Creole Studies and Historical Linguistics: Renewing Our Vows
Author(s): John McWhorter
*Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley
Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Historical
Issues in Sociolinguistics/Social Issues in Historical Linguistics* (1995),
pp. 450-464

CREOLE STUDIES AND HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS: RENEWING OUR VOWS

John McWhorter
Cornell University

1. INTRODUCTION

When creole studies came formally into existence in 1968 at the Conference on Pidginization and Creolization of Languages in Mona, Jamaica, one of the prime expectations resulting was that creole studies would vitally challenge models of language change, and thus that a new interface, as it were, between creole studies and historical linguistics would be particularly dynamic and rewarding.

However, a survey of the approaches to this interface in the literature over the past twenty-eight years unavoidably reveals that in the end, creole studies thus far has contributed rather little to our understanding of language change. In this paper, after making clear the grounds for this assessment, I will offer suggestions as to how we might make this interface more fruitful in the future, an undertaking which will include a fundamental shift in perspective regarding the nature of the interface in question.

2. THE *STAMMBAUM* VICTORY

The assertion here is hardly, of course, that historical linguistics has reaped no benefits at all from the work of creolists; we have seen an invaluable revision of the Neogrammarian *Stammbaum* model as the result of the examination of the parentage of pidgins and creoles. In fact, as conceived by the early creolists, the creole-historical interface was more or less a shorthand for the investigation of this particular *Stammbaum* issue. Where the *Stammbaum* model stipulated that all languages can be derived genetically from single ancestors, the fact that several languages make their contribution to all structural layers of pidgins and creoles made it clear that this model required expansion, in order to incorporate what had been designated as *Mischsprache* (mixed languages) by Hugo Schuchardt in the late nineteenth century (1884).

The revision of the *Stammbaum* paradigm was hardly instant. In the 1960s and 1970s, before the West African languages constituting the substrate of most Caribbean creoles had been confidently identified, before substantial fieldwork had been done on more than a couple of dozen or so pidgins or creoles, and at a time when a number of creolists were erstwhile Romance scholars, arguments were made for classifying pidgins and creoles simply as descendants of their lexifiers, although usually in more nuanced fashion than legend has hitherto depicted (e.g. Hall 1958:370, Chaudenson 1979, Posner 1983). However, over the past twenty years or so, the massive contribution of substrate languages to all structural levels in creoles has been well-documented, with some scholars going as far as classifying Caribbean creoles as West African languages simply relexified by European languages (Alleyne 1980, Lefebvre 1986). In view of such findings, the status of pidgins and creoles as mixed languages has become more or less a matter of general consensus; at this point it would seem that the only substantial resistance to this conception comes from a particular Francophone school of thought which is of rather marginal general influence (see below for

discussion of this work). Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) already classic treatment of this issue would seem to be the most authoritative and summary statement.

What motivates this paper, however, is that despite the specific intentions of the Mona creolists in their investigation of the creole-historical interface, from a more general perspective the *Stammbaum* issue constituted but one facet of a less theory-specific conception of the interface, and various creolists have seen it as worthwhile to explore other aspects thereof. It is here that it becomes clear that after the early *Stammbaum* victory, subsequent creole-historical encounters have presented a much lower yield.

3. OTHER APPROACHES TO THE CREOLE STUDIES-HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS INTERFACE

3.1. The Creole Continuum as Targeted Change

There can be seen to have been three main schools of creolist investigation which have aimed at forging ties with historical linguistics. The first is the study of creole continua. In the early 1970s, it was discovered that the wide-ranging variation that a given Caribbean creole displayed could be systematized via arrangement according to implicational hierarchies of features. Specifically, it was found that a given feature in a person's idiolect strictly implied the presence of certain others. For example, DeCamp (1971:355) selected six features representative of basilectal, or most conservative, Jamaican Creole English:

(1)

IDIOLECT					
	nyam "eat" /d/ for /ð/	*nana* "granny"	*no ben* "was not"	*pikni* "child"	/t/ for /θ/
5.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1.	+	+	+	+	+	-
6.	+	+	+	+	-	-
2.	+	+	+	-	-	-
7.	+	+	-	-	-	-
3.	+	-	-	-	-	-
4.	-	-	-	-	-	-

In (1) we see his arrangement of seven idiolects, each displaying a different selection from among the six basilectal variables, in such a way that it becomes clear that there is pattern amidst the apparent chaos presented by a creole such as this one. Specifically, the presence of certain features automatically impies the presence of others. For example, note that a speaker who has *nyam* for eat, a particularly conservative feature in Caribbean English-based creoles, can be expected to also have all of the other conservative features, while a speaker without *nyam* but who has *nana* for grandmother can be expected to have all of the other features except *nyam*, rather than a smaller, and/or random, subset thereof. The proportion of basilectal features a given speaker controls is proportional to level of education, frequency of contact with standard English speakers, and motivation to imitate same -- in other words, creole continua were discovered to be linguistic indicators of sociological stratification.

The continuum studies inspired by DeCamp's work were couched in a conception of the continuum as representing a diachronic progression through time, the idea being that at the inception of a given colony, only the basilect was spoken, but that as former slaves and their descendants acquired more geographical mobility and economic opportunity, their increasing contact with whites led them to move their basilect towards the local standard. This "movement toward the target" was seen as offering a rich mine of data on what was designated "targeted language change", and spawned a fairly voluminous literature in the 1970s. One of the most eminent practitioners in this vein was Bickerton (1973, 1975, 1980), who conceived the powerful axiom that, to paraphrase, spontaneous change involves the recruitment of old forms in new functions while targeted change involves the recruitment of new forms in old functions. To illustrate, a typical spontaneous change was when Latin recruited forms of the verb *habere* to encode the future (*amare habeo* "I will love"), in the place of its eroding inflectional morphology for this purpose (i.e. *amabo* "I will love"). Here, an "old" form, the longstanding full verb *habere*, was recruited to fulfill a "new" function, one it had not served previously. As a contrast, Bickerton presented the use of *did* as an anterior marker in mesolectal Guyanese Creole English, in which *did* behaves not like standard *did*, but like the basilectal anterior marker *bin*. For example, with dynamic verbs *bin* encodes past-before-past, as in *mi bin go* "I had gone" (not "I went"), while with stative verbs it encodes the simple past, as in *mi bin nuo* "I knew" (not "I had known"). What is significant is that when used in the mesolect, *did* mirrors the behavior of *bin*: *a did go* "I had gone"; *a did nuo* "I knew". This behavior is distinct from the behavior of *did* in the standard, where it is restricted to inverted interrogative and emphatic sentences (*Did I go?*, *I **did** know*). Thus in its mesolectal reflex, *did*, under Bickerton's conception, was seen as constituting a form "new" (to the basilect) serving an "old" function, that of the basilectal *bin*.

As insightful as the diachronic approach to the continuum was, however, over the past several years there has been a profound paradigm shift in how creole continua are viewed. Historical investigation and documentation (e.g. Lalla & D'Costa 1990, Baker 1990) have made clear that the continua of lects on view in a given creole today actually have existed since the inception of the colony, rather than having emerged only over time. Thus whereas in 1971 the continuum was seen as having arisen as the result of latter-day socioeconomic change, in 1995 it is seen as having resulted from the varying degrees of contact with whites that slaves had even at the founding of the colonies -- field slaves would have had the least such contact, but house slaves and slaves residing in towns would have had much more.

The significance of the direction continuum studies have moved is that, while in itself representing the progress of scientific inquiry, it has the fortuitous result of essentially eliminating the continuum as an example of language change *per se*. Instead, the continuum of dialects represents various degrees of the acquisition of the standard. Mesolectal registers, for example, can no longer be seen as the result of a basilectal register moving towards a target over time; instead, a mesolectal register represents a degree of acquisition acquired at the inception of a colony, passed on to subsequent generations like any other language. More specifically, then, it must be stated that the work couched within the original conception of "targeted change" is now obsolete: Bickerton's axiom, for example, elegant though it is, can no longer be seen as having been formulated on the basis of an actual phenomenon. Rickford (1988:35) has suggested that despite the new

paradigm, we need not rule out that some actual spontaneous change still takes place when creole speakers move to different lects in the course of their lifetimes. This is certainly true, but given 1) the difficulty of distinguishing the created features from those simply acquired, 2) the fact that we can assume that acquisition vastly dominates creation in such contexts given the exigencies of communication, and that 3) the similarities between earlier texts and modern speech appear to confirm that generational transmission has kept creation at a relatively marginal level, it is unclear that maintenance of the earlier paradigm would yield significant benefits. In sum, then, all of the continuum literature in question must today be read through this lens, and leads us to look elsewhere for creolistic insights into language change.

3.2. Tok Pisin and Permeability to Mixture

In the meantime, in the late 1970s and 1980s Peter Mühlhäusler offered another perspective on the creole-historical linguistics interface in his work on Tok Pisin, the English-based creole of Papua New Guinea. One of Mühlhäusler's many concerns was to identify constraints upon language mixture according to subsystem, his working hypothesis being that certain linguistic subsystems are less permeable to language mixture than others. Part of his intention in this work was to show how pidgins and creoles could be used to shed light on language change in contexts of contact.

Mühlhäusler's analysis led to conclusions which are best summarized by this passage:

> As a general principle, it can be postulated that the more arbitrary an area of grammar, the more readily can languages borrow from one another. With regard to the formation of developmental continua such as the pidgin-creole continuum, this implies that: 1) substratum influence will be most pronounced in the areas of lexical semantics, prosodic phonetology, some segmental phonology [and] pragmatics whilst superstratum influence will be strongest in lexical form [and] segmental phonetology; *relatively independent of substratum or superstratum influences are syntax, inflectional morphology [and] derivational morphology* [emphasis mine]. (Mühlhäusler 1980:36)

However, once again, further research over the past several years has, while lending us invaluable new insights on Tok Pisin and its history, had the unfortunate side effect of severely constraining the relevance of Tok Pisin itself to the language change issue, at least in the vein Mühlhäusler intended. While Mühlhäusler couched his hypothesis on the most fundamental level in traditional and intuitive conceptions of the relationship between arbitrariness of subsystem and susceptibility to transfer, his empirical base consisted of detailed comparison of Tok Pisin with the Austronesian language Tolai, based on the fact that this is the language spoken natively by the people who first adopted Tok Pisin in New Guinea. Mühlhäusler noted that despite the occasional teasing correspondence or two between Tok Pisin and Tolai, systematic comparison revealed a predominance of contrasts. For example, he noted that Tok Pisin and Tolai tend to display contrasting noun-adjective orderings despite the occasional apparently fortuitous match-up, as in (2), where we see that despite the correspondence in (2a) and (2b), most other cases contrast:

(2) Adjective placement in Tolai and Tok Pisin (adjectives in bold) (Mosel 1980:57-8):

TOLAI   TOK PISIN

(a) A   tutana **tuna**.   (b) Man **tru**.
    DEF man   real   man real
    A real man   A real man

(c) A   **mo** na gamata.   (d) Banana **mau**.
    DEF ripe C apple.   banana ripe
    A ripe apple   A ripe banana

(e) A   **kaina** pakana.   (f) Ples **nogut**.
    DEF bad   place   place bad
    A bad place   A bad place

(g) A   mal   **pua**   (h) **Wetpela** klos
    DEF clothes white   white   clothes
    White clothes   White clothes

 However, various Pacific pidginists over the past seven years or so have decisively challenged these conclusions. For example, Keesing (1988) shows that Tok Pisin, rather than emerging and taking shape in New Guinea, actually emerged and developed decades before Mühlhäusler stipulated, as a widespread Melanesian Pidgin English developed starting in the early nineteenth century in the context of the whaling, sea cucumber, and sandalwood trades. As such, Tok Pisin can be assumed to have taken its fundamental form not among Tolai speakers in New Guinea, but much earlier among speakers of closely related Eastern Oceanic languages in Melanesia. This becomes particularly clear, for example, when we note how comprehensively and idiosyncratically similar Tok Pisin is to other Melanesian Pidgin English dialects such as Bislama, Solomon Islands Pijin, and Torres Strait Broken, which developed separately from the same early-pidgin progenitor as Tok Pisin -- the similarities demonstrate that the parent pidgin had expanded into a form much like its present-day progeny, since such close correspondences cannot have resulted from parallel development.
 The crucial fact here is that it appears that Mühlhäusler chose the wrong substrate language upon which to base his conclusions about language mixture: while Tok Pisin indeed corresponds only erratically with Tolai except in terms of lexical contributions, it corresponds much more closely to Eastern Oceanic structure, a predictable result of it having taken shape in Melanesia rather than New Guinea. In (3) we see that where Tok Pisin and Tolai do not correspond, such as in the encoding of plural with the third person plural subject pronoun, Tok Pisin and a wide range of representative, closely-related Eastern Oceanic languages do:

(3) *Correspondences between Tok Pisin and E. Oceanic as compared to Tolai:*

   TOK PISIN   TOLAI   E. OCEANIC

the men	olgeta man they man	a umana tutana ART PL man (Mosel 1980:116)	a ...ra ngwane they man (Keesing 1988:128)
my house	haus bilong mi house POSS me	kau-gu pal POSS-my house (ibid. 114)	Kwaio: ʔ fi a gu house POSS-my (Goulden 1990:145)

The result of these findings is that Mühlhäusler's theoretical ideas about language mixture, based upon an unintentional miscomparison, would appear to be largely invalidated, at least as far as they were derived from analysis of Tok Pisin. Whereas Mühlhäusler's comparison of Tok Pisin and Tolai naturally suggested language mixture in Tok Pisin occurring to starkly different degrees according to linguistic subsystem, the findings of scholars like Keesing (bolstered by Romaine 1992, et al.) instead demonstrate that language mixture permeates all systems of Tok Pisin to considerable degree.

Indeed, this has in general been shown to be true of all creoles, which can be classified as extremes along a cline of degree of language mixture. The fact is that the unusually extreme and wide-ranging language mixture in creoles hardly invalidates the basic notion that in *less* extreme cases of mixture, we can expect differences in permeability among subsystems less apparent in creoles themselves. However, it would seem that we would gain more insight into such issues through the examination not of a creole like Tok Pisin, which represents an extreme extent of mixture in all subsystems, but of instantiations closer to the middle of the restructuring cline, such as Yiddish, Andean Spanish (Lozano 1975), or Yawelmani Yokuts (see Kramer, this volume).

3.3. The French Superstratists

In the meantime, we see a final potential contribution to our interface in the form of the French superstratist school of creole origins (Chaudenson 1979, Fournier 1987, et al.). While most creolists agree that creoles are fundamentally mixed languages, many Francophone creolists hold to a belief that creoles constitute no challenge to basic *Stammbaum* theory, and that there is nothing in creole structure which cannot be attributed to nonstandard dialects of French undergoing ordinary language change unfettered by the conservatizing effects of literacy and standardization.

This view would seem, in the final analysis, to proceed from a perspective which, while philologically well-informed, neglects to engage substantially the decades of work outside of this school which would seem to offer rather comprehensive and irrefutable demonstrations that plantation creoles display a wealth of features difficult to subsume under the spontaneous change designation. Indeed, there are certain features of French-based creoles, for example, that appear exotic to the modern eye but in fact can be traced to regional French constructions. An example would be the progressive marker *ap*, used as in the Haitian Creole *m'ap pale* "I am speaking". This marker is derived from a regional French usage, still current, for example, in Québecois French as in *Le chat de Marie-Sylvia est après jouer* "Marie-Sylvia's cat is playing" (Tremblay 1978:108). Derivations like this are instructive, and indeed the contribution of regional dialects to creole structure remains underappreciated in English-based creole studies to this day, as becomes apparent when one encounters the richness of

evidence in occasional exceptions such as Hancock (1993). However, the fact is that regional dialect contributions, current or extinct, can hardly account for a great many other nonstandard features one finds in creoles. For example, it is highly unlikely that any regional French dialect has ever omitted the copula as the French-based creoles do in many contexts, as in the Haitian *Bouki ∅ anba tab-la* "Bouki is under the table" (DeGraff 1992). Or, to extend the argument to creoles of other lexical bases, it is highly unlikely that any regional English dialect ever postposed positional adpositions as Sranan Creole English does (*Kofi de a tafa ondro* "Kofi is under the table"); a West African derivation, such as the Ewe *É lè kplɔ té* he is table under "He is under the table" (Westermann 1954:638) is much more likely given the provenience of slaves brought to Suriname during the period of formation crucial to Sranan's development (McWhorter 1994).

Thus the superstratists would like creoles to be treated as an instantiation of a particular type of diachronic phenomenon, perhaps lightly brushed by contact with other languages. However, it would seem that the predominance of features prototypical of either West African contact, such as serial verbs and completive markers postposed to VP, or of radical reduction of a type foreign to spontaneous change, such as zero copulas where there were none before, render this frame of reference of limited application at best to a general theory of creole origin. Most importantly, it would seem to be outright dangerous to language change theory, given that its proponents purport that divergences as sharp as those between plantation creoles and their lexifiers are concomitants of spontaneous change, a claim belied by work in all other frameworks.

4. RETHINKING THE INTERFACE

Despite the unavoidably critical intent of the above discussions, this paper is written in a fundamentally constructive vein. The aforegoing is intended solely to make clear the grounds for my sense that a fresh perspective must be applied to the creole-historical interface if there is to be such.

It is my contention that a partnership of creole studies with historical linguistics is necessary and of rich potential, but that if it is to be a vital partnership, then creolists will have to approach the issue in a somewhat different frame of mind than in the past. Specifically, there is most likely little of import discovered by creolists which will significantly reformulate language change theory as it is currently conceived; it is likely that the *Stammbaum* victory was the only such bomb to throw. Creole studies indeed has icons to topple elsewhere, such as the reformulation of generative theories of competence as promised by the early continuum scholars, and interactions with first- and second-language acquisition. However, the creole-historical interaction will be most fruitful at this point if treated more pacifically.

The justification for this response hardly springs from any devotion to bland even-handedness of the sort which tends, when overapplied, to impede true progress in scientific inquiry. Rather, the approach I have suggested is a concomitant of a more general realization over the decades that when viewed apart from their genesis and histories -- crucial to theory in themselves -- creoles are best treated as languages just like any other. Creolists have come to realize that there are no prototypically "creole" features, in that none of the features which cluster in many creoles are absent in other languages and even at times cluster in other languages as well (Chinese, with its analytic structure, serial verbs, etc. being a notable example). Moreover, contrary to an oft-cited axiom of

the past, creoles have not been observed to change more rapidly than other languages (we note, for example, the relative likeness of the earliest documentation of Sranan in 1718 and the modern language), and while pidgins indeed do develop rapidly to fulfill the needs of full language, situations in which this expansion can be or has been actually observed are rare to non-existent: the early pidgins we can observe are unlikely to expand (Gastarbeiterdeutsch), while the earlier stages of creoles and expanded pidgins are generally unrecoverable.[1] In line with these realizations, then, in a rethought interface between creole studies and historical linguistics, the emphasis will be less on what creoles have to offer as a separate linguistic type than on what creoles have to offer given the particular traits -- out of the full set of traits found in all languages -- which happen to cluster in pidgins and creoles for various reasons. This is perhaps a little less titillating than the Trojan Horse approach of the old days, but it will also be the most constructive for all parties concerned.

4.1. Pidgins and Creoles as Sources of Data

Thus pidgins and creoles will contribute to historical linguistics in serving as sources of data for change in constructions typical of contact languages. For example, topic-comment constructions, particularly in which the subject is resumptive of the topic, are a typical trait of pidgins and creoles as the result of what appears to be a universal discourse strategy:

Saramaccan Creole English:
(4) Dí **nEn, hen** da súkuma.
    the name it COP foam
    The name was "foam".

Tok Pisin:
(5) Nau wanfela **masta bilong kampani em** i-kisim mi.
    then ART white-man of company he PM-take me
    Then a white man from the company took me. (Hall 1966:149)

What is important here is that as it happens, cross-linguistically, topic-comment constructions tend to be the site of a wide range of reanalyses and grammaticalizations, resulting from the reanalysis of topic as subject, and pidgins and creoles are no exception. In Saramaccan Creole English, for example, this author has documented the emergence of the identificational copula from an erstwhile topic-comment construction, as shown in (6) and (7)) (see McWhorter 1993 for details):

Saramaccan (most likely as Guinea Coast Creole English) (reconstructed):
(6) Kofi, dati ø di Gaama.
    Kofi that the chief
    Kofi, that's the chief.

(7) Development of the identificational copula in Saramaccan (McWhorter 1993):

Stage A (reconstructed):				Stage B (modern):	
[Kofi]	[da]	a	[di Gaamá]	--->	[Kofi da di Gaamá]
topic	subject	COP	predicate		subject predicate

TOPIC COMMENT	SUBJECT-PREDICATE
"Kofi, he's the leader."	"Kofi is the leader."

This author has elsewhere documented the development of an idiosyncratic allomorphy of the predicate negator, outlined in (8) (see McWhorter [forthcoming] for details):

(8)
STAGE A: -----> STAGE B: -----> STAGE C:

Reconstructed	Reconstructed	Modern
(11) Kófi á ná wáka	(12) Kófi á wáka	(13) Kófi á wáka
Kofi he NEG walk	Kofi he-NEG walk	Kofi NEG walk
"Kofi he doesn't walk"	"Kofi he doesn't walk"	"Kofi doesn't walk"
[Kófi] [a ná wáka]	[Kófi] [á wáka]	[Kófi á wáka]
TOPIC COMMENT	TOPIC COMMENT	SUBJ-PRED

Elsewhere, as for example in Bislama Creole English, we see the grammaticalization of an erstwhile third person pronominal resumptive *i*, derived from *he*, as a paradigmatically generalized predicate marker used in all persons and numbers, as shown in (9), where it is used in the second person despite its third person singular etymology and original usage:

Bislama Creole English:
(9) a. Hem i   stap   talem wanem? (Original parsing: *Him, he stop talk what?*)
       him he PROG talk   what
       What is he saying? (Crowley 1989:186)

    b. O yufela i   kranki.
       oh you-PL PM crazy
       Oh, you're crazy. (Charpentier 1979:374)

Pidgins and creoles also display a very strong tendency to encode tense, mood and aspect via preverbal particles, generally with a rich and systematic range of combinabilities. This makes pidgins and creoles invaluable sources of data on the evolution of such markers over time, and by extension fine places to watch the development of inflectional morphology (although, crucially, pidgins and creoles are hardly alone in this). For example, Guinea-Bissau has reanalyzed the Portuguese verb *acabar* "to finish" as a past marker of unusually flexible syntactic movement, as shown in (10). A marker which appears to resemble its Ibero-Romance progenitor semantically in modifying VP as in (10a) surprises us in allowing accusative pronominals to intervene between the verb and itself as in (10b); furthermore, it even marks NP predicates as in (10c). Note also that this is not an SOV language, thus ruling out analyzing *ba* here as a sentence-final verb "to be" or the like:

Guinea-Bissau Creole Portuguese:
(10) a. I ten **ba**   un minjer ki   ten **ba**   manga de konpadre.
        it have ANT a   woman REL have PAST many   of friend
        There was a woman who had a lot of friends. (Kihm 1980:234)

(10) b. I ka   ta   permiti-n **ba**   pa   n papya.
       it NEG IMP permit-me PAST COMP I speak
       It didn't permit me to speak. (Kihm 1989:365)

(10) c. Ami i   karpinteru **ba**.
       I   PM carpenter PAST
       I was a carpenter. (ibid.)

In the meantime, the curious habitual *be* of African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) has been traced back to an original concatenation *doz be* still on view in Gullah Creole English. In AAVE, *he be workin'* can only signify the habitual, and never, contrary to the folk perception, the progressive. This can be traced back to early Gullah, as seen in (1a), after which *doz* be eroded phonologically to simply *be*:

Stage 1:
(11) a. *He **does be** up and cut wood sometimes.*

Stage 2:
(11) b. *Sometimes you* [z] ***be** in the bed...*

Stage 3: (now also current in AAVE):
(11) c. *He ø **be** up and cut wood sometimes.* (Rickford 1986:270-1)

There are myriad such cases awaiting examination in the pidgins and creoles of the world.

4.2. Pidgins and Creoles and Grammaticalization

Furthermore, in general, creoles prove themselves to be rich sources of information on processes of grammaticalization. This is in part because, as new languages, they are often in the process of developing grammatical items whose origins in many regular languages is lost to time. For example, Bislama, which developed from Mealnesian Pidgin English which can be reconstructed to have had but two prepositions (*bilong* for possession and *long* elsewhere in all functions), is developing a rich collection of new prepositions out of serial verb constructions, as in the case of *kasem* "to get" in (12). *Kasem* began as a simple verb, as in (12a):

(12) a. Mi no   **kasem** mane   long   bang.
       I   NEG get   money PREP bank
       I didn't get money from the bank. (Crowley 1990:76)

What sparked the reanalysis of *kasem* as a preposition was its use in serial verb constructions. In Bislama, both verbs in serial construction are marked with the predicate marker *i*. *Kasem*, however, began to occur without it, suggesting that it was shedding the properties of verbhood:

(12) b. Sip ia **i**   ron long Vila (***i**) **kasem** Santo evri   wik.
       ship this PM go PREP Vila   get   Santo every week
       This ship goes from Vila to Santo every week. (ibid. 78)

Next arose semantic extensions, as well as occurrence within NP and PP, as in (12c):

(12) c. Graon long   ples ia **kasem** taon
        land   PREP place this to   town
        The land from here to town... (ibid. 79)

Finally, today *kasem* can strand as in (12d), which is diagnostic of prepositions and impossible for verbs in the language:

(12) d. Wan mil   nao, hem i   sakem   vatu **kasem**.
        one   thousand now he PM contribute vatu to
        It was as much as 1,000 vatu that he contributed. (ibid. 85)

Creoles are also valuable to the investigation of grammaticalization because, despite the complaint common among creolists that historical records of creoles' earlier stages tend to be scanty, the fact is that creolists are comparatively well-off in this regard in comparison to many linguists working on other language families. Thus scholars of the Suriname creoles, for example, have almost three centuries of relatively copious documentation to work with, while most Africanists, Papuanists, Austronesianists, or Amerindianists could never hope for the same. This is an outgrowth of the fact that most creoles emerged in contexts dominated by Europeans, who had a stake in documenting the creoles for religious and communicative purposes. Thus creolists are hardly as blessed as scholars of the history of English or Russian, but a historical linguist can nevertheless take advantage of a creole's recent birth and its historical documentation to draw a great many discoveries, when combining the documentation with comparative and internal reconstruction.
    For example, combining synchronic and diachronic analysis of a single creole, Sranan Creole English, one can trace the evolution of definite articles, a complementizer, a copula construction, a dative preposition, subordinating conjunctions, a place adverb, and a wide range of morphophonemic phenomena.[2] Note illustrations of some of these in (13) and (14), with the processes of change sketched in more detail in (15), (16) and (17) (the latter strictly not a grammaticalization, but included to further illustrate the development of morphology as described in 4.1.):

Reconstructed Sranan c. 1690 (most forms attested):
(13) Dati man, dati man disi ben go teli mi.
      that man that man this ANT go tell me
      That man is the one who would have told me.

Modern Sranan:
(14) A man-dati na   a man di   bo   tei mi.
      the man-that COP the man REL COND tell me
      That man is the one who would have told me.

(15) The erosion and redevelopment of distal demonstrative NP modification:

a. ***dati*** *man* "that man"
b. ***da*** *man* "the man"
c. ***a*** *man* "the man"
d. *a man-****dati*** "that man"

(16) The development of demonstrative pronoun to equative copula; proximal demonstrative pronoun to relativizer:

a. *Dati man,* ***dati*** *ø man* ***disi***... "that man, that's the man who..."
b. *Da man,* ***da*** *man* ***di***....
c. *A man-dati* ***da*** *(da) man* ***di***... "that man is the man who..."
d. *A man-dati* ***na*** *a man* ***di***...³

(17) The emergence of a monomorphemic conditional marker:

a. *ben go teli mi* "would have told me"
b. *ben o tei mi*
c. *bo tei mi*

4.3. A Two-Way Street

Finally, the creole-historical linguistics interface has always been couched in terms of what creole studies had to offer historical linguistics. However, at this juncture we need also consider what historical linguistics has to teach creole studies. The past ten years have seen a minor explosion in diachronic studies of creoles, and I think that this body of work would benefit immensely from close attention to the tenets and findings of historical linguists in general. Specifically, creolists must bring not only documentation to bear upon charting diachronic processes in creoles, but also comparative and internal reconstruction. The examples in (15) through (17), as well as (7) and (8), serve as illustrations. For example, the development of the Sranan and Saramaccan equative copulas is most rigorously and refutably charted via reference not only to historical documents, which themselves shed only partial light on the process, but via reference to the cross-linguistic literature on copula development, which reveals a strong tendency for copulas to develop from resumptive demonstrative pronouns in topic-comment constructions, and to principles of internal reconstruction, which reveal synchronic idiosyncracies which render the demonstrative derivation nearly inescapable (see McWhorter 1993). In addition, emerging creolists should seek thorough training in diachronic linguistics in order to most usefully fulfill the requirements of bringing its insights into creole studies.

5. CONCLUSION

In general, it is my view that our current aproach to the creole studies-historical linguistics interface is best informed by a bird's-eye perspective, via which we can see that the opening rounds of interaction produced a vital paradigm shift, but that the facts of the situation have since demonstrated that the initial catastrophically-oriented pitch has not lent itself to being maintained indefinitely -- as is the nature of most such interactions between two fundamentally sound theoretical orientations. Instead, our findings since that paradigm shift have shown us that the

interface can and must proceed, but will do so most fruitfully via a cooperation intended for the constructive improvement of both frameworks. The very existence of such an interaction is but one of many signs at this writing that display that creole studies, after almost three decades of exciting but inevitably somewhat breathless forays, is coming gracefully of age.

REFERENCES

Alleyne, Mervyn C. 1980. Comparative Afro-American. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
Arends, Jacques. 1989. Syntactic developments in Sranan. University of Nijmegen   dissertation.
Baker, Phillip. 1990. Off target? Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages 5:107-19.
Bickerton, Derek. 1973. The nature of a creole continuum. Language 49:640-9.
_____. 1975. The dynamics of a creole system. Cambridge: Cambridge University   Press.
_____. 1980. Decreolisation and the creole continuum. In Valdman & Highfield, 109-   27.
_____. 1981. Roots of language. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
_____. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. The Behavioral and Brain Sciences   7:173-88.
Charpentier, J.-M. 1979. Le Bislama: pidgin des Nouvelles-Hébrides. Paris: SELAF.
Chaudenson, Robert. 1979. Les créoles français. Évreux: Nathan.
Crowley, Terry. 1989. Say, c'est, and subordinate constructions in Melanesian Pidgin.   Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages 4:185-210.
_____. 1990. Serial verbs and prepositions in Bislama. Melanesian pidgin and Tok   Pisin, ed. by John W.M. Verhaar, 57-89. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
DeCamp, David. 1971. Toward a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum.   Pidginization and creolization of languages, ed. by Dell Hymes, 349-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
DeGraff, Michel. 1992. The syntax of predication in Haitian. Proceedings of NELS 22.
Fournier, Robert. 1987. Le bioprogramme et les français créoles: vérification d'une   hypothese. Université du Québec a Montréal dissertation.
Goodman, Morris. 1985. Review of Bickerton (1981). International Journal of American   Linguistics 51:109-37.
Goulden, Rick J. 1990. The Melanesian content in Tok Pisin. Canberra: Australian   National University.
Greenberg, Joseph. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? Universals of Human Language III, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson and Edith   Moravcsik, 47-82. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Hall, Robert A. 1958. Creole languages and genetic relationships. Word 14:367-73.
_____. 1966. Pidgin and creole languages. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Hancock. Ian. 1993. Componentiality and the creole matrix: The S.W. English   component. Sociolinguistics and Black language, ed. by Michael Montgomery.   University, AL: Alabama University Press.
Holm, John. 1986. Substrate diffusion. In Muysken and Smith, 259-78.
Keesing, Roger. 1988. Melanesian pidgin and the Oceanic substrate. Palo Alto: Stanford   University Press.

Kihm, Alain. 1980. Aspects d'une syntaxe historique: études sur le créole portugais de   Guiné-Bissau. Thèse de doctorat de 3e cycle. Université de Paris III, Sorbonne Nouvelle.

_____. 1989. Lexical conflation as a basis for relexification. Canadian Journal of Linguistics 34:351-76.

Kramp, A. 1983. Early creole lexicography: A study of C.L. Schumann's manuscript   dictionary of Sranan. University of Leiden dissertation.

Lefebvre, Claire. 1986. Relexification in creole genesis revisited: The case of Haitian   Creole. In Muysken & Smith, 279-300.

Lozano, Anthony G. 1975. Syntactic borrowing in Spanish from Quechua: The noun   phrase. Lingüistica e indigenismo moderno de América, Vol. V, 297-305. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

McWhorter, John H. 1993. Towards a model of genesis: Competing motivations in the   birth of Saramaccan Creole. Stanford University PhD dissertation.

_____. 1994. Rejoinder to Derek Bickerton. Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages 1994:79-93.

_____. forthcoming. The diachrony of predicate negation in Saramaccan Creole: Synchronic and typological implications. *Studies in Language.*

Mosel, Ulrike. 1980. Tolai and Tok Pisin: The influence of the substratum on the development of New Guinea Pidgin. Canberra: Australian National University.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1980. Structural expansion and the process of creolization. In Valdman & Highfield, 19-56.

Muysken, Pieter and Norval Smith, eds. 1986. Substrata versus universals in creole   genesis. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Posner, Rebecca. 1983. The origins and affinities of French creoles: New perspectives.   Language and communication 3:191-202.

Rickford, John R. 1986. Social contact and linguistic diffusion: Hiberno-English and   New World Black English. Language 62:245-89.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1992. Language, education and development: Urban and Rural Tok   Pisin. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1884. Slawo-deutsches und Slawo-italienisches. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky.

Tremblay, Michel. 1978. La grosse femme d'à côté est enceinte. Ottawa: Leméac.

Valdman, Albert and Arnold Highfield, eds. 1980. Theoretical orientations in creole   studies. New York: Academic Press.

Westermann, Diedrich. 1928. Wörterbuch der Ewe-Sprache. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

FOOTNOTES

1. Bickerton's (1981, 1984) Language Bioprogram Hypothesis is based upon the identification of the language of aged Hawaiian informants in the 1970s as a pidgin variety of the creole spoken by later descendants, but this analysis has been strongly challenged by Goodman (1985), Holm (1986), and McWhorter (1993, 1994). Meanwhile, Mühlhäusler in much of his work (e.g. 1980) designates certain varieties of Tok Pisin as "pidgin" varieties in contrast to "creole" varieties elsewhere, but the additional historical data cited above put these designations into severe question. In both the Bickerton and Mühlhäusler cases, we are left with the strong possibility that what the authors designate as "pidgin" registers

were actually second-language registers acquired of previously existent, more expanded reflexes.

2. For diachronic data on Sranan, see Arends (1989) for the most useful treatment, as well as Kramp (1983).

3. The extra *da* here is derived from a separate process, the bleaching of another instance of *dati* into definite article a via the intermediate form *da*, sketched above in (15). The extra *dati* is omitted in (1a) both for purposes of clarity, and because it can be presumed that at an early stage, determination had yet to be regularly marked overtly, with overt marking arising only via the bleaching and generalization of erstwhile demonstratives which had at first been used only for emphatic deictic designation (see Greenberg 1978, e.g., for a general conception of the development of determiners from demonstratives).