SSLA, **25**, 175–184. Printed in the United States of America.
DOI: 10.1017.S0272263103000081

INTRODUCTION

Silvia Kouwenberg
University of the West Indies

Peter L. Patrick
University of Essex

This volume aims to rekindle interest in the question of whether insights from the study of second language (L2) acquisition can usefully be called on to provide explanations for pidgin and creole genesis, providing (mainly) creolist perspectives.[1] Not surprisingly, the focus of several contributions is on transfer in pidginization, creolization, and L2 acquisition.

Although the questions addressed in this issue are several decades old, and creolists have adopted positions in favor of or against transfer-based scenarios of pidgin and creole genesis, there has never truly been a debate on any of the issues that are potentially raised by the intersection of SLA research and pidgin and creole studies. Some of the concepts that have emerged from the SLA literature have become common coin in pidgin and creole studies, yet the research that ought to underpin their application to processes of pidginization and creolization has not been carried out. The reverse is equally true: Questions such as "What are pidgins and creoles?" and "By what processes do these languages emerge?" are still hotly debated in pidgin and creole studies, yet outside the field of language contact this controversy is little noticed. Our position as creolists makes us constantly aware that overly simplified and outdated textbook answers are widely taken for granted by many linguists, including SLA specialists.

Here we trace the relationship between the fields of SLA research and pid-

The papers by Clements and Siegel were originally given in a colloquium on "Second language acquisition and pidginization/creolization," organized by Kouwenberg and Patrick and held April 18, 2001, at the Third International Symposium on Bilingualism at the University of the West of England, Bristol. We wish to thank the organizers of that symposium for facilitating the colloquium as well as other participants—Adrienne Bruyn, Fredric Field, Carla Hudson, and Patrick-André Mather—for their ideas and critical input. Finally, we thank the editorial staff and reviewers of *SSLA* for their interest, patience, and rigorous critique of all papers.

Address correspondence to: Peter L. Patrick, Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, United Kingdom; e-mail: patrickp@essex.ac.uk. Silvia Kouwenberg, Department of Language, Linguistics, and Philosophy, University of the West Indies, Mona, Kingston 7, Jamaica WI; e-mail: silvia@uwimona.edu.jm.

© 2003 Cambridge University Press 0272-2631/03 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gin and creole studies, provide a brief overview of the positions taken by creolists regarding the role of SLA in pidgin and creole formation, and outline the contributions made by the papers in this issue toward a reconsideration of the relevance of SLA insights for pidginization and creolization.

SIMPLIFICATION IN PIDGINIZATION, CREOLIZATION, AND SLA

In the 1970s, some SLA researchers adopted conceptual machinery from the fledgling field of pidgin and creole studies (e.g., Andersen, 1980; Meisel, 1977; Schumann, 1978; Valdman, 1980). The original insight was of structural similarities between early-stage or fossilized interlanguages and prototypical creoles, where—by comparison to synchronic standard languages—a lack of inflectional morphology, reduced phonological inventories, and shallow transformational structure were purportedly observed. Notions including pidginization, creolization, reduction, expansion, and simplicity were explored as heuristics for SLA, drawn in part on the findings of early pidgin and creole research. On the basis of superficially observed similarities, comparability was postulated between pidginization and early SLA; creolization was likened to learners' expansion of their interlanguage (e.g., Andersen, 1980, 1983).

For these parallels to be drawn, it was necessarily assumed that the (usually European) lexifier constitutes a target in pidgin and creole genesis as it does in SLA.[2] This assumption has since been criticized, an issue to which we return. Attention was focused on simplification as the characteristic that was thought to unite interlanguage with pidgins and creoles rather than with their target or lexifier languages. This viewpoint, too, has come under considerable fire. Thus, Alleyne (1980) expressed his discontent with the conceptual bias that, applied to the relationship between standard and so-called nonstandard forms, always results in a scenario whereby the latter derive from the former (p. 3). The impressive volume of descriptive work on pidgin and creole languages has revealed not only their complexity in many areas of grammar but also their morphosyntactic independence from their lexifiers and has gradually led to the abandonment of the notions of simplicity and simplification.[3] Muysken (1988), in his discussion of the "simplicity" of creole languages, pointed out that this notion makes sense only in the context of a markedness theory; on the basis of a preliminary assessment of some creole properties in this light, he concluded that this is "not a promising line of research" (p. 297).[4]

SUBSTRATA VERSUS UNIVERSALS

Despite enthusiasm on the part of some students of pidgin and creole languages for approaches to pidginization and creolization informed by SLA research, the resulting research agenda was quickly overshadowed by the "substrata versus universals" debate that dominated creole studies through the 1980s and early 1990s (Muysken & Smith, 1986). This opposition divided the field into those in support of a universalist account of creolization—the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

so-called bioprogrammatic approach of Bickerton (1984)—and those adhering to the position that substrate continuities have shaped creole languages (in particular, those of the Caribbean; see Alleyne, 1971, 1980). Many substratists expended more energy on garnering and presenting evidence against the bioprogrammatic approach than on developing the theoretical underpinnings of their own position. Among creolists, reference to SLA became synonymous with substratist positions, with a narrow focus on transfer of first language (L1) structures in pidgin and creole formation. Thus, early discussion on the relevance of SLA insights for the field degenerated into a situation in which two camps were sharply opposed, with transfer an article of faith for one (substratist) and an easy target for critique and even ridicule for the other (universalist; see Alleyne, 1986; Bickerton, 1986). Moreover, the notion of universals became so inseparable from the bioprogrammatic position that creolists directed little attention to exploring universals in the context of SLA studies.

Although at the start of the 1980s it was still possible to claim that "we do not yet have a generally accepted model for language acquisition" (Alleyne, 1980, p. 7), research toward developing such a model by SLA students subsequently went unnoticed by many creolists for nearly a decade.[5] At the same time, acquisition research had come to recognize that many learner errors do not reflect L1 transfer and that, as a result, interlanguages may display properties that are found neither in the target nor in the L1.[6] A shift toward universalist explanations followed, though of a different kind than the creolist bioprogram view. The shift in emphasis in SLA can be encapsulated in the opposition of Andersen's (1983) description of transfer (from substrate) as a structural resource for formal properties of pidgins and creoles, to Meisel's (1983) argument that transfer was unimportant for interlanguages and by extension also unimportant for pidgins and creoles. Much work in SLA research during the 1980s thus came to focus on the properties of interlanguages and argued for universal pathways of acquisition, largely independent of learners' L1.[7] The role of the L1 came to be restricted to either promoting acquisition of target language categories, if the same or similar categories exist in the L1 (the case of positive transfer), or inhibiting acquisition, in the reverse case of negative transfer (Zobl, 1984).

SLA research subsequently reconsidered transfer, which led to the formulation of models involving both situational factors (e.g., proficiency, tutored settings) and linguistic constraints (e.g., markedness), such as Ellis (1994). However, creolists remained wary, and largely ignorant, of SLA research for several reasons. For some, an SLA perspective left room for overstressing the superstrate influence and misperceiving pidgins and creoles as poorly learned European languages, the result of so-called imperfect SLA.[8] For others, it was conversely associated with emphasis on transfer of substrate properties at the expense of universalist mechanisms. Additionally, for most, "pidginization" was used too freely and vaguely by acquisition researchers, with little regard for structural characteristics of attested pidgins, whereas studies of pidgin languages had begun to draw attention to the existence of a wide range of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pidgins of varying degrees of functional and structural elaboration (e.g., Bakker, 1995; Barbag-Stoll, 1973; Broch & Jahr, 1981; Drechsel, 1981).

Within the acquisition field, too, criticism was leveled at problems of comparability between the individual and psychological phenomenon of interlanguage and social and historical processes of pidginization and creolization (Cook, 1993; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Creolists who attended to the detailed interplay of demographic factors and social contexts in speech communities undergoing language contact and concerned themselves with historically attested phases of pidgin and creole development saw little relevance in contemporary studies of individual interlanguages arising from tutored acquisition of standard languages in urban settings. Meanwhile, researchers focused on modeling the mental processes underlying acquisition saw naiveté in the reluctance of many pidgin and creole scholars to explore psycholinguistic aspects of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century contact situations. As a result, the fields drifted apart, their contributions to each other undermined. Creolists continued to use the notion of transfer in substratist explanations without seeking the benefit of information from the growing body of literature on the subject. In the context of the polarization between universalists and substratists, transfer had become a matter of course for substratists rather than an area of research.

TOWARD A RAPPROCHEMENT

In recent years, developments in each area have prepared the ground for a reconsideration of mutual relevance. Some SLA researchers have focused on both situational and structural similarities and contrasts between SLA and pidgins and creoles in significant detail (e.g., Newport, 1999; Odlin, 1992), and greatly improved data and historical documentation now exist for a range of pidgins and creoles, leading in each case to an appreciation of the diversity of pidgin and creole genesis contexts and of linguistic outcomes. For SLA, investigation of untutored learning situations (e.g., the European Science Foundation project) has led to an understanding of interlanguages as applying to speech communities, not just individuals, and a more sophisticated appreciation of social factors. Simultaneously, the availability of longitudinal data in projects such as the European Science Foundation has refocused attention on the role of the L1, in particular of L1 conservation (transfer) in L2 acquisition (Perdue, 1993; Véronique, 1994).

Among creolists, dialogue that began in the mid 1980s (Muysken & Smith, 1986) led to the prevalence of perspectives synthesizing universalist (including, but not limited to, bioprogrammatic) and substratist views, which bore fruit in more carefully articulated models involving both social and structural factors (e.g., Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). The increasing formal sophistication of creolist studies, allied with Bickerton's provocative theses (1984, 1988), brought creoles to the attention of generative syntacticians. It also resulted in a new interest in SLA by those inclined to language-universal explanations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This allowed the dissociation of SLA work from substratist views in recent works such as DeGraff (1999) and Mufwene (2001), both of which essentially hold that L2 acquisition and creolization instantiate the same linguistic processes (both L2 acquisition and L1 acquisition are accorded central roles in creolization in DeGraff's view).

New historical data and theories were also significant. Of particular relevance is the research that resulted in the fairly precise identification of substrate languages for at least some creoles, obliterating the need for reliance on allegedly generalized structures for a wide variety of potential substrates and paving the way for a more informed assessment of the extent of L1 conservation (see Arends, 1995, and Bruyn, 2001, for the Suriname Creoles; Kouwenberg, 1992, and Smith, Robertson, & Williamson, 1987, for Berbice Dutch). Controversy over the possibility of substrate influences in pidgins and creoles gave way to acceptance, which in turn stimulated new interest in the mechanisms whereby substrate properties are incorporated into pidgin and creole languages. Demographic evidence (e.g., Arends; Singler, 1986, 1993) indicated that, in at least some cases of creolization, language origination must have been overwhelmingly performed by adults. Meanwhile, the tendency for historically inclined substratists to take mechanisms of transfer for granted came due for a challenge. Baker's (1993) and Baker and Huber's (2001) "language construction" thesis—proposing that all parties in pidginization situations strove to develop and use a contact variety, not learn a superstrate language—ironically refocused attention on SLA as an alternative account (Siegel, 1998, 2000). The superstratist position lost most of its stigma as it, too, became increasingly sophisticated and, moreover, drew on a body of solid historical research (Chaudenson, 1992).

THE PAPERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ideas once widely accepted or debated by creolists, and since disseminated among linguists at large as received wisdom, have been seriously questioned or rejected. The existence of a creole prototype is severely doubted despite McWhorter (1998).[9] The dogma linking development of creoles to prior pidgins (the life-cycle hypothesis) has been rejected by many creolists. Bickerton (1984) early undermined it by claiming a lack of any real structure in pidgins and arguing that creolization is largely a product of children's linguistic activity in the face of inadequate input. Caribbeanists (e.g., Singler, 1993) countered by demonstrating that child populations were too small during the critical periods for the genesis of some creoles, and they argued that little historical evidence existed for any Atlantic pidgins. Alternate routes for so-called abrupt creolization were proposed (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988) and debated, and rising interest in pidgins as independent objects (not merely sources for creoles) made comparison with synchronic SLA fossilization studies a fruitful line of research.

The importance of SLA theory and findings for creole studies has conse-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quently risen, and we propose to reconsider key issues at this propitious moment. In this collection, which contains contributions by scholars from Europe, North America, the Caribbean, and the Pacific, the data and analyses pertain to a range of contact languages—English- and French-lexifier creoles and varieties of Melanesian Pidgin, from the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans—as well as to a native Chinese speaker's naturalistically acquired Spanish and the early English-targeted interlanguage of native Vietnamese speakers. The general thrust is to reverse the earlier direction of disciplinary influence by applying knowledge from SLA studies to refine our understanding of the processes at work in natural situations of language contact, creation, and acquisition.

The papers in this issue consider the extent to which interlanguage varieties and pidgin and creole languages display similar properties. This addresses the nature of the evidence required to demonstrate that adult learning is the central process in creolization. It also raises the question of the mechanisms underlying the similarities, where they are identified. Siegel argues that transfer is one of the psycholinguistic processes central to L2 acquisition, and he points to parallels between the properties of interlanguage varieties of several different European languages and the creole languages lexically based on the same European languages. Constraints on transfer in SLA, he argues, cause the parallels, accounting both for transfer of substrate features and the lack of certain creole substrate features. He identifies the (later) expansion phase of a pidgin as the period during which substrate transfer takes place, following Sankoff (1994), with bilingual speakers of pidgin and ancestral languages as agents of the process.

Helms-Park's paper contrasts with Siegel's here. She identifies transfer as a communication strategy employed by speakers at low levels of proficiency, comparable perhaps to strategies of early pidgin speakers. Her evidence is that transfer is of relevance in the earliest stages of SLA: As learners continue to target the language of the host community, the transferred features disappear. This may highlight a contrast between pidgin formation and many situations studied by SLA researchers: the extent of negative evidence. Many researchers have argued that negative evidence, though often problematic in SLA, is needed to reset L1 parameters (e.g., Lightbown & Spada, 2000; Sharwood Smith, 1996; White, 1991). Pidgins and creoles may provide a large pool of cases in which, for a variety of reasons—for example, restricted lexifier input, absence of focus on a target ("language construction"), and lack of pressure from the social-evaluative norms usually attached to a variety—negative evidence is minimal or absent.[10]

The paper by Clements as well as Becker and Veenstra's paper both consider the acquisition of morphological categories. Clements examines a case of untutored L2 acquisition and argues that the resulting system is a function of the L1, constrained by universal tendencies. Clements makes a case for the resemblance between interlanguages and pidgins that is crucially independent of creole-prototype assumptions. Becker and Veenstra consider the acquisition of French inflectional morphology by learners and its survival in creoles,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

proposing a three-generational, composite scenario of the creolization process. In the first stage, untutored adult SLA varieties provide the raw material for creolization; subsequent developments, however, are essentially independent of SLA, relying instead on bilingual L1 acquisition (including processes of relexification) and later expansion by creole-speaking monolinguals.

The insights gained from these papers thus converge on two issues. First, the evidence points to the relevance of SLA in early stages of contact, with a cutoff point after which SLA ceases to be the central process in pidgin and creole development. That point may be reached when the emerging contact variety itself becomes the target of language learning, the so-called target shift of Baker (1990). SLA, therefore, bears no relevance for subsequent developments in pidgins and creoles, but vigorous and rapid internal change processes and the elaboration of autonomous evaluative norms follow the SLA stage. In contrast, in situations of "typical" SLA, a cutoff point is associated with a lack of further developments, which results in frozen and often idiosyncratic interlanguage varieties.

The second point relates to the relevance of transfer strategies. It appears that transfer of L1 properties occurs in very early stages of learning, and in this respect pidgin and creole formation is not different from SLA. However, these processes part company in later stages. The evidence suggests that transfer also occurs in the later period of pidgin and creole expansion; at this stage, such substrate effects are independent of SLA (though not of transferability factors; see Odlin, 1992; see also Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, on typological distance). In contrast, as SLA proceeds and the interlanguage variety is further restructured toward the target, the evidence of L1 transfer is expected to diminish under the constant pressure of L2 input and norms.

The papers in this issue advance the development of analytic approaches that allow for distinctions between the effects of SLA and other processes during different stages of pidgin and creole genesis and expansion. This points in the direction of a unique line of development for pidgin and creole languages, after all.

NOTES

1. Terminological debates regarding the labels *pidgin* and *creole* do not concern us here. Although much discussion regarding SLA and pidgin and creole genesis centers on nonnative varieties for obvious reasons, we do not necessarily subscribe to the position that native speakers distinguish pidgins from creoles. For present purposes, it is more relevant to distinguish stable from unstable varieties than native from nonnative ones. Except for instances in which the terms are introduced in discussing previous work (where they have the interpretations intended by their authors), we refer to the class of pidgin and creole languages without attempting to sort out what properties are supposed to separate one from another.

2. The existence of pidgins and creoles in which European languages did not determine the lexicon or were not involved at all was noted but little studied by creolists before the late 1970s and did not inform earlier debates involving SLA—for example, (Ki)Nubi, with Arabic as superstrate; Nagamese, in the creation of which Assamese (Indo-Aryan) was restructured by Naga speakers of Tibeto-Burman languages; Pidgin Fijian, with the Austronesian Fijian as the main lexical source.

3. The presumed lack of morphology takes a central place in the notion of simplicity of pidgin and creole languages. However, this overlooks the complexity of the derivational component in many

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of these languages (Plag, 2000) and properly refers only to the inflectional component. Moreover, DeGraff (1993) argued that Haitian pronominal subjects are agreement markers, and Veenstra (1996) maintained a similar position regarding the Saramaccan third-person-singular clitic subject pronoun, implying that such pronouns are part of the inflectional component. Several other creole languages have about as much inflection as English, including at least Berbice Dutch (Arends, Kouwenberg, & Smith, 1995) and Papiamentu (Dijkhoff, 1993; Kouwenberg & Murray, 1994).

4. These issues have been recently taken up and elaborated by Bruyn, Muysken, and Verrips (1999).

5. Siegel (in press) gives an extended, but not dissimilar, account of developments in this period. The reemergence of these issues began in such works as Adone and Plag (1994) and Wekker (1996).

6. For example, asymmetry of subject-verb inversion occurs in Turkish L1 acquisition of German L2 word order (Schwartz & Sprouse, 2000).

7. A recent expression of this viewpoint can be found in Kotsinas (2001), who, after surveying properties of the Swedish used by many first-generation immigrants, concluded that it "displays many features typical of pidginization" and that "contrary to common popular belief, interference from the mother tongue plays a minor role in the formation of these varieties. . . . Instead, universal linguistic and communicative strategies seem to play an important role" (pp. 152–153).

8. Valdman (1980, p. 297) pointed out that this view was held by Jespersen (1922, p. 233), who—comparing pidgins, broken or approximative versions of an L2, and child language—commented that "in all these seemingly so different cases the same mental factor is at work, namely, imperfect mastery of a language." The so-called imperfect learning view dates back to Oldendorp (1777, translated in Gilbert, 1986) for the Virgin Islands and to Pelleprat (1655, cited in Goodman, 1964, p. 105) in Martinique.

9. See responses to McWhorter (2001) in *Linguistic Typology*.

10. This is not to imply that it is normally full and adequate in SLA, but the contrast remains stark. Patrick wishes to thank Sarah Liszka for discussing this issue.

REFERENCES

Adone, D., & Plag, I. (Eds.). (1994). *Creolization and language change*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Alleyne, M. (1971). Acculturation and the cultural matrix of creolization. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (pp. 169–186). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Alleyne, M. (1980). Introduction. In A. Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), *Theoretical orientations in creole studies* (pp. 1–17). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Alleyne, M. (1986). Substratum influences: Guilty until proven innocent. In P. Muysken & N. Smith (Eds.), *Substrata versus universals in creole genesis* (pp. 301–315). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Andersen, R. (1980). Creolization as the acquisition of a second language as a first language. In A. Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), *Theoretical orientations in creole studies* (pp. 273–295). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Andersen, R. (Ed.). (1983). *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Arends, J. (Ed.). (1995). *The early stages of creolization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Arends, J., Kouwenberg, S., & Smith, N. (1995). Theories focusing on the non-European input. In J. Arends, P. Muysken, & N. Smith (Eds.), *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction* (pp. 99–109). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Baker, P. (1990). Off target? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages, 5,* 107–119.

Baker, P. (1993). Australian influence on Melanesian Pidgin. *Te Reo, 36,* 3–67.

Baker, P., & Huber, M. (2001). Atlantic, Pacific, and world-wide features in English-lexicon contact languages. *English World-wide, 22,* 157–208.

Bakker, P. (1995). Pidgins. In J. Arends, P. Muysken, & N. Smith (Eds.), *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction* (pp. 25–40). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Barbag-Stoll, A. (1973). *Social and linguistic history of Nigerian Pidgin English*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg.

Bickerton, D. (1984). The Language Bioprogram Hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 7,* 173–188.

Bickerton, D. (1986). Creoles and West African languages: A case of mistaken identity? In P. Muysken & N. Smith (Eds.), *Substrata versus universals in creole genesis* (pp. 25–40). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bickerton, D. (1988). Creole languages and the bioprogram. In F. J. Newmeyer (Ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey: Vol. 2. Linguistic theory—Extensions and implications* (pp. 268–284). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Broch, I., & Jahr, E. H. (1981). *Russenorsk: Et pidginspråk i Norge* [Russenorsk: A pidgin language in Norway]. Oslo, Norway: Novus Forlag.
Bruyn, A. (2001, April). *Substrate transfer in radical creoles: Beyond constraints*. Paper presented at the colloquium "Second language acquisition and pidginization/creolization" at the Third International Symposium on Bilingualism, University of the West of England, Bristol.
Bruyn, A., Muysken, P., & Verrips, M. (1999). Double-object constructions in the creole languages: Development and acquisition. In M. DeGraff (Ed.), *Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony, and development* (pp. 329–373). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Chaudenson, R. (1992). *Des îles, des hommes, des langues: Essais sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle* [Islands, people, and languages: Essays on linguistic and cultural creolization]. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
DeGraff, M. (1993). Is Haitian Creole a *pro*-drop language? In F. Byrne & J. Holm (Eds.), *Atlantic meets Pacific* (pp. 71–90). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
DeGraff, M. (1999). Creolization, language change, and language acquisition: A prolegomenon. In M. DeGraff (Ed.), *Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony, and development* (pp. 1–46). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Dijkhoff, M. (1993). *Papiamentu word formation: A case study of complex nouns and their relation to phrases and clauses*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
Drechsel, E. (1981). A preliminary sociolinguistic comparison of four indigenous pidgin languages of North America (with notes towards a sociolinguistic typology in American Indian linguistics). *Anthropological Linguistics, 23,* 93–112.
Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Gilbert, G. (1986). Oldendorp's *History* . . . and other early creole materials in the Moravian archives in Herrnhut, East Germany. *Carrier Pidgin, 14,* 5–7.
Goodman, M. (1964). *A comparative study of French creole dialects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Jespersen, O. (1922). *Language: Its nature, development, and origin*. New York: W. W. Norton.
Kotsinas, U.-B. (2001). Pidginization, creolization, and creoloid in Stockholm, Sweden. In N. Smith & T. Veenstra (Eds.), *Creolization and contact* (pp. 125–155). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Kouwenberg, S. (1992). From OV to VO: Linguistic negotiation in the development of Berbice Dutch Creole. *Lingua, 88,* 263–299.
Kouwenberg, S., & Murray, E. (1994). *Papiamentu*. (Monograph in Languages of the World/Materials 68). Munich: Lincom Europa.
Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2000). Do they know what they're doing? L2 learners' awareness of L1 influence. *Language Awareness, 9,* 198–217.
McWhorter, J. (1998). Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class. *Language, 74,* 788–818.
McWhorter, J. (2001). The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars. *Linguistic Typology, 5,* 125–166.
Meisel, J. (Ed.) (1977). *Langue en contact: Pidgins, creoles*. Tübingen: Narr.
Meisel, J. (1983). Transfer as a second-language strategy. *Language and Communication, 3,* 11–46.
Mufwene, S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Muysken, P. (1988). Are creoles a special type of language? In F. Newmeyer (Ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey: Vol. 2. Linguistic theory—Extensions and implications* (pp. 285–301). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Muysken, P., & Smith, N. (Eds.). (1986). *Substrata versus universals in creole genesis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Newport, E. L. (1999). Reduced input in the acquisition of signed languages: Contributions to the study of creolization. In M. DeGraff (Ed.), *Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony, and development* (pp. 161–178). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Odlin, T. (1992). Transferability and linguistic substrates. *Second Language Research, 8,* 171–202.
Perdue, C. (Ed.). (1993). *Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Plag, I. (2000). The nature of derivational morphology in creoles and non-creoles. *Pidgins and Creoles*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Archive PCA-2. Retrieved November 14, 2002, from http://www.pca.uni-siegen.de/doc/2/index.html.
Sankoff, G. (1994). An historical and evolutionary approach to variation in the Tok Pisin verb phrase. *Parasession on Variation in Linguistic Theory: Chicago Linguistic Society, 30,* 293–320.
Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Schwartz, B., & Sprouse, R. (2000). When syntactic theories evolve: Consequences for L2 acquisition research. In J. Archibald (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and linguistic theory* (pp. 156–186). Oxford: Blackwell.
Sharwood Smith, M. (1996). Crosslinguistic influence with special reference to the acquisition of grammar. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), *Investigating second language acquisition* (pp. 71–83). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Siegel, J. (1998). Substrate reinforcement and dialectal differences in Melanesian Pidgin. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 2,* 347–373.
Siegel, J. (2000). *Processes of language contact: Studies from Australia and the South Pacific*. Montreal: Fides.
Siegel, J. (in press). Pidgins/Creoles and second language acquisition. In J. V. Singler & S. Kouwenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of pidgin and creole languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Singler, J. V. (1986). Short note. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages, 1,* 141–145.
Singler, J. V. (1993). African influence upon Afro-American language varieties: A consideration of sociohistorical facts. In S. Mufwene (Ed.) (with N. Condon), *Africanisms in Afro-American language varieties* (pp. 235–253). Athens: University of Georgia Press.
Smith, N., Robertson, I., & Williamson, K. (1987). The Ijo element in Berbice Dutch. *Language in Society, 16,* 49–90.
Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Valdman, A. (1980). Creolization and second language acquisition. In A. Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), *Theoretical orientations in creole studies* (pp. 297–311). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Veenstra, T. (1996). *Serial verbs in Saramaccan: Predication and creole genesis*. The Hague: Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.
Véronique, D. (Ed.). (1994). *Créolisation et acquisition des langues* [Creolization and language acquisition]. Aix-en-Provence, France: Université de Provence.
Wekker, H. (Ed.). (1996). *Creole languages and language acquisition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
White, L. (1991). *Universal Grammar and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Zobl, H. (1984). Uniformity and source-language variation across developmental continua. In W. Rutherford (Ed.), *Language universals and second language acquisition* (pp. 185–218). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000081 Published online by Cambridge University Press