

Restructuring, Feature Selection, and Markedness: From Kimanyanga to Kituba

Author(s): Salikoko S. Mufwene

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on Historical Issues in African Linguistics (1994), pp. 67-90

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Restructuring, Feature Selection, and Markedness: From Kimanyanga to Kituba*

Salikoko S. Mufwene
University of Chicago

1. Introduction

Kituba in this paper is short for *Kikongo-Kituba*, also known as *Kikongo ya leta*, *Kileta*, *Kikongo ya bula-matadi*, *Kibula-matadi*, or *Mono-kutuba*, whence *Kikongo-Kituba*, among other names listed in Heine (1970) and discussed in Mufwene (to appear-a). It is spoken primarily in the Southwestern part of Zaire and the Southern part of the Congo, although it is apparently also used in the Northern part of Angola. It is better known as a creole, having been discussed more in creole studies than in African linguistics (see also Part 4). It must have developed toward the end of the nineteenth century associated with the formation of the Congo Free State in 1885, which officially marks the beginning of the colonization of what is now known as Zaire.

An important question in this and other papers of mine is: why does Kituba seem to diverge from the Bantu morphosyntactic canon regarding some features considered typical of this genetic group of languages? The question becomes more important as we consider the fact that, unlike Atlantic creoles lexified by European languages, Kituba falls in the category of what Chaudenson (1979) calls 'endogenous' creole, for two reasons. First, it started in Bas-Zaire (the Lower Zaire Region), the Kikongo-speaking area, in which speakers of the lexifier and related languages have always been indigenous and the majority. The odds for the formation of a more Bantu-like Kituba, similar to Lingala, seem to have been as great as those which led to the formation of Tok Pisin and Bislama, reflecting strong influence from Melanesian and other Austronesian languages.

Second, even after spreading eastward, outside Bas-Zaire and into the Bandundu Region (east of the Kwango River), it has been used still by Bantu speakers, even though of languages not belonging in what Hinnebusch (1989) calls the 'Kikongo Group.' Since influence from these other languages was just as likely in the earlier stages of Kituba's emergence in Bas-Zaire as in the later stages of its spread (see below), we may treat the creole as a primarily Bantu contact phenomenon whose usage has remained within the relevant Bantu territory. Thus it may be considered more endogenous than some creoles such as Krio and Nigerian Pidgin English, which have a non-African lexifier.¹

Despite some structural differences among Bantu languages, the spread of Kituba both within and outside Bas-Zaire, in the Bantu territory, raises the question of why its morphosyntax and its tonological systems in particular have turned out so different from those of Lingala (Mufwene 1989b), another Bantu contact

phenomenon that developed around the same time, at the end of the nineteenth century and under very similar colonial circumstances, with the West Africans still involved in the colonial work force—at least according to Samarin (1982, 1989, 1990). For instance, Lingala has subject-verb agreement (albeit restructured and simplified) and an incorporated reflexive marker, but Kituba does not.

I thus decided to examine morphosyntactic features of some of the Bantu languages of the Bandundu Region and compare them with the alternatives available in Kimanyanga, one of the Kikongo Group varieties, which has been assumed since Fehderau (1966) to be Kituba's lexifier (see below). Without discounting the element of chance, I wished to determine whether either the lexifier or some of the other Bantu languages in contact with it may have features that influenced the development of Kituba in the direction of divergence from the Bantu canon presented in much of the literature. I intended to focus on Kiteke (B75, according to Guthrie 1953), because its speakers had been involved in the precolonial trade and served in the colonial system (Samarin 1989). However, lack of accessible information on it led me to start by checking a related language, Kiyansi (Bantu B85, according to Guthrie 1953), which I speak natively. The Bayansi, sometimes confused with the Babangi (Whitehead 1899), were also involved in the precolonial trade and live in the area east of the Kwango River, where Kituba has spread as a major lingua franca and as an urban vernacular. A sketch of that comparison, partial to date, follows in Part 2, after which I raise some issues regarding Kituba's genesis in Part 3 and some others on Bantu genetic linguistics in Part 4.

2. Some Morphosyntactic Characteristics of Kituba: A Genetic Perspective

One of the most noticeable features of Kituba in comparison with Bantu languages is absence of subject verb-agreement, as illustrated below:²

- (1) *Móno* \emptyset +*mon*+*áka* *yánda* *ye* *yánda* \emptyset +*mon*+*áka* *móno*.
 me AGR+see+ANTER him/her and him/her AGR+see+ANTER me
 'I saw him/her and he/she saw me.'

I was curious whether this apparent idiosyncrasy was a confirmation of the kinds of innovations—virtually *ex nihilo*—claimed by Bickerton (1981, 1984) and in later work, or something that Kituba may have selected from any of the languages in contact. As I show in Part 3, I also had doubts, contrary to Samarin (1982, 1990), about the extent of the influence of West African colonial escorts in the restructuring of Kimanyanga into Kituba. So I started with Kiyansi, at least my Kibwaal dialect. A startling finding in this project was that Kiyansi diverges from the Bantu canon, as illustrated below:

(2) Sample Verb Conjugation in Kiyansi:

<i>mε mā dia</i> me NPERF eat 'I have eaten'	<i>nzé mā dia</i> you-SG NPERF eat 'You have eaten'	<i>ndí mā dia</i> he/she NPERF eat 'He/She has eaten'	<i>bí mā dia</i> we NPERF eat 'We have eaten'
<i>mε ε+dí</i> I RPERF eat 'I ate (already)'	<i>nzé ε+dí</i> You RPERF eat 'You ate'	<i>ndí ε+dí</i> He/She RPERF eat 'He/she ate'	<i>bí ε+dí</i> We RPERF eat 'We ate'
<i>mε áyí: 'dia</i> me FUT eat 'I will eat'	<i>nzé áyí: 'dia</i> you-SG FUT eat 'You will eat'	<i>ndí áyí: 'dia</i> he/she FUT eat 'He/She will eat'	<i>bí áyí: 'dia</i> we FUT eat 'We will eat'
<i>mε a+di+áná</i> 'I eat [HABIT]'	<i>nzé a+di+áná</i> 'You eat'	<i>ndí á+di+áná</i> 'He/She eats'	<i>bí a+di+áná</i> 'We eat'

A similar pattern without a canonical Bantu subject-verb agreement obtains also in the Kiwumbu dialect of Kiteke, even though it has a singular/plural distinction and clear third person plural marker in the verb form:³

(3) Sample Conjugation in Kiwumbu (Kiteke):

<i>mè (à)lyɛ:l</i> I cry	<i>nzè àlyɛ:l</i> you-SG cry	<i>ndè àlyɛ:l</i> he/she cries
<i>bí lìlyɛ:l</i> we cry	<i>byɛn lìlyɛ:l</i> you-PL cry	<i>bo balyɛ:l</i> they cry

A closer examination of facts in Kimanyanga reveals that Kiyansi and Kiwumbu-Kiteke are not so unique. Kimanyanga does not follow the Bantu canon so strictly either in regard to subject-verb agreement, as illustrated below. There are a few cases where there is a null marker, which may well be interpreted as absence of agreement, at least from the point of view of a Kiyansi speaker:

(4) Illustration of Subject-Verb Agreement in Kimanyanga:

- a. *Mbuta muuntu w+e+ziēt+a* *kuku,*
Old man AGR+ANTER+travel+Ending here
Ø+mwen+i *ki+ina* *ki+ndumba-ndumba.*
AGR+see+NEAR PERF. AGR7+that CL.7+girl-girl
'My old man traveled this way [and] saw that young woman over there.'

- b. *Ma+lavu ma+tanu Ø+bong+ele me+eso*
 CL6+wine CL6+five take+NPERF CL6+eye
 '[Those] five [bottles of] wine are before your eyes.'

One of the characteristics of Kituba, which has no incorporated object pronominal markers either, is that it uses the same free pronominals in both subject and nonsubject functions. One depends thus on the syntactic position of the pronominal to determine its function, as below:

(5) Distribution of Pronominals in Kituba:

- a. *móno mé(n)e móna yô*. 'I have seen it.'
 me PERF see it
- b. *yó búl+a móno*. 'It hit me.'
 it hit+NARR me
- c. *béno món+a béto*. 'You saw us.'
 you-PL see+NARR we-PL
- d. *béto món+a bô*. 'We saw them.'
 you-PL see+NARR them

Kiyansi is also like Kituba in some related respects, especially in also allowing usage of independent object pronouns in several contexts, even though in some of these the pronouns cooccur with an incorporated object pronominal marker, as below:

(6) Object Pronominals in Kiyansi:

- a. *mε m+ð+sámí*. 'I have told him/you.'
 I NPERF+you/him+tell
- a'. *mε nzé m+ð+sámí*. 'I have told you.'
 I you-SG NPERF+you+tell
- a". *mε ndí m+ð+sámí*. 'I have told him/her.'
 I him/her NPERF+him/her+tell
- b. *mε (bea:g),⁴ m+ě+sámí*. 'I have told them.'
 I (them) NPERF+them+tell

- c. *mε (bε) m+ě+sámí.* 'I have told you.'
I (you-PL) NPERF+you+tell
- d. *bε (mε) ma+n+sámí.* 'You have told me.'
you-PL (me) NPERF+me+tell
- e. *nzé (bí) m+ě+sámí.* 'You have told us.'
you-SG (we) NPERF+we+tell
- f. *bí (ndí) ma+k+ō+sámí.* [*k* + < *k'ε* 'go']
We (he/she) NPERF+go+him+tell
'We are leaving to tell him/her.'
- g. *ndí (nzé) ma+y+ō+sámí* [*y* + < *ya* 'go']
he/she (you) NPERF-come-you/him-tell
'He/She has come to tell you/him.'

Note that in Kiyansi the free object pronominal plays an important role in clarifying reference, since incorporated pronominals are distinguished only in terms of first person singular vs. non-first person singular vs. plural. Because reliance on context alone may be quite confusing, it helps to disambiguate reference with concomitant use of free pronominals. By the same token, the free pronominals make the incorporated ones superfluous. Although Kimanyanga has a fully articulated system of distinctions for incorporated pronominals, it also seems to allow occasional usage (based on the Matuka corpus) of free object pronouns, whose usage, I suspect, may have increased in the contact settings that prompted and nurtured the development of Kituba:⁵

(7) Free and Incorporated Object Pronominals in Kimanyanga:

- a. *bu n+tel+ele mono.* 'This is what I personally said.'
this I+tell+NPERF me-EMPH
- b. *mo+mo xu+n+tel+ele mono* 'what you told me'
PL+what you+me+tell+NPERF me-EMPH
- c. *u+m+bak+idi.* 'You got me/him/her.'
you+me/him/her+get+NPERF
- d. *mono mpe n+kaanda y+e+taanga wo.* 'The letter, I read it too.'
me too letter I+PAST+read it

- e. *mono bu yi+zol+anga*. 'I like [it] this way.'
me this-way I+like+HABIT it
- f. *tu+mwiin+i yo*. 'We have seen it.'
we+see+NPERF
- g. *mono mpe n+kutu we xoxa*. 'I too was about to say it.'
me too AGR+about it say

To be sure, there is not as much flexibility in Kimanyanga as in Kiyansi in the use of free object pronouns. However, compared to how creoles lexified by European languages have selected most of their grammatical features (Mufwene 1989a, 1991), one cannot deny the significance of the option to use free object pronouns in Kiyansi, in Kimanyanga (although it seems more constrained here), and perhaps in other Bantu languages of the region.⁶ As a matter of fact, the selection of free object pronouns over their agglutinated counterparts may have helped solve the apparent homonymy between, for instance, *n-* in (7b) and *m-* in (7c). Since the nasal is not syllabic, the phonological variation in this case may be considered no more than homorganic assimilation triggered by the following consonant.⁷ Note also that the absence of an incorporated object in (7a) might be due to a constraint against doubling the same morpheme, *n-* 'I' and 'me', before the verb stem. Thus, syntactic marking eliminated some complications in the grammar.

Another respect in which Kituba diverges from the Bantu canon is lack of an incorporated reflexive form, as illustrated below. Because Lingala has one, it seems natural to wonder whether this peculiarity of Kituba's is a Bickertonian innovation.

(8) Reflexivization in Kituba:

- a. *Yánda lwad+ís+a yánda mósi*. 'He/She cut him-/herself.'
he/she cut+CAUS+NARR he/she one
- b. *Bó lwad+ís+a bó mósi*. 'They cut themselves.'
they cut+CAUS+NARR them one

(9) Reflexivization in Lingala:

- a. *A+mi+tumb+í móto*. 'He/She burned him-/herself.'
he/she+REFL+burn+NPERF fire
- b. *Ba+mi+tumb+í móto*. 'They burned themselves.'
they-+REFL+burn+NPERF fire

Kituba's periphrastic reflexive marker is a grammaticization of the quantifier 'one', which is sometimes used also with the meaning 'alone' and, in addition, serves as an emphasis marker, as in (10):⁸

- (10)a. *Béto mon+áka mu+ntu mósi.* 'We saw one person.'
we see+ANTER CL1+person one
- b. *Móno/Béto vand+áka móno/béto mósi.* 'I was/We were alone.'
me/we LOC-be+ANTER me/we one
- c. *Móno/Béto mósi mu+ntu/ba+ntu sal+áka yo.* 'I/We-EMPH did it.'
me/we CL1+person/CL2+person do+ANTER it

While varieties of ethnic Kikongo are usually reported to have an incorporated reflexive marker, such as illustrated in (11) from Mufwene (1988), I have not identified any yet in Matuka's Kimanyanga text. On the other hand, I have noticed that Kiyansi-Kibwaal does not have one at all, as illustrated in (12). The pattern in the latter language is not significantly different from that in Kituba, though it makes a morphological distinction between the reflexive and the 'alone' functions. Note incidentally that the emphatic and reflexive functions are performed by the same morpheme *ngáàkwēag* similar to pronominal compounds with *-self* in English for that matter:

(11) Reflexivization in Kikongo:

- a. *Yandi ka+ki+zol+ele.* 'He/She likes him-/herself.'
he/she AGR+REFL+like+NPERF
- b. *B+ana ba+ki+zol+ele.* 'The children like themselves.'
CL2+child AGR+REFL+like+NPERF

(12) Reflexivization in Kiyansi:

- a. *ndí á+tyē:n ι ndí ngáàkwēag.* 'He/She is talking to him-/herself.'
he/she NARR+talk CONN he/she EMPH.SELF
- b. *ndí ngáàkwēag y+ĩ:.* 'He/She him-/herself came.'
he/she EMPH-SELF come+NPERF
- c. *ndí á+tyē:n ι ndí ntu.* 'He/She is talking alone.'
he/she NARR+talk CONN he/she alone

In a somewhat different vein, I have shown elsewhere (especially Mufwene 1988, 1989b, 1991) that Kituba's time reference distinctions are semantically more or less the same as in varieties of ethnic Kikongo.⁹ The same applies to mood distinctions. As noted much earlier by Fehderau (1966), the tense-mood-aspect (TMA) markers themselves have generally come from Kimanyanga, although it is still not clear how to account for the change from the suffixal form *-anga* to *-áka* for the habitual aspect.¹⁰ Because it is commonly assumed that Bantu languages typically mark time reference by agglutination, it seems very appealing to invoke some grammaticization processes, which must have been concomitants of the development of Kituba, to account for the current grammatical functions of the auxiliary verbs. Without rejecting offhand this explanation (which is consistent with work by especially Heine and his associates at the University of Cologne, e.g., Heine et al. 1991), grammaticization would have to be interpreted loosely here, in the sense of extended or regularized usage of these verbs for grammatical functions that were not unattested in the lexifier, as well as in the sense of their selection over their agglutinated alternatives, but not in the sense of newly formed grammatical patterns. More or less the same verbs in more or less the same periphrastic constructions are available in Kimanyanga, and/or in other varieties of ethnic Kikongo, for more or less the same functions, as below. Moreover, Kituba has followed their pattern in not marking the main verb in the infinitive as one of the options (Mufwene to appear-a).¹¹

(13) Periphrastic Verbal Delimitative Constructions in Kimanyanga:

- a. *Mono ng+yena fila nkaanda.* 'I am going to send/sending a letter.'
me AGR+go-PRES send letter
- b. *Nduumba yiyi y+ina teetuka.* 'This young woman is blooming.'
young-woman this AGR+be-PRES come-out-of-shell
- c. *W+eta ku+n+tuma.* 'He is sending me.'
he+be INFIN+me+send
- d. *K+eta pelesa.* 'He is rushing.'
he+be rush
- e. *K+i+leend+i teka mw+ana ko.* 'I dare not sell [my] child.'
NEG+I+dare+NPERF sell CL1+child NEG
- f. *Mono ng+ina kala toko dy+ani* 'I am (going to be) her husband.'
me AGR+be-PRES be husband AGR+POSS

The following options were cited in Mufwene (1991) from Fehderau (1966):

(14) More Periphrastic Verbal Delimitative Constructions in Kimanyanga:

- a. *W+eti dia.* 'He/She is (busy) eating.'
he/she+be-PRES eat
- b. \emptyset +*kedi dia.* 'He/She was (busy) eating.'
+be-NPAST
- c. *W+a+kedi dia.* 'He/She was indeed (busy) eating.' RPAST
- d. *U+mana dia.* 'He/She has eaten.'
he/she+finish eat
- e. \emptyset +*meni dia.* 'He/She has eaten.' NPAST
- f. *W+a+meni dia.* 'He/She has eaten.' RPAST

(15) Periphrastic Verbal Delimitations in Kituba:

- a. *Móno mé(n)e 'dia.* 'I have eaten.'
- b. *Móno ké(l)e 'dia.* 'I am eating.'
- c. *Móno vand+á(k)a 'dia.* 'I was eating.'¹² [vándá = 'sit']
- d. *Móno lénda 'dia.* 'I can eat.' [lénda = 'be able to']
- e. *Móno tond+á(k)a 'dia.* 'I would have eaten.' [tónnda = 'want']

Regarding time reference and mood markers, Kiyansi uses a system that is heterogeneous as in ethnic Kikongo, resorting both to agglutination and to periphrasis. This may be noted from the examples cited in (2). The patterns are very similar in both languages, even with respect to the variable position of tense markers (see Mufwene 1988, 1989b, and, to appear-a, for ethnic Kikongo). The division of labor that now obtains in Kituba, with aspectual and mood markers being free and preverbal while the tense markers are suffixes, should not be surprising and must have been a happy solution, producing more regularity.

I could go on showing how perhaps most morphosyntactic features of Kituba are developments from features of Kimanyanga, other varieties of ethnic Kikongo, or other Bantu languages involved in the ethnolinguistic contacts that produced it. However, space is limited and I should hasten to highlight the relevance of these data to the debate on the development of Kituba, at the intersection of history and language contact, and to genetic aspects of Bantu linguistics. Before I

do this, however, it will help to show that not all selections made by Kituba originated from the lexifier or its closest kin alone. Examples of influence from outside the Kikongo group may be cited in Head + Modifier constructions. Unlike in ethnic Kikongo, the form of the connective in Kituba does not vary much in such constructions, as illustrated below:

(16) Head + Modifier Relation in Kimanyanga's NP:

- a. *bi+bundi by+a bi+oole* 'two six-yard cuts of cloth'
CL8+six+yard cut CL8+CONN CL8+two
- b. *mi+inda mi+e Koleman* 'Coleman lamps'
CL4+lamp CL4+CONN
- c. *fuunda dy+e n+zitu* 'in-law's packet'
CL5a+packet CL5+CONN in-law

(17) Head + Modifier Relation in Kituba's NP:

- a. *mw+ána ya Ø+máma* 'mother's child'
CL1+child CONN CL1a+mother
- b. *b+ána ya Ø+máma* 'mother's children'
CL2
- c. *m+bísi ya Ø+máma* 'mother's fish'
CL9/1a+fish
- d. *di+kulu ya Ø+nkénto* 'left leg'
CL5+leg CONN CL1a+woman
- e. *ma+kulu ya Ø+nkénto* 'left legs'
CL6
- f. *mw+ána na béto/béno* 'our/your child'¹³
CL1+child CONN we/you-PL

This development in Kituba is the kind of simplification that would dispute the kind of explanation I summarize below, from especially Mufwene (1991), if all Bantu languages followed the Bantu morphosyntactic canon presented in much of the literature. However, Kiyansi diverges again from this misleading stereotype, as shown below:

(18) Head + Modifier Relation in Kiyansi's NP:

- a. *mw+á:n í mâ:* 'mother's child'
CL1+child CONN mother
- b. *b+á:n í mâ:* 'mother's children'
CL2+child CONN mother
- c. *m+biy í mâ:* 'mother's fish'
CL9/10+fish CONN mother
- d. *∅+kwū:l í ká:r* 'left foot'
CL5a+foot CONN female
- e. *m+yē:l í ká:r* 'left feet'
CL6+foot CONN female

I argue in Mufwene (1990) that, while the invariance of the connective may have been selected from outside the Kikongo group of languages, the form *ya* itself seems to have come from the second half of the variable connective in the lexifier itself and its immediate kin. While the consonantal beginning of the connective varies a lot, reflecting agreement, the segment following it is [y] (represented graphically as *y* or *i*), and the following/final vowel is predominantly [a].

I could thus argue safely that, like in other creoles (or call them simply contact-induced language varieties), very few morphosyntactic features of Kituba, if any, are innovated in the sense suggested by, for instance, Bickerton (1984, 1988, 1992). There are undoubtedly innovations in the traditional historical linguistic sense, according to which, in the case of the aspectual markers of Kituba discussed here, the systemic distribution of some constructions has been extended and their function generalized, but nothing in the Bickertonian sense of creation virtually *ex-nihilo*.¹⁴

The position I present here is based on the assumption that creoles are mixed languages, as was advocated before me by, for instance, Schuchardt (1909), Hjelmslev (1938), and, recently, Thomason and Kaufman (1988). Thus their grammatical features need not have come from one language variety only, even though their morphemes, especially the grammatical ones, may have a predominant common source, as argued in Mufwene (1986). Creoles qua restructured varieties need not be any more homogeneous than other languages, which have often been restructured in various ways and to various extents in the course of their histories, Hjelmslev (1938) argues quite convincingly.¹⁵ Having articulated this position, we may now re-examine the facts with regard to the contact-based development of Kituba and, later, relative to genetic aspects of African linguistics.

3. On the Development of Kituba

There are two competing hypotheses on the development of Kituba. According to the first, assumed by Fehderau (1966), Kituba started in the sixteenth century as a koiné out of diverse mutually unintelligible language varieties of the Kikongo Group. Although this position may seem plausible, given the existence of the Kongo Kingdom at that time, Samarin (1982, 1990) has undermined it successfully with two main objections: 1) It was not necessary for a koiné of any sort to develop in order for different African ethnolinguistic groups to communicate with each other. According to him, Africans have generally been associated with the facility to learn their neighbor's language, a disposition that has resulted in widespread individual multilingualism on their continent. Further evidence for this observation lies in the fact that in the course of their colonial expeditions Europeans recruited Africans as their interpreters, apparently not in the least concerned by geographical distance and concomitant systemic differences.

2) If there had been a koiné since the sixteenth century, this would have been reported in historical accounts, like several other facts about human contact in precolonial Africa. For instance, colonial agents typically identified those ethnic languages that were widely spoken as *lingua francas* and adopted them, as in the case of Bobangi, the primary lexifier of Lingala, according to Samarin. In the same way, Kimanyanga, the language variety of Manyanga, an important trade post inland on the Zaire River rapids, rather than any of the coastal language varieties, was adopted as a *lingua franca* for the Western part of Zaire, then the Congo Free State.¹⁶

I would like to add a third objection: 3) if koineization or pidginization was a common solution in precolonial Africa, there would have been many more cases similar to the central African contact phenomena represented by Kituba, Lingala, and Sango, certainly given the precolonial existence of several noteworthy empires and kingdoms on the continent. Nurse (1985) argues convincingly that even Swahili, which is assumed by some scholars (such as Ohly 1982) to have had a pidgin/creole origin, did not start as one and was only adopted by the Arabs, without grammatical restructuring, for trade in East Africa.

According to the second hypothesis, assumed by Samarin (1982, 1989, 1990), the development of Kituba was a concomitant of colonization, dating from the end of the nineteenth century, with the Berlin Treaty in 1885 and the formation of the Congo Free State serving as a convenient historical milepost. To paraphrase him, the ethnographic circumstances of the formation of this creole, originally a pidgin, involved the encounters of, on the one hand, West African languages with local Bantu languages, and, on the other, Bantu languages among themselves in colonial posts, originally in Bas-Zaire and later, as colonization spread toward the hinterland, in the Bandundu Region south of the Kasai River.

As reported by Samarin (1982, 1989, 1990), the West Africans, recruited as militia men, clerks, interpreters, and porters for the Belgian colonial agents, in-

cluded Senegalese (speakers of West Atlantic and Mande languages), Kru, Hausa, and several speakers of Kwa languages.¹⁷ The Bantu populations not speaking any of the ethnic Kikongo varieties¹⁸ came from as far East as Zanzibar, brought over especially to build the railroad from the Atlantic Ocean to Kinshasa, or to serve as militia men, cooks or porters. According to Samarin, 'they were the first most important workers of [Sir Henry Morton] Stanley and his successors [in the nineteenth century] and for quite some time they were the principal recruits of the "force publique"' (p.c. 1994). Many words of Arabic origin may have found their way into Kituba through these East African recruits!

I conjecture that although Kituba's development started in colonial posts in the Lower Zaire Region, where language varieties of the Kikongo Group are indigenous, the process itself entailed selection from among competing grammatical structures. The colonial *centres extra-coutumiers*, beginnings of present-day cities, started with the multilingual indigenous populations forming the overwhelming majorities. In these new ethnographic settings, the local Bantu languages must have led the way in the competition of features, with their speakers becoming the models for the West African colonial escorts. According to the ecological-ethnographic approach to creole genesis that I have advocated over the past few years (e.g., Mufwene 1991, 1992a, 1993, to appear-a), factors such as the ethnolinguistic composition of the colonial posts and the demographic proportions of speakers of the different languages (on which there is very little information in the case of Kituba) are as significant as both the systemic options available in the lexifier and the alternatives provided by the non-indigenous languages. In other words, markedness values are not determined by structural considerations alone, even though these are heavily weighted.

These considerations suggest that, because speakers of the local Bantu languages were likely to be in the majority, their features were just as likely to prevail as any others that may appear to be less marked from a purely structural point of view. We are reminded of this possibility especially by Melanesian pidgins in which features such as the inclusive/exclusive distinction in the pronominal system have been retained from the convergent substrate languages.¹⁹ However, since, as shown above, the indigenous Bantu languages in contact do not always follow the Bantu canon suggested in the literature, selection must have been more manifold than traditionally assumed. Both purely structural factors and the demographic-ethnographic factors involving speakers only may have converged variously to produce the Kituba phenomenon. Still it may not be necessary to invoke languages from outside the Bantu area to account for Kituba's selection of exclusive periphrastic delimitation for aspect, mood, and pronominal arguments.

Contrary to what might be concluded from the above, I disagree only partly with Samarin's (1990) position that the West African colonial workers were the primary agents of Kituba's formation. Although I questioned this view in Mufwene (1989b), I entertain it in Mufwene (to appear-a), arguing that the West Africans may be considered the initiators of the restructuring. As the Bantu-

speakers adopted the West Africans' second-language variety of Kimanyanga (probably assuming in areas outside the Kongo territory that it was the colonists' language), they must have played an important role in making this ancestor of Kituba as Bantu-like as possible with respect to, for instance, TMA semantic distinctions, noun class morphological distinctions, and verbal extensions. They must have done this in the same way that Melanesians restructured English, not only omitting some native distinctions but also assigning it new ones.

Assuming that the Kru and other West Africans from the coast must have spoken some pidgin English, which may have served as the means of communication between them and the Belgian colonial agents in lieu of English,²⁰ Kituba would probably have been much less agglutinating than it is, had it not been for the intervention of Bantu-speakers in its development. The contribution of Bantu-speakers must have become more important during the formation of colonial posts, in which they came to work, having been brought from diverse parts of Zaire east of the Kwango River and from Zanzibar. In Mufwene (to appear-a), I reinterpret Samarin's position as follows:

'Samarin's hypothesis is thus not as implausible as it may seem. The colonial posts, the factory towns, and the missions, with which Kituba's development has been associated, provide the socio-historical setting. The West Africans as interpreters between the Europeans and the Bantu populations were instrumental in the development of especially the colonial posts and factory towns. Their association with colonial power must have made the contact language they initiated a viable alternative for communication once identified by the indigenes as a *lingua franca*. Its usage in all the colonial posts where the West Africans and others carried it must have given it some relative universal usefulness that later on relegated the Bantu languages that hitherto had functioned as *lingua francas* to a lower ethnographic status, especially in the colonial posts.

It may be assumed that, despite the similarity, at least lexical, of the initial-stage Kituba—as used by the West Africans—to Kikongo and to some of the languages around the area, the Bantu populations, including the Bakongo, just assumed that it was colonial speech and largely accommodated the powerful foreigners. On the other hand, they must have not been passive language learners in this kind of setting. While accommodating the colonial, European and West African, foreigners, they must have brought the new language closer back to the Bantu patterns. In turn, the West Africans must have adjusted back to the variety spoken by the Bantu speakers. Whether or not things worked out this way remains a speculation difficult to verify beyond doubt in the absence of a sample of West Africans' Kituba and, generally, of early linguistic records. One particular factor encouraging the above division of labor between the West Africans and the Bantu is that, despite its development toward an isolating

morphosyntax (Mufwene 1988), Kituba is still in several ways more different from Kwa, or West Atlantic, or Mandé languages than it is from Kimanyanga or any of the surrounding Bantu language varieties, e.g., regarding the noun class and time reference system (Mufwene 1988, 1990a).'

One of the points I wish to make with the data in Part 2 is that with or without the initial instrumental role of West Africans in the colonization of the Congo Basin at the turn of the century, a Kituba-like creole could still have developed, provided the other ethnographic conditions remained the same. Every morphosyntactic feature of Kituba discussed here and in Mufwene (1988, 1989b, 1990b, 1991, to appear-a) can be related to some option in Kimanyanga or some other indigenous Bantu language(s), represented here partly by Kiyansi. Note that the selection is hardly a perfect copy, as it is generally also accompanied by some partial innovation in the traditional historical linguistic sense (Boretzky 1993). I will go as far as claiming, as in Mufwene (1991), that the selections are generally in favor of some unmarked option, with 'unmarked' being a descriptive shorthand for a variety of more explanatory factors, such as perceptual salience, semantic transparency, morphological uniformity, morphosyntactic regularity, convergence between the lexifier and other languages in contact, among other factors.

Markedness values in this model are determined relative to other competing parametric options in the specific ethnographic setting of language contact rather than in Universal Grammar. There are cases where these factors may be in conflict with each other, suggesting different options as unmarked. Such conflicts may be resolved either by weighting the factors in ways that still remain to be worked out or by considering how they cluster to favor some particular options.

The latter part of this statement explains, for instance, why Kituba has selected the free-pronoun option for anaphoric objects over the incorporated alternative, especially since Kiyansi and probably most of the other local Bantu languages *do* have the latter option, which may be claimed to favor Hagege's (1992) 'ease of production' principle. As noted above, the incorporated alternative was likely to refer ambiguously in some cases, due to homonymy of some forms. This state of affairs is likely to favor alternatives which are both salient, unambiguous, and uniform, all of which are embodied in the free-pronoun option. In any event, an important advantage of this approach is that it accounts for cases where more than one option is selected, reflecting occasional natural inability to resolve a structural-option conflict among those who developed the new language.

My hunch is that this model accounts adequately for how creoles have selected their structural features from competing alternatives in the contact settings in which they developed. In a way that is quite consistent with the history of contacts, it also marginalizes the role of children in the vernacularization and normalization of such varieties. One would have to be familiar with some of the competing options to play a role in the selection of features!

There are also several established assumptions about language that one would have to abandon or modify in order to adopt the above approach. We may start with the realization that while language is transmitted from one generation to the other, it is also constantly being made by its speakers (Hagège 1992). Language is an exponential working construct; the reality is speech, from which the construct 'idiolect' was formed. In a contact setting, one can imagine several individual speech varieties competing with each other, up to the point where patterns of the most successful attempts prevail. For instance, construction patterns that reflect more regularity, transparency, and relative simplicity are likely to be selected over other alternatives.

Some creolists, such as Thomason and Kaufman (1988), have advocated accommodation as an important explanation. I do not see accommodation and selection as mutually exclusive. In fact I see them as working together, with selection probably accounting for the direction of accommodation processes. Note that accommodation is an interactional notion that does not explain which structural options get selected and for what structural or ethnographic reasons.

4. Implications for Genetic Aspects of African Linguistics

We may now address the question of how relevant this discussion of the development of Kituba is to genetic aspects of Bantu linguistics. Let us start with the fact that Kituba has generally been omitted in classifications of Bantu languages. For instance, neither Bendor-Samuel (1989) nor Bright (1992), two of the latest major references in which one might want to check how Kituba is classified genetically, lists it among the Bantu languages under any of its many names.²¹

There are several conceivable reasons for the above state of affairs, one of which is that Kituba may simply have been confused with other language varieties subsumed by the name *Kikongo Group*. This interpretation is consistent with Hjelmslev's (1938) position that creoles are dialects of their lexifiers despite the putatively extensive restructuring that has produced them and the fact that their systems have mixed sources.²² This particular view of the facts makes it acceptable to disregard some of the respects in which Kituba differs from other members of the Kikongo Group, for instance, in not having much of the inflectional agglutination (including subject-verb and head-modifier agreement) typically associated with Bantu languages. However, it does not explain the inconsistency in several genetic classifications which do not list Kituba along with other varieties of Kikongo such as Kiyombe, Kifioti, Kintandu, or Kimanyanga, its lexifier.

Things become complicated if one considers the fact that Kituba speakers do not generally perceive much kinship, if any, between their language and those of the Kikongo Group. It is not even certain that the Bakongo themselves consider Kituba to be one of the related language varieties identified by outsiders indiscriminately as Kikongo. We must thus wonder why a language variety recognized

as a major urban vernacular and as a lingua franca for millions of speakers in rural areas of Bas-Zaire and the Bandundu Region south of the Kasai River has been overlooked in genetic classifications.

A second and most likely reason for not listing Kituba seems to lie in the tradition of genetic linguistics since the nineteenth century to focus on what may essentially be claimed as pure parent-to-offspring relations, rather than in mixed languages. Thomason and Kaufman (1988:3) in fact reiterate the nineteenth-century position in claiming that:

mixed languages [such as pidgins and creoles] do not fit within the genetic model and therefore **cannot be classified genetically at all; but most languages are not mixed**, and the traditional family tree model of diversification and genetic relationship remains the main reference point of comparative-historical linguistics owing to the fact that it is usually possible (except in relatively rare borderline cases) to distinguish mixed languages, whose origins are nongenetic, from languages whose development has followed the much more common genetic line (T&K's emphases).

Like most genetic linguists, they perpetuate an inadequate analogy from biological taxonomies, regardless of the fact that one of the concerns of biology itself is how to account for features of hybrid species, which are in fact considered a normal occurrence. For most species, the normal offspring is a hybrid, which makes the genetic linguistics tradition inadequate. Schuchardt (1909) and Hjelmslev (1938) were justified in disputing the treatment of pidgins and creoles as abnormal cases, and in arguing that all languages are mixed to some extent.

I should clarify that Schuchardt's and Hjelmslev's position that creoles are mixed languages, only to a larger extent than their non-creole counterparts, is not quite the same as Mufwene's (1992b) arguments that linguistic systems are not monolithic. While Mufwene highlights inconsistencies and the fact that rules overlap, independently of the histories of individual languages, Schuchardt and Hjelmslev meant what is suggested by the history of contacts that are characteristic of the developments of, e.g., the Romance languages. This sense can also be extended to other contacts in Europe that have affected the structures of several languages, as well as to the migrations that account for the current geographic distribution of Bantu languages in sub-Saharan Africa. Their position refers to the diverse sources of structural features in particular languages.

In the case of the Bantu languages, their speakers moved into territories that were inhabited by other people. They did come in contact with these populations while pushing them away. During the migrations, the Bantu (sub-)groups must also have come into contact with one another and thus must have influenced each other. Assuming that present-day differences are not simply the result of their divergent migrations, variation within Proto-Bantu and selection in the direction

of present-day crosslinguistic variation are factors that must be taken as seriously in Bantu genetic studies as the features of the substrate languages themselves.²³

So, while it is convenient to assume that all the Bantu languages stem from the same ultimate Proto-Bantu, through the misguided model of one parent for any number of offspring, we cannot ignore the likelihood that the proto-language must have allowed internal variation, another important assumption for the evolution theory in population genetics. One of the consequences of this assumption is that some of the features that now distinguish Bantu subgroups from one another may follow from Proto-Bantu itself, by a process similar to speciation (involving selection, with the helping hand of ecology²⁴) in biology. Contact among the Bantu languages themselves after their respective contacts with the substrate languages complicates the speciation patterns. Could the variation and systemic inconsistencies shown above in Kiyansi and Kimanyanga follow from such manifold contacts? Whatever the situation is, genetic relationships may not always be as straightforward and exclusive as we would like them to be. Not being a genetic linguist myself, I can only wonder now, at this initial stage of connecting my research on Kituba's development with the genetic linguistics enterprise, to what extent contact has been taken into account in the latter's agenda.

Lexicostatistics seems to have played a very important role, over morpho-syntactic considerations, in the genetic classification of Bantu languages. The practice has, nonetheless, led most of the scholarship to infer morphosyntactic typological kinship from lexical-genetic kinship. As the research on Kituba's development shows that there may be more typological variation, even within individual languages, than may have been assumed in the literature, it is also conceivable that Proto-Bantu may have allowed not only grammatical but also lexical variation. It may help for geneticists to explain to the rest of us not only why lexicostatistics is weighted so heavily compared to other potential measures of kinship, but also why Proto-Bantu has been assumed to be so monolithic. Is it not conceivable to think of Proto-Bantu as a group of lexically and typologically related language varieties that were not necessarily identical?

The above comments and questions follow naturally from research on language contact. The reason for formulating them here and showing the implications of studying Kituba's development for Bantu genetic linguistics is precisely to highlight the not-so-marginal role that contact must have played during the spread of Bantu and its speciation into different subgroups. It was also to suggest the possibility of variation in the putative Proto-Bantu system, suggesting that pure innovations *qua* creations *ex-nihilo* were probably very limited during the speciation processes.

Notes

*. I am grateful to Yeno Matuka, Jerry Sadock, and Bill Samarin for comments on the conference version of this paper. I assume full responsibility for all the remaining shortcomings.

1. To the extent that Nigerian Pidgin English is used by some speakers as a vernacular, it is as much a creole as Krio in Sierra Leone and their counterparts in the New World.

2. The following abbreviations are used in this paper: AGR = subject agreement prefix, ANTER = anterior tense, CL# = class number, CONN = connective, DUR = durative, EMPH = emphatic, FUT = future, HABIT = habitual, NARR = narrative, NPERF = near perfect, RPERF = remote perfect, SG = singular, PL = plural, OBJ = object marker, NPAST = near past, RPAST = remote past, REFL = reflexive.

3. The Kiwumbu examples are from Mputubwel Makim (p.c.), to whom I am very grateful. The Kimanyanga examples are from Matuka (1990). He provides no tone diacritics, a shortcoming that does not reduce the usefulness of the corpus. The glosses and translations have occasionally been adjusted when I thought his analysis was inaccurate.

4. The graphic sequence [ea] is a diphthong in which [e] is weaker than [a]. Rottland (1970) treats this [e] as a glide. However, this putative diphthong combines with other glides, as in [mbwæág] 'road'.

5. I argue in Mufwene (1989a, 1991) that in ethnographic settings which produce creoles free morphemes are generally selected over their bound alternatives because they are more salient, even if the bound ones do not violate Seuren and Wekker's (1986) principle of semantic transparency.

6. I have not yet been able to verify this feature in Kiwumbu (Kiteke).

7. According to Matuka (p.c. 1994), the prefix *m+* in (7c) is syllabic and 'heavy' when meaning 'him/her'. Still I wonder how clear the distinction is to speakers of languages, such as Kiyansi, which do not have syllabic nasals at all or might have them only in word-initial positions.

8. According to Jerry Sadock (p.c. 1994), Yiddish right-adjoins the morpheme *aleyn* 'alone' to the reflexive form *zix* (from German *sich*) to mark semantically transparent reflexives. Kituba may thus not be unique in selecting this grammaticalization path.

9. The Matuka texts suggest that Kimanyanga may make more subtle PAST (or ANTER) distinctions than I originally thought. This observation, which is consistent with the best known cases of creolization, does not, however, affect the morphosyntactic point made below.

10. Fehderau (1966) conjectures that Kituba's habitual suffix *+áka* has come from Lingala. As discussed in Mufwene (1988), this analysis faces some problems, in part because it is not consistent with the fact that the two creoles developed around the same time. In fact, if Samarin (1982) is right, Kituba must

have developed a little bit earlier and may have influenced the development of both Lingala and Sango. There is also the problem of why Lingala's LL tone pattern would have changed to a HL pattern in Kituba. This is significant because Lingala words have generally maintained their tone pattern in Kituba, as shown in Mufwene (1989b).

11. Both Kimanyanga and Kiyansi nominalize verbs also by not marking them with any prefix at all, as in the Predicate-Cleft construction *diá ká+dià* 'He/She ate RPASt' in Kimanyanga or the complex deverbal noun phrase *diá kó adιά ndí la* 'the way he is eating' in Kiyansi (Mufwene 1987).

12. As explained in Mufwene (1988), *vánda* (from Kimanyanga *vwanda*) 'LOCALITIVE be, sit' is used as the past allomorph of *kéle* 'be'.

13. The connective becomes *na* before personal pronouns. This variation, the only type I can remember, is still simple compared to the complex kind of variation in Kikongo, which is conditioned by the class of the head noun. The simplification in Kituba is of course consistent with the general loss of agreement discussed in Mufwene (1988, 1989b, to appear-a).

14. I derive this seemingly uncharitable interpretation of Bickerton's thesis from his association of his innovations with the creation of the relevant creoles putatively by children.

15. According to Hjelmslev, after two or more languages have competed with each other, the one that prevails does so often at the cost of incorporating several elements from its competitors. It wins only a Pyrrhic victory, so to speak, undergoing a fate similar to the lexifier of a creole language.

16. As often noted by Samarin, Manyanga also played an important role in the recruitment of porters for colonial explorations from the Atlantic coast during the Congo Free State.

17. In Zaire West Africans are often referred to indiscriminately as *Sénégalais*.

18. Ngalasso (1991) observes correctly that speakers of ethnic Kikongo varieties claim they speak separate languages, which is consistent with Fehderau's observation that they are not mutually intelligible. The term *Kikongo* is used either by outsiders to refer to the cluster of languages or occasionally by speakers of these varieties to contrast their group of languages with those of others, by analogy to the ethnic term *Mu+/Ba+kongo*. Otherwise they typically introduce themselves as *Mu+/Ba+ntandu*, *Mu+/Ba+yombe*, *Mu+/Ba+ladi*, etc.

19. I am also reminded here of Copper Island Aleut, which developed at the beginning of this century out of the contact of several Aleut dialects and Russian (Golovko and Vakhtin 1990). Being an endogenous contact-based language variety, with Aleut as the lexifier, most of its grammatical patterns and morphemes have been selected from Aleut. As in Kituba and other creoles, there is little evidence, if any, of Bickertonian innovations. A similar case is that of Nubi, which, according to Owens (1990), derives many of its grammatical features from (Sudanese) Arabic, its lexifier, and a few from the substrate (originally Chadic and Easteran Sudanic) languages.

20. Samarin (1989:34) reports that 'many of the Kru [and probably other West Africans from British territories] were probably speakers of pidgin English. Indeed, it was said that they all spoke a little English, and some even spoke some French (Valcke 1886:29).' Regarding the importance of English in the colonization of the Congo Free State, he reports: 'That English was an important lingua franca of the Belgian foreign work force is seen in the fact that Zanzibari were addressed in it at the military instruction camp at the equator ([*Le Congo Illustré*] 1892:186' (1989:34). Samarin also explains that indeed the Belgians recruited most of their non-indigenous African workers from British rather than French territories, thus clarifying the privileged position of English as a lingua franca between the Belgians and their interpreters at least during the Congo Free State stage.

21. To be sure, Rickford's article in Bright (1992) lists Kituba among creole languages but, because of its focus, it does not link it to Bantu languages.

22. Extent of restructuring is a debatable factor in deciding whether or not a contact-based variety is a creole, just as whether or not the term *creole* is used in discussions of language-based varieties changes little, if anything of significance, in investigating how they developed (Mufwene, to appear-b).

23. Orin Gensler has kindly brought to my attention Trubetzkoy's (1939) article which raises similar questions about positing a monolithic Proto-Indo-European (IE) as the ultimate root of IE languages. Note that Trubetzkoy thinks of this family not only as genetic but also as typological. From the latter point of view he claims that a language may become IE by acquiring IE features through contact, just as another may cease to be IE by losing IE features. Contact, with which he associates borrowing, plays an important role in his view of language classification.

24. Ecology in this model remains a necessary, though still elusive, notion. In this particular case, it subsumes the substrate languages, whose particular features are a relevant factor in determining those of the Bantu superstratum.

References

- Bendor-Samuel, John, ed. 1989. *The Niger-Congo languages: A classification and description of Africa's largest language family*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7.173-221.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1988. Creole languages and the bioprogram. In *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey*, vol. 2: *Linguistic theory: Extensions and implications*, ed. by Frederick J. Newmeyer, 268-84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bickerton, Derek. 1992. The creole key to the black box of language. In *Thirty years of linguistic evolution: Studies in honor of René Dirven on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, ed. by Martin Pütz, 97-108. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Boretzky, Norbert. 1993. The concept of rule, rule borrowing, and substrate influence in creole languages. In *Africanisms in Afro-American language varieties*, ed. by Salikoko S. Mufwene, 74-92. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Bright, William, ed. 1992. *International encyclopedia of linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1979. *Les créoles français*. Paris: Fernand Nathan.
- Fehderau, Harold. 1966. *The origin and development of Kituba*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Golovko, Eugeni V. and Nikolai B. Vakhtin. 1990. Aleut in contact: The CIA enigma. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 22.97-125.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1953. *The Bantu languages of Western Equatorial Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hagège, Claude. 1992. *The language builder: An essay on the human signature in linguistic morphogenesis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd. 1970. *Status and use of African lingua francas*. Munich: Weltforum Verlag.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hinnebusch, Thomas J. 1989. Bantu. In Bendor-Samuel 1989.
- Hjelmlev, Louis. 1938. Etudes sur la notion de parenté linguistique. *Revue des Etudes Indo-Européennes* 1.271-286.
- Matuka, Yeno Mansoni. 1990. *Three Koongo palavers: Wedding, bereavement and reconciliation*. Ms., Ball State University.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1986. Notes on durative constructions in Jamaican and Guyanese creoles. In *Varieties of English Around the World: Focus on the Caribbean*, ed. by Manfred Görlach and John Holm, pp. 167-82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1987. An issue on predicate-clefting: Evidence from Atlantic creoles and African languages. In *Varia Creolica*, ed. by Philippe Maurer & Thomas Stolz, 71-89. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1988. Formal evidence of pidginization/creolization in Kituba. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 10.33-51.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1989a. Some explanations that strike me as incomplete. Column. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 4.117-128.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1989b. La créolisation en bantou: Les cas du kituba, du lingala urbain, et du swahili du Shaba. *Etudes Créoles* 12.74-106.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1990a. Time reference in Kituba. In *Tense-modality-aspect systems in pidgins and creoles*, ed. by John Singler, 97-117. Amsterdam: John

Benjamins.

- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1990b. Creoles and Universal Grammar. In *Issues in creole linguistics*, ed. by Pieter Seuren and Salikoko Mufwene, 783-807. *Linguistics* 28.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1991. Pidgins, creoles, typology, and markedness. In *Development and structures of Creole languages: Essays in honor of Derek Bickerton*, ed. by Francis Byrne & Thom Huebner, 123-43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1992a. Africanisms in Gullah: A re-examination of the issues. In *Old English and new: Studies in language and linguistics in honor of Frederic G. Cassidy*, ed. by Joan Hall, Nick Doane, and Dick Ringler, 156-182. New York: Garland.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1992b. Why grammars are not monolithic. In *The joy of grammar: A festschrift in honor of James D. McCawley*, ed. by Diane Brentari, Gary Larson, and Lynn MacLeod, 225-250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mufwene, Salikoko s. 1993. Creole genesis: A population genetics perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Languages, University of Amsterdam. To appear in *Caribbean language: Issues old and new*, ed. by Pauline Christie. Mona, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. to appear-a. Kituba. In *Pidgin and creoles lexified by non-European languages (?)*, ed. by Sarah Grey Thomason. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. to appear-b. Jargons, pidgins, creoles, and koinés: What are they? In *Pidgins and creoles: Structure and status*, ed. by Arthur Spears and Donald Winford. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ngalasso, Mwatha Musanji. 1991. Tons ou accents? Analyse des schèmes tonals du kikongo parlé dans la région de Bandundu (Zaire). *Etudes Créoles* 14.147-162.
- Nurse, Derek. 1985. *The Swahili: Reconstructing the history and language of an African society, 800-1500*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ohly, Rajmund. 1982. *Swahili: The diagram of a crisis*. Vienna: Afro-Pub.
- Owens, Jonathan. 1990. East African Nubi: Bioprogram vs. inheritance. *Diachronica* 7.217-250.
- Rottland, Franz. 1970. *Die Verbformen des Yanzi*. Doctoral thesis, University of Leiden.
- Samarin, William J. 1982. Colonization and pidginization on the Ubangi river. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 4.1-42.
- Samarin, William J. 1989. *The black man's burden: African colonial labor on the Congo and Ubangi Rivers, 1880-1900*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Samarin, William. 1990. The origins of Kituba and Lingala. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 12.47-77.

- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1909. Die Lingua Franca. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 33.441-61.
- Seuren, Pieter and Herman Wekker. 1986. Semantic transparency as a factor in creole genesis. In *Universals versus substrata in creole genesis*, ed. by Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith, 57-70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, Sarah G. and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1939. Gedanken über das Indogermanenproblem. *Acta Linguistica* 1.81-89.
- Valcke, (Lt.). 1886. Description de la région des cataractes: de Vivi à Stanley-Pool. In *Conférence sur le Congo*. Brussels: Librairie Universelle de Veuve J. Rozez, 27-41.
- Whitehead, John. 1899. *Grammar and dictionary of the Bobangi language, as spoken over a part of the Upper-Congo—West Central Africa*. London: Gregg International Publishers.