

Introduction: Creole Studies and Contact Linguistics

*Margot van den Berg, Pieter Muysken,
and Norval Smith*

1. Language contact in Creole Studies

The study of pidgins, creoles, intertwined languages, and other outcomes of language contact has seen many lively debates regarding their origin over the years. While it is generally undisputed that these new languages emerge in a situation where two or more languages are in contact, the degree in which the languages in contact contribute to the emergence of the new language, and the way in which this happens, is a particularly controversial matter.

Some scholars have argued that the specific grammatical properties of creole languages directly reflect universal aspects of the human language capacity, thus reducing the role of the individual languages in the creole formation process to a minimum. Others have argued that creole languages reflect patterns of the native languages of the main agents of creole formation, which are the substrate groups of the enslaved in a typical colonial setting. Yet others have stressed the role of the European lexifiers. The Surinam Creoles feature prominently in this debate, resulting in a wealth of studies on Sranan, Ndyuka, Pamaka (also referred to as Paramaccan in the literature), and Saamaka (also referred to as Saramaccan), often with conflicting outcomes.¹

For example, McWhorter (1999) maintains that the Surinam Creole Tense Mood Aspect (TMA) system developed largely according to its own

-
1. Here we will mention only Rens (1953), Simons (1941), Voorhoeve (1957), Charry, Koefoed, and Muysken. (1983), Seuren (1981, 1983), Alleyne (1987), Byrne (1987), Sebba (1987), Wendelaar and Koefoed (1988), Huttar & Huttar (1994), Veenstra (1995), Arends and Perl (1995), McWhorter (1999), Carlin and Arends (2002), Essegbey (2005), Aboh (2006c), Lefebvre and Loranger (2006), Damonte (2002), Migge (2003a, 2006), Narrog (2005), Winford (2000), van den Berg (2007), Bally (1932), Goury (2003), but this is not an exhaustive list. Note that the Surinam Creoles of the Kwinti and Matawai are understudied.

dictates. From his point of view, it only dimly reflects patterns of the West African substrate languages that contributed to the Surinam Creoles. Migge (2006), Winford and Migge (2007) and Migge and Winford (2009), on the other hand, find that the TMA systems of the Surinam Creoles display many features that parallel those of the Gbe languages, a major substrate or adstrate group present in early eighteenth century Surinam. This raises the question: What constitutes evidence of substrate influence in creole formation, and how is this demonstrated? Since the 1980s, most scholars within the Creole subfield combine historical socio-demographic data with linguistic data to demonstrate substrate influence: The socio-demographic data must show that speakers of the substrate languages were in the right place at the right time (Bickerton 1981), while the linguistic data bring out the similarities and differences between the creole, the substrate languages and the superstrate/lexifier-languages. Muysken and Smith (1986) argue that the linguistic data that feed into the comparison of creole, substrate and superstrate/lexifier need to be selected in a principled manner. General parallels with substrate or superstrate/lexifier languages are not sufficient to demonstrate substrate influence. Rather, features must be selected on the basis of markedness; the linguistic data should represent typologically marked (as opposed to unmarked) features in order to prove substrate influence, as creole – substrate parallels “cannot prove the substratist case if the same phenomena are also claimed by universalists to represent the unmarked settings of various parameters” (Muysken & Smith 1986: 2).

2. Transfer and sub-disciplines of linguistics

The role of language transfer due to language contact is not just posited in Pidgin and Creole studies, but is also utilized in historical linguistics, sociolinguistics and second language acquisition research. A brief overview of some examples of what counts as proof of transfer in the various sub-disciplines of linguistics follows below, showing that transfer can be demonstrated in multiple ways, ranging from qualitative to quantitative research methods, on the basis of very different types of data.

In historical linguistics, the emergence of a certain feature is commonly ascribed to language contact on the basis of the consideration of ‘all’ the changes that have occurred in the language, and not just a particular feature. If this feature is an isolated instance of claimed language change in the direction of the language from which it is apparently transferred, it is generally not regarded as a promising candidate for an explanation in terms of

contact in the field of historical linguistics. However, if there are also other phenomena that suggest change towards the language from which the features are transferred, this is usually taken as a convincing demonstration of contact induced change. Transferred forms of morphemes are, of course, the most compelling evidence of transfer. Strong evidence of transfer can be provided on the basis of a number of marked features that can be shown to have changed in the direction of the source language in different subsystems of the recipient language (Thomason 2003: 710).

In sociolinguistics, language contact is acknowledged as a possible cause of language change, but most sociolinguistic studies of language change are primarily concerned with changes that emerge within a linguistic system. Language-internal changes expose the problem of the causation of language change in its sharpest form (Labov 2001: 20). However, the effects of contact among sublinguistic systems such as regional dialects and sociolects on language change feature prominently in the sociolinguistic subfield of dialect contact and dialect mixture (e.g. Auer, Hinskens, and Kerswill. 2006 on dialect contact in Europe; Otheguy, Zentella, and Livert. 2007 on the New York Spanish speech community). The latter study shows that both dialect and language contact contribute to the emergence of a variety of Spanish that may be regarded as typical of the city of New York, i.e. ‘New York Spanish’. It is based on a quantitative corpus-based, variationist approach to rates of overt pronoun usage, variable and constraint hierarchies, involving speakers from different regions and different generations. Using statistical methods, Otheguy et al. argue that hierarchies of independent linguistic variables and constraint hierarchies are both needed in particular to bring “issues of dialect contact and speech community ... into sharp relief” (Otheguy, Zentella, and Livert 2007: 773).

Cross-linguistic influence is also demonstrated in another manner in language acquisition studies. Jarvis (2000, 2010) distinguishes between comparison-based and detection-based approaches. The latter, relatively new approach relies on automated, computerized detection of background characteristics of language samples in order to bring out learner’s source-language backgrounds on the basis of their target-language performance. The former includes different types of comparisons, ranging from 1) within-group comparisons of people from the same language backgrounds using the same target languages, to 2) between-group comparisons of people from different source-language backgrounds using the same target language, to 3) cross-language comparisons of people using both the source and target languages (Jarvis 2010: 170). Each comparison brings about a different type of evidence to argue for or against the transfer of forms, fea-

tures, functions, meanings or distributional properties from one language to another. These types of evidence are referred to as intra-group homogeneity (within-group similarities), inter-group heterogeneity (between-group differences) and cross-language congruity (between-language similarities and intra-lingual contrasts). Jarvis (2000, 2010) stresses that these types can manifest both qualitatively and quantitatively. However, within-group similarities and between-group differences are most frequently demonstrated by means of quantitative studies, for example, how common a particular pattern of target-language use is among a group of learners from a particular source-language background (within-group homogeneity). The third type of evidence is often of a qualitative nature, focusing on qualitative similarities in speaker performances in their source and target languages. All three types are always relevant, but at least two should be presented to make a case for transfer. It sometimes suffices to draw one or two types of evidence from “other sources, such as the results of prior studies, published grammars and language histories, and personal experiences” (Jarvis 2010: 173).

3. Creole formation

Creole formation is regarded as a complex process operating on two connected levels, namely at the individual and the community levels. At the level of the individual, creole formation is understood as a mental process. The creole language emerges as the linguistic outcome of developments in individual speakers' minds – an instance of individual grammar construction. At the community level, the locus of creole formation is not the individual's mind, but the social interaction between individuals, out of which a newly formed and shared linguistic code emerges. DeGraff (1999) proposes the terms I-Creole and E-Creole along the lines of Chomsky's (1986) distinction between I-language and E-language: the term I-Creole refers to the relatively stable grammar in the mind of an individual speaker who grew up with this emerging language, whereas the term E-Creole refers to the new community language. The relationship between I-Creole and E-Creole is represented by DeGraff (1999: 9) as follows:

E-creoles are epiphenomenal upon I-creoles insofar as the former are by-products of the ‘spreading’ of parameter settings associated with the latter; such spreading takes place via further instances of acquisition as (speakers endowed with) I-Creoles become more numerous, thus more influential in

the makeup of the linguistic environment for the emerging Creole community and its language acquirers.

Thus, the emergence of the E-Creole depends on an increase of I-Creole forms, due to locally-born children who grow up with the emerging creole as one of their mother tongues; more I-Creoles will result in a higher incidence of creole features. DeGraff and others thus link the emergence of the community creole to native speakers of the emerging language. Native speakers are the main agents in creole formation. Others focus on non-native speakers as the main agents in creole formation. Lefebvre (1998), for example, sees speakers of Fongbe as the main agents in the formation of Haitian Creole. In the initial stages of creole formation, when these speakers were targeting the superstrate language, they would “use the properties of the native lexicons, the parametric values and semantic interpretation rules of their native grammar in creating the creole” (Lefebvre 1998: 9). When they stopped targeting the lexifier language and started targeting the emerging creole, their relexified creole lexicons fed into the processes of reanalysis and dialect levelling, after which a more stabilized or focussed creole would emerge. Thus, creole formation would involve a target shift from lexifier to emerging creole, an instance of targeted second language acquisition. This, however, has been questioned.

Scholars such as Baker (1990) and Siegel (2008) object that speakers of the emerging creole did not aspire to learn a language, be it the lexifier or the emerging creole. Their goal was not grammatical acquisition, but rather successful communication and mutual comprehension in a multilingual and multicultural context (bilingual or multilingual language use). Speakers employ different strategies and types of knowledge in the case of grammatical acquisition or successful communication. For example, functional transfer is found to occur more frequently in the case of the latter (Siegel 2008).

A slightly different set of motives is imputed to new language creators, whether it be mixed language speakers like those of Media Lengua (Musyken 1980, 1981, 1997, 2013), or expanded pidgins like Pijin (Jourdain 2008), or the creoles developed among slave populations in plantation colonies (Smith 2006, 2009, this volume on Ingredient X). Muysken suggested that a new in-between group (in this case between rural Quechua and urban Spanish-speakers) developed a new in-between ethnicity, and therefore language. For a similar example consider the mixed French-Cree language of the Michif (Bakker 1997). Smith basically follows Jourdain in seeing the new language as a vehicle of resistance. The advantages of a

neutral language vis-à-vis the various African languages of the slaves, but incomprehensible (initially at least) to the European colonizers seems obvious.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the process of creole formation we need to include insights on multilingual language use as well as second language acquisition. The linguistic innovations that constitute the emerging creole result from mental processes in an individual speaker's mind just as much as from social interaction, accommodation and negotiation between speakers. Hence, creole formation should not be limited to processes that operate in the individual speaker's mind. Furthermore, as Pennycook (2010) reminds us, language use is part of a multifaceted interplay between humans and the world. What people do with language in a particular place at a given time results from their interpretation of the situation. In addition there are the mental processes in individual speakers' minds, social interactions, accommodation and negotiation among speakers. As the language practices these people engage in reinforce that interpretation of the situation, we need to account for history as well as location, if we want to understand creole formation.

Creole formation happens over time. The question is how much time is, or how many generations are, involved. DeGraff (1999) and Lefebvre (1998) both view creole formation as a two stage process: a highly variable, irregular, unsystematic diffuse initial stage is followed by a less variable, more regular, systematic, focussed stage. Reanalysis and dialect levelling give rise to the latter stage in Lefebvre's view, while it is nativization in that of DeGraff. They seem to agree, however, that cross-linguistic effects are mostly likely to occur in the initial stage:

Substratist accounts predict, correctly I think, the existence, in the pre-homogenization period, of a complex array of proto-Creole nonnative interlanguages influenced by a variety of substrate languages – Fongbe, Ewe, Akan, Gã, Gur, Efik, Ibibio, Igbo, Yoruba, Bamana/Malinke, Fula, Kikongo, etc. In this pre-levelling stage, there could *not* exist one single Creole variety, or a small set of Creole varieties, *with relatively homogeneous morphosyntactic profile(s)* (DeGraff 2009: 941-942).

A particularly convincing case of the impact of nativization on creole formation is presented by Roberts (2000). She shows, on the basis of socio-historical and linguistic evidence, that nativization plays an important role in the structural elaboration that distinguishes the creole from the pidgin of foreign-born adults in Hawaii. While Bickerton assumes a two-generational

model, Roberts posits a three-generational account for the emergence of Hawaiian Creole. In the classic view of Bickerton (1981), Hawaiian Creole was formed relatively abruptly by children of immigrants (G(eneration)2) who acquire their parent's pidgin (G1) as their mother tongue. Roberts shows that a three-generational model is more appropriate to account for the emergence of Hawaiian Creole: it is not the locally-born children (G2), but the locally-born grandchildren (G3) of the immigrants who are responsible for the linguistic innovations that are now recognized as Hawaiian Creole. The three-generational model relates not only to language birth but also to language death, as the rise of the creole coincides with the falling out of use of the ancestral or first language(s) of the immigrants. As pointed out by Roberts (2000: 295), this is not unique to Hawaiian Creole. It is found frequently in other immigrant societies, such as America (Fishman 1985), New Caledonia (Corne 1994), and the South Pacific region (Siegel 2008). These cases further show that when the ancestral or first language(s) of the immigrants continue(s) to be used by their locally born children, who are typically bilingual in the ancestral and the superstrate languages, substratal influence on the developing creole becomes possible: G2 speakers and subsequent generations may introduce substratal patterns from the ancestral languages in the creole as long as they remain bilingual. These cross-linguistic effects are even more likely to occur when the ancestral language and the superstrate converge (Corne 1994). Thus, cross-linguistic effects are expected to occur not only in the foreign-born G1, as suggested by DeGraff, Lefebvre and others, but also in the locally-born G2 as long as bilingualism is maintained.

The circum-Caribbean English-lexifier creoles possess shared morpho-syntactic features (McWhorter 1995; Smith, this volume on Ingredient X), as well as significant phonological parallels among those creoles lacking an extended superstrate influence from English (Smith, this volume on creole phonology). Smith terms this the Proto-Atlantic Slave Community Language (PASCL) and concludes that its creation took place in the Caribbean. When this was brought to Surinam with slaves (probably) from Barbados, it would be rapidly nativized. A total period of about 30 years might be sufficient.

4. The present volume: Substrate in Surinam

In order to contribute to this longstanding debate about cross-linguistic effects in creole genesis, this book is about the close historical and linguistic relationship between the languages of Surinam in the Caribbean and, in particular, Benin in West-Africa. This relationship can be viewed, we argue, in terms of a Trans-Atlantic linguistic area or Sprachbund. It consists of a detailed analysis of various possible substrate and adstrate influences in a number of components of the grammars of the Surinam Creole languages, primarily from the Gbe languages of Benin, but also from Kikongo, a Bantu language from further south in West Central Africa.

The Surinam Creoles constitute one of the richest and best-documented sources for the study of creole genesis. There are early sources available, and detailed descriptions of many aspects of their structure and development. Furthermore, there is abundant and indisputable historical, demographic, and lexical linguistic evidence that the Gbe languages, in particular the varieties spoken in Benin, as well as Kikongo, were of crucial importance in shaping the Surinam Creoles. This book deals with a number of aspects of linguistic structure, ranging from phonology to semantics, as well as with socio-historical considerations.

It reflects the detailed work carried out on the nature and history of the Surinam Creoles by members of the research group, including the late Jacques Arends of the University of Amsterdam (1952–2005). The group, and also many others, has worked on the languages of Surinam in considerable detail, notably the coastal language Sranan, and the maroon languages Saramaccan and Ndyuka. These are currently among the best-documented creole languages of the world.

The book is intended to bring new evidence to the discussion about Africanisms in language varieties of the New World. Two of the post-doctoral researchers in the project, James Essegbey and Enoch Aboh, are native speakers of relevant West-African languages: Akan and Gungbe, respectively, and trained experts in the comparative grammar of West African languages. Furthermore, the search for potentially significant contributing languages can be limited, for socio-historical reasons, to just a few languages, which have all been fairly well studied.

The book contributes to the discussion about and definition of linguistic areas by postulating a linguistic area, not so much characterized by geographical contiguity as by the historical evidence of massive population movement due to the capture and forced transportation of slaves. In Section 5, and in Muysken (2007b), this perspective is further explored.

Finally, it explores new dimensions of the process of linguistic interference or transfer. As Herskovits and Herskovits (1936: 131) put it “... the peculiarities of Negro speech are primarily due to the fact that the Negroes have been using words from European languages to render literally the underlying morphological patterns of West African tongues.” This leads us directly to the issue of relexification, extensively discussed in Muysken’s contribution (see Chapter 5), and which provided a starting point for the research undertaken here. New in this book is that the various alternatives to the classical relexification scenario are considered and discussed in detail.

Our main conclusions are that creole formation was a fairly rapid process, but that there was a subsequent period of prolonged bilingualism in at least Gbe (languages) and Kikongo. The crowded timetable of events in the early history of Surinam does not allow for a gradual process of creolization. However, it is clear that the Surinam creoles display more African features than most circum-Caribbean creole languages. This argues for a longer period of adstratal, rather than substratal, influence, which can be explained by several generations of bilingualism.

The idea that structural (in this case substrate) links exist between West African languages and creole languages, including those spoken in Surinam, is not at all new. This idea was proposed by Schuchardt (1914), for example, and has enjoyed a degree of popularity at various periods during the 20th century, in particular in the 30’s (e.g. Sylvain 1936 on the relationship between Haitian Creole and Ewe(Gbe). And for anthropological parallels between Surinam and Benin (Dahomey), see Herskovits & Herskovits (1936). In the 70’s, the idea made its reappearance, in particular in respect of English-lexifier creoles, in works such as Voorhoeve (1975), Huttar (1975), and Alleyne (1981). In the 80’s and 90’s, the emphasis moved back to the French-lexifier Haitian Creole again, with the work of a research team under Claire Lefebvre in Montréal (cf. Lefebvre 1998). In hindsight, it is striking that the Surinam Creoles and Haitian should continue to feature most strongly in this connection – Surinam in Schuchardt (1914), Herskovits & Herskovits (1936), and Voorhoeve (1973), and Haitian in Sylvain (1936), and in the work of Lefebvre’s team. Now in the 21st century, in work by the present NWO programme project team, and also by an NSF-supported team (Winford & Migge) working complementarily with ours, the focus has returned once again to the Surinam Creoles.

This should not create the impression that the substrate theory has ever been “the theory” of choice for the creolist community. Its greatest popularity was in the 70’s but even then it had to compete with other approaches.

The two other basic approaches are the universalist model (of which the main champion has been Derek Bickerton (1981)) and the superstrate model (whose main proponent is Chaudenson (1992)). Typical of the last two approaches, at least as formulated by the authors quoted, is a generally denigrating attitude towards proposals imputing an important role to influence from substrate languages. This opinion was certainly stimulated by the wilder and more poorly informed substratist proposals of the 1970's – *substratomania(c)*, in the words of Bickerton.

With respect to these three main types of linguistic explanations for creole genesis, workers in the field of creole languages have come to realise that linguistic arguments have to be backed up by socio-historical ones. Why did groups of slaves, or others collected together on plantations, develop new languages? What was the function of these new languages? Were they trying to learn the colonial languages or not? How long did they maintain their original languages? How many speakers of the various languages were really present at the different historical periods?² What was the social and demographic structure of plantations? It is still also true however that socio-historical arguments must be backed-up by linguistic arguments. How directly can these questions be answered by an examination of the records of the Atlantic slave trade?

In addition, new types of linguistic approaches have been applied to the problems of Creole genesis. Are there aspects to be found in creole language structures that are reminiscent of what we are now learning about the early stages of language acquisition? This question is relevant for both first and second language acquisition. In particular the latter appears relevant for creole genesis, along with the growing realization that the interlanguage stages seen by some in naturalistic second language acquisition, may well be susceptible to explanation in terms of first language (i.e. substrate) influence (Sprouse 2006), and that there can be cross-linguistic (adstrate) influence through prolonged bilingual usage.

Where previous attempts to study substrate influence have missed the mark is because there was a presumption in Creole studies that one of the three above-mentioned approaches was necessarily the best one, the one that basically told the whole story. Either the substrate approach was the

-
2. See Smith (2009: 313–314) for relative numbers of English, Portuguese and Dutch in the first 40 years of the colony, including the transition from English to Dutch rule. See also Smith (this volume on the early history of Surinam) for a detailed summing-up of the sources of slaves imported into Surinam from various parts of Africa during the first 60 years of the colony's existence.

touchstone, or the superstrate approach, or the universalist approach. This has been proved by experience not to be the case. In reality, things are much more complex, and different creole languages also differ from each other in this respect.

In proposing this project, we felt that the substrate approach in particular had received an unnecessarily bad press. The most attractive solutions tend to be the simplest ones, or even the most simplistic ones. Various individuals in the field have made their name and fame by pushing each of the three alternatives to the limit. Not that this is necessarily bad in methodological terms. However, the substrate hypothesis as it had hitherto been employed had not been convincing. The reason for the criticisms of the substratist approach was not so much, we thought, because of its inherent wrongness, but that it had not been tested on the right languages, or in reality tested properly at all.

Smith, Robertson & Williamson (1987) had shown that if the right substrate language was selected – in the case of Berbice Dutch, the Eastern Ijò language of the Niger Delta – a number of features of the creole could be satisfactorily explained in terms of substrate mechanisms. One reaction was that Berbice Dutch was a special case – a kind of mixed creole – and that therefore the result was not generalizable. It was felt that this was in some way more like the Mixed Language type first identified by Muysken (1981), where one effect of substrate influence, relexification, plays an overwhelming role.

However, Smith had also identified the Gbe language group as being of importance for the Surinam Creoles in terms of lexicon, and to some extent function words. Smith (1996), for example, demonstrates the near-identity of the syntax of contrastive focus in Fon/Gungbe and Saramaccan, down to the use of the same low-toned marker *wɛ* in post-focus position, which reinforced the work on aspects of morphosyntax by Bruyn (1995). Hence we felt confident that in these two groups of languages we had very good candidates for a valid test of the substrate hypothesis in what were widely accepted as canonical creole languages, if such exist. Aboh, in fieldwork in Surinam, has since established that the morphosyntax of contrastive focus is virtually identical in Fon/Gungbe and Saramaccan (Aboh 2006c).

All the more reason to again test the substrate hypothesis for Surinam, in our view the most solid historical case, next to Berbice Dutch, that the Caribbean creoles have to offer.

5. The notion of Sprachbund or linguistic area

In the title of our book, we suggest that the issue of West African substrate in the creole languages can be profitably pursued from the perspective of the notion of Sprachbund. Since Creole studies are not generally linked to this notion, it is useful to look at it a bit closer. Thomason (2001: 99) defines a linguistic area or Sprachbund (Trubetzkoy 1930) as "... a geographical region containing a group of three or more languages that share some structural features as a result of contact rather than as a result of accident or inheritance from a common ancestor." This definition contains a number of key elements that call for independent justification for our perspective.

Geographical region. Of course, Surinam and Benin do not form a geographical region in the strict sense. However, historically, they form a contact network, *in casu* through the slave trade.

Three or more languages. In the case of Surinam, there are about five major contributing languages or language complexes: Gbe, Kikongo, English, Portuguese, Dutch, and a handful of resulting creole languages.

Shared structural features. The number of shared structural features is of course a matter of investigation and debate, but Surinam certainly conforms to this criterion, it will turn out.

Contact. The issue of contact was covered above, under geographical region.

Not an accident. The features of the creoles certainly do not resemble those of the contributing languages by accident, but there is a debate in Creole typology on the issue of the origin of the creole structural features. Following Bickerton (1981), they could be due to universal properties of the process of creole genesis.

Not inheritance from a common ancestor. There are two different families involved in the emergence of the creoles: Niger-Congo and Indo-European, as well as individual languages descending from different branches of these families.

6. The contents of the book

The various chapters that are contained here, illustrating various types of substrate effect, all provide evidence of one sort or another bearing on various aspects of the process of creole genesis. In addition to this introduction, a chapter with the full bibliography of the West Africa-Surinam

Sprachbund project, a new inventory of all words in Surinam Creoles with etyma in the Gbe language family and Kikongo, and a combined list of references, there are twelve other chapters.

Migge (2003a: 25) conveniently lists five key components in any account of creole formation:

1. a historical scenario for creole formation
2. a characterization of the nature of the linguistic inputs
3. processes and mechanisms of contact
4. the factors that constrained them
5. the nature of the outcome

The remainder of the book is divided into three parts. In Part I *Setting the scene*, establishes the relevant background information for the linguistic studies in Part II. The first two chapters in Part I deal with the **early history of Surinam** (by Smith) [component 1] and **Benin** (by Smith and Aboh), and the specific varieties of Gbe relevant to Surinam [component 2]. In the next chapter, Smith then presents the evidence for an **antecedent extended Atlantic pidgin** feeding into the Surinam Creoles. Muysken then analyzes the history of the study of **substrate** effects, and provides an analytic overview of language contact mechanisms, particularly **relexification**, **second language learning**, and **bilingual convergence** [components 3 and 4].

The chapters in Part II *Language structures: a sprachbund?* focus mostly on the nature of the outcome of creole genesis [component 5]. Four chapters focus on the lexicon, taking into account both morphological, semantic, and categorical aspects. Building on the discussion in Muysken's chapter, Yakpo and Bruyn, explore **locative constructions** in Sranan: are we dealing with relexification of items or of patterns? Essegbey surveys verb semantics and argument structure in Gbe and in the Surinam Creoles. Then, van den Berg explores the role of cross-linguistic influence in **nominal morphology** in Sranan and on **property concepts** (often realized as stative predicates), also citing recent work on multilingual language use in West Africa [component 3]. Aboh & Smith, study non-iconic **reduplications** in Eastern Gbe and Surinam Creoles. Finally, Smith discusses key aspects of substrate, superstrate, and adstrate **phonology** in creole languages. The two subsequent chapters proceed with formal syntax. Aboh focuses on the **left periphery** in the Surinam Creoles and Gbe, arguing for the modularity of substrate transfer. Then Veenstra explores the role of relexification in the genesis of **clause-embedding predicates**.

Part III *Wrapping up*, begins with the concluding chapter, based on work of all the authors, and compiled by Muysken, contains the conclusions from the papers in the volume and develops new perspectives from the perspective of **structural phylogenetics**. We conclude that the Surinam Creole languages share structural features both with the Gbe languages and Kikongo and with their European lexifiers. The process of adoption of West-African features however, was adstratal, i.e. selective, creative, and gradual, rather than instantaneous and automatic, as the relexification hypothesis would suggest.

We then provide a list of additional publications resulting from the project and the combined list of references cited. Included are also two appending lists of probable **Kikongo** and **Gbe lexical items** in the Surinam Creole languages, prepared by Smith. These chapters show the extraordinary role that just two (minor) African language groups played in the languages of Surinam in contributing the large majority of African-derived words, contrasting with the general impressions that Caribbean creoles have had significant input from a wide variety of African languages³. Further work will be needed to study the degree of regularity in the sound changes through which these words were adopted in the Surinam Creole languages, and identify possible additional items.

3. Left out of consideration here is a lesser body of African words from Akan/Twi (Ghana/Gold Coast). These are much less numerous than the Gbe and Kikongo words, reflecting presumably the largely eighteenth century importations of slaves from this area.