Creole languages lexified by Spanish and Portuguese have played a relatively small role in theories of creole genesis. Especially in the 1980s and 1990s when genesis issues were most hotly debated in the creolist community, the focus was on the English-lexified and French-lexified creoles of the New World (and, in the case of Mauritian and Reunionnais French Creole, the Mascarenes in the Indian Ocean). As a result, the geneses of English or French-based Saramaccan, Haitian, and Mauritian, for instance, were comprehensively addressed. However, those of Spanish or Portuguese-based creoles such as Palenquero, Papiamentu, and Cape Verdean Creole were only occasionally considered, and virtually always as distinct evolutionary events rather than as part of more general “genesis models”.

This lack of attention to the early evolution of Spanish and Portuguese creoles cannot be attributed to absence of data. Indeed, the past ten years or so have seen invaluable new research on the formation of several Portuguese-based creoles of Asia and Philippine Creole Spanish. Palenquero, often considered a “new” discovery because of its first description by linguists as late as 1970, has by now yielded multiple diachronic studies and a substantial bibliography. Today, the relevant literature for both Papiamentu and Cape Verdean is vast, and therefore potentially overwhelming to the new scholar. While it is true that the Portuguese creoles of the Gulf of Guinea are not as well studied as Cape Verdean, Guinea-Bissau Creole Portuguese, or some other Atlantic creoles, it also bears mentioning that by now all four Gulf of Guinea creoles are described in book-length grammars,¹ a situation that stands in sharp contrast to that of the more widely recognized Haitian Creole, for which there still is no full grammar as of this writing.

¹ Compare:
The marginal place of Iberian-lexified creoles in the literature on creole genesis is in large measure due to the special focus on plantation creoles. The pioneering and remarkably theory-oriented publications by Mervyn Alleyne (who concentrated on the non-Hispanic Caribbean) in the 1970s and Derek Bickerton in the 1980s (when plantation-era Hawaii became a major focus) profoundly influenced creolists’ thinking that plantation creoles constitute the “classic” scenario for creole genesis. In the seventies and beyond, the emphasis placed by the Social Sciences on the history and current circumstances of the subject of colonization further encouraged this focus on former plantation colonies. As welcome as these scholarly trends have been, they have mostly (and quite naturally) had the effect of sidelines Iberian-based creoles, as these did not form on plantations.

Throughout the history of modern creole studies, creole genesis was viewed as the result of several key factors, including (1) access to a target language among massive slave populations, (2) the size (large or small?) of early plantations, and (3) the speed with which a given slave population transitioned to a large plantation work force. In contrast to widely studied creoles such as Gullah, Louisiana Creole French, or Negerhollands Creole Dutch, the contact vernaculars that evolved into Philippines Creole Spanish, Macao Creole Portuguese, or Palenquero—all studied in this volume—thus “naturally” attracted less scholarly attention, having arisen as what may best be described as “cases sui generis” (Palenquero, for instance, evolved in a maroon setting, while Macao Creole Portuguese emerged as a trade post language).

There is, however, no a priori reason to classify plantation creoles as the “default” or prototypical kind. From a global perspective, creole languages have formed in a wide range of circumstances: among soldiers, in an orphanage, amidst religious commitments, within interracial marriages, among schoolchildren, and so forth. The plantation scenario is thus only one of many—a realization that poses special challenges to theories of creole genesis that seek to be maximally comprehensive. Overall, the Iberian-based creoles demonstrate this diversity of complex circumstances. In these contact vernaculars, traditional creolist concerns such as “weak parameters within Universal Grammar resorted to by children” and “transition from a ‘homestead’ to a ‘plantation’ phase” have little application. At least one author in this volume takes the argument about the supposed genesis of creoles even a step further by reasserting (pace McWhorter 1996) that plantations were not at all the place where creole languages emerged. Rather, as John McWhorter suggests in “The Missing Spanish Creoles: Still Missing” (this volume), plantation creoles too were all born in situations sui generis, namely as pidgins in West African coast slave castles.
The articles assembled in this volume on Iberian creoles teach a lesson about creole genesis which, in light of genesis theories of the past forty years, can seem almost regressive: namely, that creole languages begin with a pidgin-level (or Basic Variety-level) command of a language, which is then adopted by future generations and expanded into a full creole. Of course, further developments can be eccentric: Michelle Li’s article, for instance, shows that the Macanese Portuguese Pidgin recorded in Chinese-language documents was based on the creole Portuguese that already existed, rather than the creole having grown from the pidgin.

This book —a selection of papers from the workshop on Iberian creoles at the 19. Deutscher Hispanistentag in Münster in 2013— presents research on Iberian creoles challenging not only traditional conceptions on creole genesis but also various grammar-related issues. On genesis specifically, Alain Kihm and Jean-Louis Rougé’s article argues that the story of the Portuguese-based creoles of Africa began with the speech of African slaves in Portugal itself. Drawing on novel evidence from music manuscripts, Ana R. Luís and Paulo Estudante argue independently that an African community speaking an Afro-Portuguese L2 variety existed in Portugal in the 17th century. Bart Jacobs and Nicolas Quint trace certain lexical items in Portuguese creoles (and Saramaccan) to Classical Portuguese sources. In terms of sociohistorical timing, this constitutes evidence for a conclusion unexpected amidst a tendency among creolists to reconstruct the birth of each creole within the context in which it is spoken today: that Cape Verdean creole was the parent language to Guinea-Bissau Creole Portuguese and Papiamentu, rather than new creoles having emerged in either Guinea-Bissau or Curaçao. Miguel Gutiérrez Maté illuminates the social history of Colombian and Dominican palenques that nurtured the birth of creoles such as Palenquero. The historical situations he uncovers are quite unlike those usually associated with the birth of creole languages.

Meanwhile, on linguistic issues, this volume is similarly innovative. Armin Schwegler’s field-based exploration into the complex pragmatics of pre- and post-verbal negation brings creole studies in line with the increasing realization among linguists in general that pragmatics is by no means an ancillary component in language, but possibly at its very heart. John Lipski assesses Palenquero speakers’ counterintuitively fluid conception of the difference between Palenquero and Spanish, while Paola E. Dussias and her colleagues (Jason W. Gullifer and Timothy J. Poepsel) assess whether Palenquero is currently decreolizing according to the “classic” Anglophone continuum model. Finally Marilola Pérez reveals that the animate object marking in Cavite Phillipines Creole Spanish, whose details and multiple causation can appear almost unanalyzably chaotic, is in fact determined by the nature of the information structure
(in parallel to what has been observed for Tagalog).

A principal goal of this volume is to demonstrate that the Iberian creoles can no longer be considered the “other ones”, and that plantations are but one of many settings that can harbor a creole. In the variety of their pasts and presents, the Iberian creoles can thus be seen as one of several norms in terms of how creoles have emerged and what they are like.
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