvall (2002).

4. The original follows:

> Les créoles français, nés de la colonisation des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, résultent, dans le contexte socio-historique de la plantation esclavagiste alimentée en main-d'œuvre par des populations immigrées linguistiquement hétérogènes, de l'appropriation non guidée des variétés approximatives d'un français, déjà koneisé durant la phase antérieure de société d'habitation. La créolisation est donc, en fait, un phénomène exceptionnel dans la mesure où, dans des conditions socio-historiques et sociolinguistiques spécifiques (plantations à main-d'œuvre immigrée) ont été mis en œuvre, hors de toute contrainte socio-culturelle et de toute pression normative, des processus linguistiques (essentiellement l'autorégularisation et les stratégies d'appropriation), qui se manifestent dans bien d'autres circonstances, à d'autres degrés, pour les langues en cause, en l'occurrence le français.

5. Whereas Bickerton posited a native-bred pidgin, McWhorter (1997, 1998) proposed that the creoles that developed in the Caribbean basin were evolved forms of pidgins transported from the coast of West Africa to the various European plantation colonies.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6. Bickerton qualified his claim by specifying demographic conditions for the genesis of creoles that involves a total rupture of transmission of the target language (here, referring to prototypical creoles): He proposed that the proportion of the TL speakers must be quite low, 20% of the overall population. It is clear that, because they do not conform to this demographic pattern, the bioprogram theory does not apply to FBCs.

7. A closer reading of Sylvain (1936/1979) reveals that in fact she is a proponent of only partial transfer. She traced many morphosyntactic features of Haitian Creole to French.

8. The term *alloglot* refers to the imported African slaves, not all non-NSs of French. In some colonies, some of the Europeans were foreigners—for example, some of the Germans and Alsatians who were persuaded to settle in Louisiana. Also, Whites from France had limited competence in either SF or French vernacular varieties excluding local dialects (*patois*).

9. The second-generation nature of Guadeloupean and Martinican creoles is questionable. Hazaël-Massieux (1991) identified Saint-Kitts (Saint-Christophe), where D'Esnanbuc and de Roissey established the first French Caribbean settlement in 1627, as the focal point for the genesis of New World FBCs. Settlements were established in Guadeloupe and Martinique only about 10 years later. Thus, according to Chaudenson's model, that time interval was insufficient for the establishment of a creologenetic plantation economy. Despite an influx of refugees from Saint-Domingue from 1790 to 1810, who, with their slaves, comprised 25% of the population, there is no evidence that Saint-Domingue Creole had a major effect on Louisiana Creole, which must be considered endogenous and not a second-generation creole (Klingler, 2003).

10. Because of their general use in creolistics and in the SLA research literature that links the two fields, after this clarification, the terms *substrate* and *superstrate* will be retained.

11. For a detailed discussion of the use of transfer in creolistics, see Mufwene (1990).

12. Specifically, Moreau de Saint-Méry (1797/1958) stated: "Bénin donne peu de nègres à Saint-Domingue; les nègres les plus communs sont ceux de la Côte de Congo et D'Angole [(the area of) Benin provides few Negroes to Saint-Domingue; the more numerous Negroes are those from the Congo and the Angola coast" (p. 52)]. Jean-Jacques Dessalines, the leader of the Haitian Revolution and considered the founder of an independent Haitian republic, was a Congo and town (vs. plantation) slave.

13. Frei's data were, in a sense, indirect. They were abstracted from letters written during World War I by French prisoners of war and their family members that transited via the Swiss Red Cross.

14. Some of those French-speaking regions were settled by Acadians, but it is the more regularized System I that is more extensively distributed. In fact, it is not uncommon to find extensive free variation between the two systems in certain areas (Rottet, 2001).

15. La phase essentielle de l'autorégulation est celle qui s'exerce dans la période d'habitation et elle concerne le français lui-même.

16. Coelho (1880, p. 138), the early creolist who actually collected empirical data, declared:

> The Romance and creole dialects, Indo-Portuguese, and all the similar formations, represent the first stage or stages in the acquisition of a foreign language by people that speak or spoke another. . . . They owe their origin to the operation of psychological or physiological laws that are everywhere the same, and not to the influence of the former languages of the people among whom these dialects are found.

17. Many putative longitudinal studies typically involve guided SLA in which experimental and control groups are not directly observed. Their acquisition of particular TL features is inferred from tests given periodically over periods that might be as short as several weeks.

18. Chaudenson credits the notion of basic system to Klein and Perdue (1997). However, that notion was put forward much earlier by Jespersen (1921), Ferguson (1971), and Corder (1978). The basic system refers to cognitive universals less specific than Bickerton's (1981) bioprogram or Chomskian Universal Grammar. According to Corder, the basic system is available in all types of language appropriation: L1 acquisition, SLA, and pidginization as well as in the production of foreigner talk. Corder interpreted creolization and the evolution of approximative systems in SLA as the complexification of the basic system in response to increased linguistic needs.

19. The *Passion* text exhibits structural features that occur in both present-day Lesser Antilles and Haitian Creole. The following excerpt contains the progressive marker *ka* (qu'à) of the Lesser Antilles and the postposed pluralizer *yo* (*ïo*) characteristic of Saint-Domingue Creole. Note, too, that unrounding of marked front rounded vowels was an early feature of the incipient creole.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> *Pendant ïo té qu'a palé comme ça, ïou camarade dans mitan ïo tous la té dis faire macé avec pères jouifs pour quimber Jesi ba ïo tous.*
> "While they were speaking in this way, a comrade among them decided [said] to make a deal with the Jewish priests to seize Jesus and to beat all of them [the apostles]."

20. "Creole is a language whose body is French but whose soul is African." Statement made at the 1985 annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of French in Martinique.

REFERENCES

Adam, L. (1883). *Les idiomes négro-aryens et malayo-aryen: Essai d'hybridologie linguistique*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Alleyne, M. (1980). *Comparative Afro-American: An historic-comparative study of the English-based Afro-American dialects of the New World*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Press.

Andersen, R. (1990). Models, processes, principles, and strategies: Second language acquisition inside and outside the classroom. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 45–68). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Arveiller, R. (1963). *Contribution à l'étude des termes de voyage en français (1505–1722)*. Paris: Éditions D'Artrey.

Baker, P. (1984). Agglutinated French articles in Creole French: Their evolutionary significance. *Te Reo, 27*, 89–129.

Baker, P. (1987). Combien y a-t-il eu de genèses créoles à base lexicale française? *Etudes Créoles*, *10*, 60–76.

Barbaud, P. (1984). *Le choc des patois en Nouvelle-France*. Sillery, Canada: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Bickerton, D. (1981). *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Press.

Boretsky, N. (1983). *Kreolsprachen Substrate und Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Otto Harrassowitz.

Calvet, L.-J., & Chaudenson, R. (1998). *Saint-Barthélemy: Une énigme linguistique*. Paris: Didier-Erudition.

Canac-Maquis, S., & Poirier, C. (2005). Origine commune des français d'Amérique du Nord: Le témoignage du lexique. In A. Valdman, J. Auger, & D. Piston-Hatlen (Eds.), *Le Français en Amérique du Nord: État présent* (pp. 517–538). Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Carrière, J.-M. (1937). *Tales from the French folk-lore of Missouri*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.

Chanlatte, J. (Comte de Rosiers). (1818). *L'entrée du Roi en sa capitale en janvier 1818*. Cap Haïtian, Haiti: Imprimerie royale de Sans-Souci.

Chaudenson, R. (1974). *Le lexique du parler créole de la Réunion* (Vols. 1–2). Paris: Champion.

Chaudenson, R. (1977). Toward the reconstruction of the social matrix of creole languages. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *Pidgin and Creole linguistics* (pp. 259–276). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Chaudenson, R. (1981). *Textes créoles anciens (La Réunion et Ile Maurice): Comparaison et essai*. Hamburg, Germany: Buske.

Chaudenson, R. (1982). [Review of the book *Roots of Language*]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *5*, 82–102.

Chaudenson, R. (1986). And they had to speak anyway . . . Acquisition and creolization of French. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *The Fergusonian impact* (Vol. 1) (pp. 69–82). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chaudenson, R. (1992). *Des îles, des hommes, des langues: essai sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Chaudenson, R. (With Mufwene, S.). (2001). *Creolization of language and culture*. (S. Pargman, Trans.). London: Routledge.

Chaudenson, R., Mougeon, R., & Beniak, E. (1993). *Vers une étude pandialectale de la variation en français*. Paris: Didier-Edition.

Clahsen, H., Meisel, J. M., & Pienemann, M. (1982). *Deutsch als Zweisprache: Der Spracherwerb ausländischer Arbeiter*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Coelho, F. A. (1880). Os dialectos românicosou neolatinos na África, Ásia e América. *Boletim da Sociedad de Geografia de Lisboa*, *2*, 129–196.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*, 161–169.

Corder, S. P. (1978). "Simple codes" and the source of the second language learner's initial heuristic hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *1*, 1–10.

Ducoeurjoly, S. J. (1802). *Manuel des habitants de Saint Domingue*. Paris: Lenoir.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Faine, J. (1937). *Philologie créole: Etudes historiques et étymologiques sur la langue créole d'Haïti*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Imprimerie de l'Etat.
Faine, J. (1939). *Le créole dans l'univers: Etudes comparatives des parlers français-créole. 1 Le Mauricien*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Imprimerie de l'Etat.
Fattier, D. (2000). *Contribution à l'étude de la genèse d'un créole: L'atlas linguistique d'Haïti, cartes et commentaires* (Vols. 1–6). Villeneuve d'Ascq, France: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
Ferguson, C. A. (1971). Absence of the copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk, and pidgins. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (pp. 141–150). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Frei, H. (1971). *La grammaire des fautes*. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints (Reprinted from 1929, Paris: P. Geuthner).
Gougenheim, G. (1929). *Etude sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Grégoire, A. (1937). *L'apprentissage du langage: les deux premières années*. Paris: Alcan.
Hazaël-Massieux, G. (1991). Le guyanais et les créoles atlantiques à base française. *Etudes Créoles*, *12*, 95–110.
Hazaël-Massieux, G. (1994). La Passion de Notre Seigneur en langage nègre. *Etudes Créoles*, *17*, 10–27.
Hall, R. A., Jr. (1953). *Haitian Creole: Grammar—texts—vocabulary*. Philadelphia: American Folklore Society (Memoirs 43).
Hall, R. A., Jr. (1958). Creole languages and genetic relationships. *Word*, *14*, 367–373.
Hall, R. A., Jr. (1966). *Pidgins and creole languages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Harris, R. M. (1973). "*Cofé*" Pourquoi? Un africanisme parmi d'autres en créole louisianais. *Revue de Louisiane*, *2*, 54–102.
Hesseling, D.C. (1979). *On the origin and formation of creoles: A miscellany of articles* (T. L. Markey & T. L. Roberge, Eds. and Trans.). Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Press.
Holm, J. (1988). *Pidgins and Creoles: Vol. 1. Theory and structure*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Hull, A. (1979). Affinités entre les variétés du français. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *Le français hors de France* (pp. 165–180). Paris: Champion.
Hymes, D. (Ed.). (1971). *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Jespersen, O. (1921). *Language: Its nature, development, and origin*. New York: Holt.
Klein, W., & Perdue, C. (1997). The "basic" variety. *Second Language Research, 13*, 301–347.
Klingler, T. (2003). *If I could turn my tongue like that: The creole language of Pointe Coupée Parish, Louisiana*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
Lefebvre, C. (1993). The role of relexification and syntactic reanalysis in Haitian Creole: Methodological aspects of a research program. In S. Mufwene (Ed.), *Africanisms in Afro-American varieties* (pp. 254–279). Athens: University of Georgia Press.
Lefebvre, C. (1998). *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar: The case of Haitian Creole*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
McWhorter, J. (1997). *Towards a new model of creole genesis*. Bern: Peter Lang.
McWhorter, J. (1998). Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class. *Language*, *74*, 788–818.
McWhorter, J., & Parkvall, M. (2002). Pas tout à fait du français: Une étude créole. *Etudes Créoles*, *25*, 179–231.
Mongin, R. P. J. (1984). Lettres du R. P. Jean Mongin: L'évangélisation des esclaves au XVIIe siècle. *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire de la Guadeloupe*, *61–62*. (M. Chatillon, Ed.). (Original work published 1679).
Moreau de Saint-Méry, M. (1958). *Description topographique, physique, politique et historique de la partie françois de l'Ile de Saint-Domingue* (Vols. 1–3). (B. Maurel & E. Taillemite, Eds.). Paris: Société de l'histoire des colonies françaises (Reprinted from 1797, Paris: Dupont).
Mufwene, S. (1990). Transfer and the substrate hypothesis in creolistics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *12*, 1–23.
Mufwene, S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Neumann, I. (1985). *Le créole de Breaux Bridge, Louisiane*. Hamburg, Germany: Buske.
Parkvall, M. (2000). *Out of Africa*. London: Battlebridge.
Rottet, K. J. (2001). *Language shift in the coastal marshes of Louisiana*. Bern: Peter Lang.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Schuchardt, H. (1883). Über das Melanesoenglische. *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historisch Klasse des kaiserlischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, *5*, 151–161.
Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review in Applied Linguistics*, *10*, 209–232.
Sylvain, S. (1979). *Le créole haïtien: morphologie et syntaxe*. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints (Reprinted from 1936, Wetteren, Belgium: DeMeester).
Taylor, D. R. (1960). Language shift or changing relationships? *International Journal of American Linguistics*, *16*, 155–161.
Taylor, D. R., & Keller, H. E. (1963). Remarks on the lexicon of Dominican French Creole. *Romance Philology*, *16*, 402–415.
Valdman, A. (1978). *Le créole: Structure, statut et origine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Valdman, A. (1979). Créolisation, français populaire et le parler des isolats francophones d'Amérique du Nord. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *Le français hors de France* (pp. 181–197). Paris: Champion.
Valdman, A. (1983). Creolization and second language acquisition. In R. Andersen (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization as a second language acquisition* (pp. 212–243). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Valdman, A. (Ed.). (2002). La créolisation: à chacun sa vérité [Special issue]. *Etudes Créoles*, *25 (1)*.
Valdman, A. (2004). L'influence de la norme émergente du Créole Haïtien sur les variétés vernaculaires régionales. In A. Coveney, M.-A. Hintze, & C. Sanders (Eds.), *Variation et francophonie: mélanges* (pp. 37–51). Paris: L'Harmattan.
Valdman, A. (2005a). Le français vernaculaire des isolats américains. In A. Valdman, J. Auger, & D. Piston-Hatlen (Eds.), *Le Français en Amérique du Nord: état présent* (pp. 207–227). Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
Valdman, A. (2005b). *Haitian Creole at the dawn of independence*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
Whinnom, K. (1965). Origin of the European based creoles and pidgins. *Orbis, 15*, 509–527.

(*Received 4 March 2005*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050199 Published online by Cambridge University Press