

Pidgins and Creoles: Overview

S Romaine, Oxford University, Oxford, UK

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Definitions

European colonization during the 17th to 19th centuries created a classic scenario for the emergence of new language varieties called pidgins and creoles out of trade between the native inhabitants and Europeans. The term ‘pidgin’ is probably a distortion of English *business* and the term ‘creole’ was used in reference to a nonindigenous person born in the American colonies, and later used to refer to customs, flora, and fauna of these colonies. Many pidgins and creoles grew up around trade routes in the Atlantic or Pacific, and subsequently in settlement colonies on plantations, where a multilingual work force comprised of slaves or indentured immigrant laborers needed a common language. Although European colonial encounters have produced the most well known and studied languages, there are examples of indigenous pidgins and creoles predating European contact such as Mobilian Jargon (Mobilian), a now extinct pidgin based on Muskogean (Muskogee), and widely used along the lower Mississippi River valley for communication among native Americans speaking Choctaw, Chickasaw, and other languages (*see Mobilian Jargon*).

The study of pidgins and creoles raises fundamental questions about the evolution of complex systems, since pidgins, in particular, have been traditionally regarded as simple systems *par excellence*. The usual European explanation given for the simplicity, and lack of highly developed inflectional morphology in particular, was that it reflected primitiveness, native mental inferiority, and the cognitive inability of the natives to acquire more complex European languages. Thus, for example, Churchill (1911: 23) on Bislama, the pidgin English spoken in Vanuatu: “the savage of our study, like many other primitive thinker, has no conception of being in the absolute; his speech has no true verb ‘to be’” (*see Bislama*).

Hampered by negative attitudes for many years, scholars ignored pidgins and creoles in the belief that they were not ‘real’ languages, but were instead bastardized, corrupted, or inferior versions of the European languages to which they appeared most closely related. Although scholars still do not agree on how to define pidgins and creoles, or the nature of their relationship to one another, most linguists recognize such a group of languages, whether defined in terms of shared structural properties and/or socio-historical circumstances of their genesis. Striking

similarities across pidgin and creole tense-mood-aspect (TMA) systems (*see Tense, Mood, Aspect: Overview*) were noted by some of the earliest scholars in the field such as Hugo Schuchardt, generally regarded as the founding father of creole studies (*see Schuchardt, Hugo (1842–1927)*). TMA marking became a focal point of debate among creolists as a result of the bioprogram hypothesis (Bickerton, 1981, 1984), according to which creoles held the key to understanding how human languages originally evolved many centuries ago (*see Evolutionary Theories of Language: Previous Theories and Evolutionary Theories of Language: Current Theories*). This theory led not only to an increase in research on these languages, but also a great deal of attention from scholars in other fields of linguistics, such as language acquisition and related disciplines such as cognitive science.

Classifying Pidgins and Creoles

The standard view that pidgins and creoles are mixed languages with the vocabulary of the superstrate (also called the lexifier or base language) and the grammar of the substrate (the native languages of the groups in contact) has been the traditional basis for classifying these languages according to their lexical affiliation. English-lexicon pidgins and creoles such as Solomon Islands Pijin spoken in the Solomon Islands or Jamaican Creole English (Southwestern Caribbean Creole English) in Jamaica comprise a group of languages with lexicons predominantly derived from English. Haitian Creole French and Tayo, a French creole of New Caledonia, are French-lexicon creoles drawing most of their vocabulary from French. Such groupings are, however, distinctly different from the genetically-based language families established by the comparative historical method (*see*). Pidgins or creoles as a group are not genetically related among themselves, although those with the same lexifier usually are.

There is a great deal of variation in terms of the extent to which a particular pidgin or creole draws on its lexifier for vocabulary, and a variety of problems in determining the sources of words, due to phonological restructuring. Compare the lexical composition of Sranan and Saramaccan, two of six English-lexicon creoles spoken in Surinam, in what was formerly the Dutch-controlled part of Guyana. About 50% of the words in Saramaccan are from English (e.g., *wáka* ‘walk’), 10% from Dutch (e.g., *strei* ‘fight’ < *strijd*), 35% from Portuguese (e.g., *disá* ‘quit’ < *deixar*), and 5% from the African substrate

languages (e.g., *totómbotí* ‘woodpecker’. By contrast, only 18% of Sranan words are English in origin, with 4.3% of African origin, 3.2% of Portuguese, 21.5% of Dutch; 4.3% could be derived from either English or Dutch. Innovations comprise another 36%, and 12.7% have other origins. African words are concentrated in the semantic domains of religion, traditional food, music, diseases, flora, and fauna. Words from the other languages do not concentrate in particular semantic domains. Numbers, for instance, draw on both English and Dutch. Sranan and Saramaccan are not mutually intelligible, and neither is mutually intelligible with any of the input languages. Other languages show a more equal distribution between two main languages, such as Russenorsk, a pidgin once spoken along the Arctic coast of northern Norway from the 18th until the early 20th century. Its vocabulary is 47% Norwegian, 39% Russian, 14% other languages including Dutch (or possibly German), English, Saami, French, Finnish, and Swedish (*see Russenorsk*).

Many creoles, like Lesser Antillean (Lesser Antillean Creole French), a French-based creole spoken in the French Antilles, started out with a far more mixed lexicon than they possess today. Where contact with the main European lexifier was permanently terminated, as in Surinam, the lexicon retains a high degree of mixture to the present day; where such contact continued, as in the Lesser Antilles, items from the main lexifier tended gradually to replace items from other sources. Depending on the circumstances, a creole may adopt more items from the superstrate language due to intense contact. In Tok Pisin spoken in Papua New Guinea, some of the 200 German elements as well as words from indigenous languages, are now being replaced by English words. Thus, *beten* (German ‘pray’) is giving way to English *pre*, and Tolai (Kuanua) *kiau* to English ‘egg’ (*see Tok Pisin*).

Relationships between Pidgins and Creoles

The question of the genetic and typological relationship between pidgins and creoles and the languages spoken by their creators continues to generate controversy. Pidgins and creoles challenge conventional models of language change and genetic relationships because they appear to be descendants of neither the European languages from which they took most of their vocabulary, nor of the languages spoken by their creators. The conventional view of the languages and their relationship to one another found in a variety of introductory texts (Hall, 1966; Romaine, 1988) has been to assume that a pidgin is a contact variety restricted in form and function, and native to no

one, which is formed by members of at least two (and usually more) groups of different linguistic backgrounds, e.g., Krio in Sierra Leone (*see Krio*). A creole is a nativized pidgin, expanded in form and function to meet the communicative needs of a community of native speakers, e.g., Haitian Creole French.

This perspective regards pidginization and creolization as mirror image processes and assumes a prior pidgin history for creoles. This view implies a two-stage development. The first involves rapid and drastic restructuring to produce a reduced and simplified language variety. The second consists of elaboration of this variety as its functions expand, and it becomes nativized or serves as the primary language of most of its speakers. The reduction in form characteristic of a pidgin follows from its restricted communicative functions. Pidgin speakers, who have another language, can get by with a minimum of grammatical apparatus, but the linguistic resources of a creole must be adequate to fulfill the communicative needs of human language users.

The degree of structural stability varies, depending on the extent of internal development and functional expansion the pidgin has undergone at any particular point in its life cycle. Creolization can occur at any stage in the development continuum from rudimentary jargon to expanded pidgin. If creolization occurs at the jargon stage, the amount of expansion will be more considerable than that required to make an expanded pidgin structurally adequate. In some cases, however, pidgins may expand without nativization. Where this happens, pidgins and creoles may overlap in terms of the structural complexity, and there will be few, if any, structural differences between an expanded pidgin and a creole that develops from it. Varieties of Melanesian Pidgin English (a cover term for three English-lexicon pidgins/creoles in the southwest Pacific comprising Tok Pisin, Solomon Islands Pijin and Vanuatu Bislama) are far richer lexically and more complex grammatically than many early creoles elsewhere. Their linguistic elaboration was carried out primarily by adult second language speakers who used them as lingua francas in urban areas. Creolization is thus not a unique trigger for complexity, and the ‘same’ language may exist as both pidgin and creole.

Debate continues about the role of children vs. adults in nativization and creolization. Other scholars have emphasized the discontinuity between creoles and pidgins on the basis of features present in certain creoles not found in their antecedent pidgins. They argue that ordinary evolutionary processes leading to gradual divergence over time may not be applicable to creoles. Instead, creoles are ‘born again’ nongenetic languages that emerge abruptly *ab novo* via a break

in transmission and radical restructuring (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988).

Origins

Because pidgins and creoles are the outcome of diverse processes and influences in situations of language contact where speakers of different languages have to work out a common means of communication, competing theories have emphasized the importance of different sources of influence. Few creolists believe that one theory can explain everything satisfactorily, and there are at least four theories accounting for the genesis of creoles: substrate, superstrate, diffusion, and universals.

Substrate

The substrate hypothesis emphasizes the influence of the speakers' ancestral languages. Structural affinities have been established between the languages of West Africa and many of the Atlantic creoles. Scholars have also documented substantial congruence between Austronesian substratum languages (*see Austronesian Languages: Overview*) and Pacific pidgins as compelling evidence of the historically primary role of Pacific Islanders in shaping a developing pidgin in the Pacific. Substrate influence can be seen in the pronominal systems of Melanesian Pidgin English such as the personal pronouns in Tok Pisin. The forms are rather transparently modeled after English, yet incorporate grammatical distinctions not found in English, but widely present in the indigenous languages forming the substrate.

Personal pronouns in Tok Pisin		
	singular	plural
first person	<i>mi</i> 'I'	<i>mipela</i> 'we' (exclusive) <i>yumi</i> 'we' (inclusive)
second person	<i>yu</i> 'you'	<i>yupela</i> 'you'
third person	<i>em</i> 'he/she/it'	<i>ol</i> 'they'

Almost all Oceanic languages distinguish between inclusive (referring to the speaker and addressee(s), 'I + you') and exclusive first-person pronouns (referring to the speaker and some other person(s), 'I + he/she/it/they'). Thus, *yumi* consists of the features [+speaker, +hearer, +other] and *mipela*, [+speaker, -hearer, +other]. There are also dual and trial forms, e.g., *yumitupela* 'we two (inclusive)', i.e. [+speaker, +hearer, -other], *mitripela* 'we three (exclusive)', etc., although these distinctions are not always made consistently. As English provides no lexical forms for the inclusive/exclusive and dual distinctions or *you* plural, these are created by forming a compound from *you* + *me* to give *yumi* and *yumitupela*, and by using the suffix *-pela* ('fellow') to mark plurality in *yupela*. The third-person singular form *em* is derived from the

unstressed third person singular *him* and the third person plural form *ol* from *all*.

A more controversial variant of the substrate hypothesis is incorporated into the notion of relexification, a process that applies to the words/structures of substrate language and matches them with phonological representations from the lexifier language. Haitian Creole French *gade* shares some meanings with the French verb *garder* 'to watch over/take care of/to keep', from which it derives its phonetic form, but it has an additional meaning 'to take care of/defend oneself'. The semantics of *gade* is very similar to that of the substrate Fongbe (Fon-Gbe) verb *kpón* 'to watch over/take care of/to keep/to look'. Haitian Creole French *gade* also means 'to look', while in French that meaning is expressed by *regarder*. These similarities have led some scholars to regard Haitian Creole French as a French relexification of African languages of the Ewe-Fon (or Fongbe) group (Lefebvre, 1998).

Superstrate

The superstrate hypothesis traces the primary source of structural features to nonstandard varieties of the lexifiers, and to evolutionary tendencies already observable in them (Chaudenson, 1992). According to this scenario, early plantation slaves acquired a normally transmitted variety of the lexifier directly from Europeans, but this imperfectly acquired variety was subsequently diluted over time as successive generations of slaves learned from other slaves rather than from Europeans. Creoles thus represent gradual continuous developments with no abrupt break in transmission from their lexifiers. This evidence eliminates the assumption of a prior pidgin history and accepts creoles as varieties of their lexifiers rather than as special or unique new languages. That is, there are no particular linguistic evolutionary processes likely to yield (prototypical) creoles; they are produced by the same restructuring processes that bring about change in any language. Creoles are neither typologically nor genetically unique, but 'advanced varieties' of the lexifiers.

Linguistic evidence supporting this hypothesis can be found in morphemes or constructions chosen for specific grammatical functions that start from models available in the lexifiers. Haitian Creole French *m pu alle* 'I will go' may not be a totally new and radical departure from French but could instead be derived from regional French *je suis pour aller*.

Diffusion

Another explanation for some of the similarities among pidgins and creoles is diffusion of a pre-existing pidgin.

According to this hypothesis, a pre-existing English or French pidgin was transplanted from Africa rather than created anew independently in each territory. Support for this hypothesis can be found in historical evidence that sailors diffused not only words with nautical origins from one part of the world to another, but also items that were more generally part of regional and nonstandard usage. Thus, *capsize* was probably originally a nautical term meaning ‘to overturn a boat’. Today, *kapsaitim* in Melanesian Pidgin English means ‘to spill or overturn anything’. Traders, missionaries, and early settlers were also responsible for diffusing certain elements. Words from Portuguese such as *savvy* (<*sabir* ‘to know/understand’, first attested in 1686) are found widely around the world. Scholars have traced the paths of diffusion of so-called worldwide features found in Anglophone pidgins and creoles from the Atlantic to Pacific (Baker and Huber, 2001). Words from indigenous languages are also widespread, e.g., African *nyam* ‘eat/food’ and Hawaiian *kanaka* ‘person/man’, a term that came to be used, often derogatorily, to refer to Pacific Islanders.

Universals

This theory actually comprises a variety of sometimes opposing viewpoints because universals have been conceived of in a variety of ways within different theoretical perspectives. Its central assumption is that creoles are more similar to one another than the languages to which they are otherwise most closely related due to the operation of universals. Although it has become fashionable to refer to a common creole syntax or creole prototype, not all creolists agree on the nature or extent of the similarities or the reasons for them. If creoles form a synchronically definable class, then there should be more similarities between Haitian Creole French and Guyanese Creole English than between Haitian Creole French and French, or between Guyanese Creole English and English. One kind of universalist claim is that creoles reflect more closely universal grammar and the innate component of the human language capacity (see **Linguistic Universals, Chomskyan**). Another, however, is grounded within a different notion of universals derived from crosslinguistic typology and theories of markedness (see **Linguistic Universals, Greenbergian**). The observation that creoles tend to be isolating languages even when the contributing languages show a different typology has a long history predating modern typological theories (see **Morphology in Pidgins and Creoles**). Kituba, for example, emerged almost exclusively from contact among Bantu languages that are agglutinative.

The notion of creoles as the simplest instantiation of universal grammar is at the heart of Bickerton’s (1981) bioprogram hypothesis, which applies to radical creoles, i.e., those that have undergone a sudden creolization without further major superstrate influence. It is based to a large extent on similarities between Hawai’i Creole English, Guyanese Creole English, Haitian Creole French, and Sranan. Evidence from Hawai’i Creole English has been the cornerstone of the bioprogram because creolization has been more recent there than in many other cases, and because the language lacked an African substrate, yet was strikingly similar to other creoles (see **Hawaiian Creole English**). This similarity is explained by assuming that creoles represent a retrograde evolutionary movement to a maximally unmarked state.

Bickerton (1981) proposed a list of 13 features shared by creoles that were not inherited from the antecedent pidgins, and therefore must have been created by children as a result of the bioprogram.

1. Focused constituents are moved to sentence initial position, e.g., Haitian Creole French *se mache Jan mache al lekòl* ‘John walked to school’.
2. Creoles use a definite article for presupposed specific noun phrases, indefinite articles for asserted specific noun phrases, and zero for nonspecific noun phrases. Hawai’i Creole English uses definite article *da* for presupposed specific noun phrases, e.g., *she wen go with da teacher* ‘she went with the teacher’, indefinite article *one* typically for first mention, e.g., *he get one white truck* ‘he has a white truck’, and no article or marker of plurality for other noun phrases, e.g., *young guys they no get job* ‘Young people don’t have jobs’.
3. Three preverbal morphemes express tense (anterior), mood (irrealis), and aspect (durative) in that order, e.g., Haitian Creole French *li te mache* ‘he walked’, *l’av(a) mache* ‘he will walk’, *l’ap mache* ‘he is walking’.
4. Realized complements are either unmarked or marked with a different form than the one used for unrealized complements, e.g., Mauritian Creole French (Morisyen) *il desid al met posoh ladah* ‘she decided to put a fish in it’ vs. *li ti pe ale aswar pu al bril lakaz sa garsob-la me lor sime ban dayin lin atake li* ‘He would have gone that evening to burn the boy’s house, but on the way he was attacked by witches’.
5. Creoles mark relative clauses when the head noun is the subject of the relative clause, e.g., Hawai’i Creole English *some they drink make trouble* ‘Some who drink make trouble’.
6. Nondefinite subjects, nondefinite verb phrase constituents, and the verb must all be negated in

- negative sentences, e.g., Guyanese Creole English *non dag na bait non kyat* 'no dog bit any cat'.
7. Creoles use the same lexical item for both existentials and possessives, e.g., Hawai'i Creole English *get one wahine she get one daughter* 'There is a woman who has a daughter'.
 8. Creoles have separate forms for each of the semantically distinct functions of the copula (i.e., locative and equative), e.g., Sranan *a ben de na ini a kamra* '(s)he was in the room.' vs. *mi na botoman* 'I am a boatman'.
 9. Adjectives function as verbs, e.g., Jamaican Creole English *di pikni sik* 'the child is sick'. This function explains the absence of the copula in this construction.
 10. There are no differences in word order between declaratives and questions, e.g., Guyanese Creole English *i bai di eg dem* means 'he bought the eggs' or 'did he buy the eggs?', depending on intonation.
 11. Questions particles are optional and sentence final, e.g., Tok Pisin *yu tok wanem?* 'what did you say'. Question words are often bimorphemic, e.g., Haitian Creole French *ki kote* 'where' (French *qui coté* 'which side'), and Tok Pisin *wanem* 'which/what' (English *what name*).
 12. Formally distinct passives are typically absent, e.g., Jamaican Creole English *dem plaan di tree* 'they planted the tree' vs. *di tree plaan* 'the tree was planted'.
 13. Creoles have serial verb constructions in which chains of two or more verbs have the same subject, e.g., Nigerian Pidgin English (Pidgin, Nigerian) *dem come take night carry di wife, go give di man* 'They came in the night and carried the woman to her husband'. (see **Serial Verb Constructions**).

There are also many similarities in the source morphemes used by creoles to express these distinctions. The semantics of the grammatical morphemes are highly constant as are their etymologies; in almost all cases, they are drawn from the superstrate language. The indefinite article is usually derived from the numeral 'one', the irrealis mood marker from a verb meaning 'go', the completive marker from a verb meaning 'finish', the irrealis complementizer from a reflex of 'for', etc.

Support for the uniqueness of these features to creoles is, however, weakened by the existence of some of the same traits in pidgins as well as in the relevant substrates and superstrates. The relexification hypothesis argues that the typological traits of Haitian Creole French display more in common with those of the substrate language Fongbe than with French. If so, then the supposed creole typology results from the reproduction of substratum

properties rather than from the operation of universals. Bimorphemic question words are also found in many of the African substrate languages, and English has *what time* 'when', *how come* 'why', etc. It is also well within the norms of colloquial French and English to use intonation rather than word order to distinguish questions from declaratives, e.g., *you're doing what?* The absence of passives may also reflect the lack of models in some of the substrate and superstrate languages.

Closer study of the particulars of individual TMA systems in creole languages has engendered increasing dissatisfaction with the bioprogram hypothesis (Singler, 1990). For one thing, the claims were originally formulated on the basis of data from creoles whose superstrate languages are Indo-European. Secondly, it is also unclear how much creole TMA systems might have changed over time after creolization. The bioprogram assumes that the creoles in question have not departed from their original TMA prototype and that the present day systems provide evidence of relevance for its operation. Thirdly, even the defining languages do not conform entirely to predictions on closer examination. The TMA system of Hawai'i Creole English is not crosslinguistically unique or even unusual; the overwhelming majority of its TMA categories are common in languages of world (Velupillai, 2003). More detailed investigations of historical evidence indicate that Bickerton's scenario of nativization bears little resemblance to what actually happened in Hawai'i (Roberts, 2000).

The typology of creoles might also be largely a result of parameter settings typical of languages with low inflectional morphology (see **Principles and Parameters Framework of Generative Grammar**). Thus, features such as preverbal TMA markers, serial verbs, and SVO word order fall out more generally from lack of inflections and unmarked parametric settings. McWhorter (1998) attempts to vindicate creoles as a unique typological class by proposing a diagnostic test for 'creolity' based not on specific shared structural features such as TMA markers, serial verbs, etc., but on a combination of three traits resulting from a break in transmission: little or no use of inflectional affixation, little or no use of lexical tone, and semantically regular derivational affixation. McWhorter's explanation for why these traits cluster essentially reiterates the conventional assumption that pidgins are languages that have been stripped of all but the bare communicative necessities in order to speed acquisition. Because creoles are new languages that emerge from pidgins, they have not had the time to develop many of the complexities found in other languages that have developed gradually over a much longer time period. Thus, he predicts

that features such as ergativity (*see Ergativity*), a distinction between alienable and inalienable possession, switch reference marking (*see Switch Reference*), noun class or grammatical gender marking (*see Gender, Grammatical*), etc. will never be found in creoles. This theory means that not only are creoles typologically unique, but also that they are the simplest languages. Those who stress the role of substrate influence and relexification, however, have argued that the reason why these features do not surface in creoles even where they are present in the substrate is because there are no appropriate phonetic strings in the superstrate to match them with.

The question of how to measure simplicity and complexity is theory-dependent and therefore controversial. McWhorter's (2001) complexity metric is based on degree of overt signalling of various phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and semantic distinctions. From this perspective, a phonemic inventory can be considered more complex if it contains more marked members than some other (*see Phonological Universals*). Markedness is interpreted in terms of frequency of representation among the world's languages. Ejectives and clicks are more marked than ordinary consonants because they occur less frequently. The presence of rarer sounds in an inventory also presupposes the existence of more common or less marked ones. However, there may be other dimensions of simplicity/complexity to consider, such as syllable/word structure. Much less is known about the phonology of pidgins and creoles than about their syntax and lexicon. Syntax is rendered more complex by the additional of rules that make it more difficult to process, e.g., different word orders for main and subordinate clauses. Inflectional marking is assumed to be more difficult than the use of free morphemes. However, there is no universally accepted account of syntactic rules nor an agreed theory of processing. Semantically, creoles are more transparent and adhere more closely to the principle of one form–one meaning.

There are problems with this view too, because creoles do not share their features universally or exclusively. There are examples of noncreole languages with the assumed typical creole-like features, and some examples of languages with no known creole history that are less complex than some creoles. Given that language change may also lead to simplification, some languages that are older than creoles may also be less complex than creoles. Similarities among creoles may be the result of chance similarities among unrelated substrates. Although the absence of inflection is perhaps the most often cited typological feature of creoles, it may be the accidental result

of limited typological spread of the contributing languages.

Yet another interpretation of the universalist approach involves the assumption that common processes of restructuring apply in situations of language contact to produce common structural outcomes. The effects of contact may operate to differing degrees depending on the social context, e.g., number and nature of languages involved, extent of multilingualism, etc. The fact that pidgins and creoles share some structural features with each other and with other language varieties that are reduced in function such as koines, learner varieties, etc., indicates that the same solutions tend to recur to some degree wherever acquisition and change occurs, regardless of contact, but especially in cases of contact. The entities called pidgins and creoles are salient instances of the processes of pidginization and creolization respectively, although they are not in any sense to be regarded as unique or completed outcomes of them. From this point of view, pidgins represent a special or limiting case of reduction in form resulting from restriction in use.

This statement brings us back to the position that the only thing special about creoles is the sociohistorical situation of language contact in which they emerge. Even that may not be so special when we consider the history of so-called normal languages, most of which are hybrid varieties that have undergone restructuring to various degrees depending on the circumstances. Even 'normal' languages such as English have been shaped by heavy contact with non-Germanic languages and thus can be thought of as having more than one parent. If universal grammar is a mental construct, or an innate predisposition to develop grammar, then in so far as there is no psychological continuity between the mental representations of one generation of speakers of a language and the next, all grammars are created anew each generation. There will always be a certain amount of discontinuity between the grammars of parents and children, and acquisition is always imperfect. Thus, the supposed dichotomy between normal and abrupt transmission is spurious because normal transmission is in fact abrupt.

Directions for Future Research

Resolution of some of the debates about pidgins and creoles, their origins, and their relationships to one another as well as to the languages spoken by their creators is hampered by lack of knowledge of the relevant substrate languages as well as insufficient knowledge of the history of the nonstandard varieties

of European languages that formed the lexifiers. There are few detailed grammatical descriptions of pidgins and creoles available for sophisticated typological analysis. More sociohistorical research is also needed. Earlier scholarship often overstated the similarities among creoles and ignored key properties unique to individual ones.

See also: Austronesian Languages: Overview; Bislama; Congo, Democratic Republic of: Language Situation; Ergativity; Evolutionary Theories of Language: Current Theories; Evolutionary Theories of Language: Previous Theories; Gender, Grammatical; Guyana: Language Situation; Haiti: Language Situation; Hawaiian Creole English; Jamaica: Language Situation; Krio; Linguistic Universals, Chomskyan; Linguistic Universals, Greenbergian; Mauritius: Language Situation; Mobilian Jargon; Morphology in Pidgins and Creoles; New Caledonia: Language Situation; Nigeria: Language Situation; Norway: Language Situation; Papua New Guinea: Language Situation; Phonological Universals; Principles and Parameters Framework of Generative Grammar; Russenorsk; Russian Federation: Language Situation; Schuchardt, Hugo (1842–1927); Serial Verb Constructions; Sierra Leone: Language Situation; Solomon Islands: Language Situation; St Lucia: Language Situation; Suriname: Language Situation; Switch Reference; Tense, Mood, Aspect: Overview; Tok Pisin; United States of America: Language Situation; Vanuatu: Language Situation.

Language Maps (Appendix 1): Maps 47, 48.

Bibliography

Baker P & Huber M (2001). 'Atlantic, Pacific, and world-wide features in English-lexicon contact languages.' *English World Wide* 22(2), 157–208.

Bickerton D (1981). *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Bickerton D (1984). 'The language bioprogram hypothesis.' *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7, 173–221.

Bickerton D (1988). 'Creoles languages and the bioprogram.' In Newmeyer F J (ed.) *Linguistics: the Cambridge survey 2: Linguistic theory: extensions and implications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 268–284.

Bickerton D & Muysken P (1988). 'A dialog concerning the linguistic status of creole languages.' In Newmeyer F J (ed.) *Linguistics: the Cambridge survey 2: Linguistic theory: extensions and implications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 302–306.

Chaudenson R (1992). *Des îles, des hommes, des langues: essais sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Churchill W (1911). *Beach-La-Mar, the jargon trade speech of the Western Pacific*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institution Publication No. 164.

Hall R A Jr. (1966). *Pidgin and creole languages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Holm J (1989). *Pidgins and creoles* (2 vols). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keesing R (1988). *Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic substrate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lefebvre C (1998). *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar: the case of Haitian Creole*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McWhorter J (1998). 'Identifying the creole prototype: vindicating a typological class.' *Language* 74, 788–818.

McWhorter J (2001). 'The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars.' *Linguistic Typology* 5(2), 125–166.

Mufwene S S (1986). 'Les langues créoles peuvent-elles être définies sans allusion à leur histoire?' *Etudes Créoles* 9, 135–150.

Muysken P (1988). 'Are creoles a special type of language?' In Newmeyer F J (ed.) *Linguistics: the Cambridge survey 2: Linguistic theory: extensions and implications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 285–301.

Roberts S J (2000). 'Nativization and the genesis of Hawaiian Creole.' In McWhorter J (ed.) *Language change and language contact in pidgins and creoles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 257–300.

Romaine S (1988). *Pidgin and creole languages*. London: Longman.

Romaine S (1992). *Language, education and development: urban and rural Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Singler J V (ed.) (1990). *Pidgin and creole tense-mood-aspect systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thomason S G & Kaufman K (1988). *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Velupillai V (2003). *Hawaii Creole English: a typological analysis of the tense-mood-aspect system*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.