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As stated in the Preface (IX-XII), this volume is a selection of fifteen papers presented at three meetings (2004, 2005, and 2006) held by the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics and which have been regrouped by the editors into three parts, devoted to phonology, synchronically oriented analyses, and diachronic studies, respectively.

Generally speaking, this volume is well edited and formatted. One exception, however, is the treatment of abbreviations. Most of the articles lack a list of abbreviations (either initially or finally, a much appreciated exception being David D. Robertson’s study, which offers such a list in fn. 5 on p. 131). Since the authors, as is natural, have different theoretical backgrounds and discuss diverse languages, it is not easy to get acquainted with the various abbreviations they each use. Typically, an abbreviation is introduced, following the in extenso expression, somewhere in the article but if you then happen to forget its meaning, you have to visually scan several pages in order to find the first occurrence, which is a bit annoying. Some other abbreviations, coming from such or such linguistic general theory or background, are also deemed by their authors to be immediately understandable to any reader, which does not prove to be the case, at least so far as I am concerned. For example, I did not know what BrACE (British Afro Caribbean English) meant when I began to read Michelle C. Braña-Straw’s article and found the first occurrence of this abbreviation on p. 4 (not explained), its in extenso meaning appearing only on p. 6. While abbreviations may seem a matter of rather minor interest, the absence of a such a list in almost all contributions to this book inevitably detracts from the reader’s appreciation of its contents.

Let me now turn to real scientific matters, beginning with Part I, concerned mainly with phonology. In Maintenance or assimilation, Michelle Braña-Straw (3-22) provides us with a fine-grained sociolinguistic study of the realization of /t/ in the English spoken in the town of Ipswich (United Kingdom) by people of Barbadian descent as contrasted with the English spoken in the same place by people of British descent (the so-called “Anglos”, as defined on p. 3), focussing on the case of the speech of Edward, a Barbadian speaker who arrived in Ipswich at age 9 and who, having married an Anglo woman, has active social interactions with both Anglo and Barbadian communities.

As a descriptivist trained and accustomed to give accounts of linguistic uses at a macro-societal level, I am not very familiar with the type of perspective developed in this article. In spite of that, I must acknowledge immediately that I found her insightful analyses totally convincing. The structure of this article is well-balanced and the argument is clearly explained. The first three sections (Introduction, Developmental factors – Critical period for acquisition, Sociolinguistic setting) allow the reader to understand in detail both the theoretical implications of the research carried out by the author (who seems to have a solid knowledge of previous work on this topic) and the socio-linguistic situation which prevails among the Afro-Caribbean community of Ipswich. Section 4 (Methodology) and 5 (Results) are equally well presented. From a cognitive point of view, I would just like to point out that in the Figures giving the percentages of diverse realisations of /t/ in Section 5, Barbadian speakers appear before Anglos in Figures 1 to 3, and after Anglos in Figures 4 and 5. This does not appear to be a good choice, even if (possibly) dictated by the value of the results. The fact of belonging to a determined speech-community is a key-parameter in this study and changing the order of appearance of Barbadians and Anglos in the middle of the presentation is rather confusing for the reader.
Section 6 and 7 happily resume the author’s findings and, through the study of Edward’s case, stress, in a typically Labovian vein, the importance of “individual access to different models of language behaviour (p. 18)”\(^\text{a}\). The fact that “Edward exhibits elements of a mixed system, employing the processes of simplification and overgeneralization to accentuate Barbadian patterns in some environments [...] and accentuating Anglo patterns in other environments (p. 20)”\(^\text{b}\) is significant and impressive, all the more so when one considers this speaker may not be fully aware of the overgeneralisations revealed by the analysis of his speech, since people probably cannot really control the average percentage of (non)-glottal realisations of /t/ in their own idiolect. Another positive aspect of this article is that it contains several samples of spontaneous speech (10-11, 18-20), which give an exact idea of the nature of the material on which the author has based her analyses.

In *Universal and substrate influence on the phonotactics and syllable structure of Krio* (23-42), Malcolm Awadjin Finney, a native Krio speaker, ponders the relative roles of substrate (i.e. “West African languages” \(^\text{26, 30}\)) and language universals (the unmarked features being preferably retained by emerging Creoles, see for example discussion p. 27) in the shaping of certain phonetic and syllabic peculiarities which distinguish Krio from English, “its superstrate language (p. 27)”\(^\text{c}\) and main lexifier.

Most of this article is devoted to the discussion of Krio examples (Section 4 and 5, 27-39), on which I shall therefore focus my comments. From a technical point of view, the data are nicely presented, with careful phonologic transcriptions which provide the reader with an exact idea of the actual pronunciation of the Krio words—such transcriptions are not particularly frequent in contributions on Creole languages, even in those dealing with Phonology—although there is no mention of stress (which cannot be disregarded, since it would be surprising if stressed and unstressed English vowels received the same treatment in Krio). Furthermore, there appears at least twice in the article some kind of confusion between Krio and English, when the author says that:

- in Krio “*beat/bit [...] are homophones (p. 33)\(^\text{d}\).*” Such a formulation is inadequate because *beat* and *bit* are English (not Krio) words. In order to be rigorous, the quoted sentence should read something like: *“English ‘beat’ and ‘bit’ have become homophonous in Krio as [bit]”*;

- “*the vowels of some lexical items originating in English have undergone minor pronunciation changes [...]\(^\text{e}\). They include words like: shrimp, shrink, square [...]\(s\), school, etc. (p. 37)\(^\text{f}\).*” If we are dealing with Krio (not English), even if the Krio word is realised the same way as in English, it should be mentioned in the same (phonological) transcription used for the remaining Krio words of this article.

As regards the evolutive trends presented by the author and always from a strictly technical point of view, several inconsistencies can be found in the data:

- p. 30, in order to illustrate the fact that “*Affricates in lexical items of both English and non-English origins for the most part remain unchanged*, the author adduces (among other words) the Krio form /bintʃ/ ‘beans’, in which the affricate /tʃ/ actually differs from the final sequence /nz/ of English ‘beans’;

- p. 32, the items /krɔkrɔ/ ‘skin disease’ and /sansan/ ‘sand’ are given as examples attesting the presence of ‘vowel harmony’ in Krio. Leaving aside the quite idiosyncratic use which the author seems to make of the very notion of ‘vowel harmony’ (all his examples consist of items displaying one and the same vowel in all of their syllables, which is altogether different from the +/- ATR (Advanced Tongue Root) vowel harmony found in many African languages: see Creissels 1994:89-103), I cannot help but think that /krɔkrɔ/ and /sansan/ are merely typical cases of reduplication. If you reduplicate a monosyllabic word, it is predictable that both syllables will have the same vowel: therefore, even in Finney’s conception of the term ‘vowel harmony’, /krɔkrɔ/ and /sansan/ are not good examples of what he appears to want to show;