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This excellent collection of papers from 21 creolists with widely varying viewpoints on the nature of creolization commemorates the work of Jacques Arends (1952-2005), linguist and teacher extraordinaire at the University of Amsterdam. Jacques moved from being a high school teacher of Dutch to a meticulous student of structural developments in the Surinamese creoles (a natural locus of interest for a Dutch creolist), and to raising a generation of creole scholars who are dedicated to exploring the understanding of creole language developments using both linguistic and non-linguistic means (the former including both modern and philologically-derived data and the latter including sociohistorical, demographic and other approaches) before leukaemia claimed him in his early fifties.

Bruyn (2007) has provided a nicely-judged obituary of Jacques together with a complete bibliography of Jacques’ work (something which this volume lacks, though there is a nice photo of Jacques in conversation, in addition to two maps indicating the location of the restructured varieties discussed in the collection). Furthermore the opening chapter in this book, “One more cup of coffee” by Margot van der Berg and Rachel Selbach (3-12), pays tribute to Jacques’ many sterling qualities as a scholar, a humanitarian and a human.

Jacques’ major theoretical interest was in gradual or transgenerational creolization, the network of processes by which the structures of creole languages arise and solidify over decades or centuries. Those who believe in abrupt creolization would maintain that creoles can emerge within maybe a generation, but they too would concede that not all the linguistic features of a given creole will be present in this first-generation form of the language. Given his work on Sranan and other Surinamese Creoles, many of which are documented from the 18th century in forms which exhibit the presence and use of creole structural features unmistakably but which at the same time show many structural differences from their modern counterparts, this interest is unsurprising. What this means is that any attempt to write the internal (and external) history of a creole language, providing a source for its structural or typological features, is going to be a complex undertaking—but the intellectual journey is sure to be thrilling. Hugo C. Cardoso’s chapter (13-23) illustrates Jacques’ thinking on gradualism, and points out that Jacques was very much open to the possibility that abrupt and gradual approaches to creolization might just be two different ways of looking at the same phenomena.

The chapters which follow the two introductory ones written by the editors are divided into two sections. Pages 27-241 are linguistic analyses of restructured languages (mostly of creoles but Cape Dutch Pidgin and Ecuadorian Quichua, neither of them creoles sensu stricto, are included), while the chapters in pages 245-387 look at sociohistorical contexts affecting various creoles. Philip Baker’s paper (29-53) examines bimorphemic structures (not merely bimorphemic interrogatives) in creole languages, observes the varying patterns of a series of heads and modifiers attested in the materials, and suggests that the perpetuation of patterns from languages which early slave populations would have had as their L1 can be more readily understood if we realize that early generations of L1 creole speakers would also very often have had a command (and would have frequently used) their ancestral language(s), which would have been able to exert influence on a creole as it spread to subsequent generations of native (and second-language) speakers.
After Baker’s crosslinguistic paper we have several papers with a narrower linguistic focus. J. Clancy Clements (55-75) looks at a couple of recent changes in Daman Creole Portuguese of western India, aduding perceptual salience as one of the reasons why earlier ɪ ‘and’ is increasingly replaced by sa nāw (originally ‘if not’) when it conjoins sentences, while do ‘of’ has extended its meaning to ‘on’ because of its similarity in sound to [nda], the local Indian English pronunciation of in the. Using a wealth of examples Pieter Muysken (77-97) demonstrates the gradual restructuring of verbal and other features of Ecuadorian Quichua inasmuch as it can be demonstrated from philological materials recorded from some time in the 17th century up to 1892, showing that overall the authors (including missionaries seeking to evangelize) wrote in the Quichua they heard around them rather than strainning for an archaizing (or, one might say, Cuzcoizing) form of Quechua that might be redolent of a mythologized Inca past. Two papers in this section examine French-lexifier creoles: Claire Lefebvre (101-112) looks at double object constructions in Haitian, which require a Recipient and a Theme; this feature is not present in French, but Lefebvre indicates that an examination of this construction in Fonibe and of the verbs which license it allows us to understand more readily why certain verbs in Haitian license this construction. Marie-Christine Hazael-Massieux (113-128) shows that while Caribbean Creole French varieties have selected reflexes of one or the other of Noun + a Person Marker or Noun + Person Marker (but not both) to express personal possession, both constructions were available for selection in the 18th and 19th centuries, and that different creole varieties each chose one of these forms.

Surinamese Creoles are well-covered here and treated in four chapters. Bettina Migge and Donald Winford (129-153) discuss the ways in which different Surinamese creoles selected differing means of expressing possibility in their verb complexes, with Sranan adopting a form kan with typological parallels in Dutch while Saramaccan adopted a form sa, which is from English but which has absorbed patterns of usage from Gbe languages. Peter Bakker (153-172) provides a fascinating analysis of the Saramaccan verb lexicon, showing how more of the verbs in this creole with a high proportion of lexical elements from Gbe languages and other languages derive from Portuguese (174) than from English (159), and most of the high-frequency verbs in modern English have been preserved in Saramaccan, though the same is true of only 1/3 of the most frequent Portuguese verbs.

George L Huttar’s chapter (173-188) discusses African lexical sources for Ndyuka vocabulary, pointing out that Gbe lexicon is only slightly more widely represented in Ndyuka than Akan lexicon (while Kikongo and other Bantu languages provide the greatest proportion of African lexicon, namely 118 out of 294 items against Gbe languages’ 39 and Akan’s 33 items, and 28 items from other Kwa languages; for the rest Yoruba provides 14 and Gur languages 8). Marvin Kramer (189-217) searches out Highs in Saramaccan tone spread, and shows that although High tone spreads rightwards in certain serial verb constructions, as it does in Fonibe, the spread of this tone in quantifier phrases in Saramaccan is paralleled in a similar use of tone in Kikongo. Among African languages Kikongo matches the Gbe languages in the degree of its contribution to Saramaccan lexicon; the Gbe contribution to Saramaccan structure was a topic dear to Jacques’ heart (Bruyn 2007:151 mentions Jacques’ role in the research project “The Trans-Atlantic Sprachbund” which explored such connections), and it is rewarding to see Kramer discuss subtle structural influences upon Saramaccan from another African source. Meanwhile, one paper deals with linguistic features of Dutch-lexifier pidgins: Hans den Besten’s careful analysis (219-241) of what we can know about the distinctive phonology of Cape Dutch Pidgin from the evidence of spellings, recordings of Dutch loans in wordlists of Cape Khoekhoe, and the like; these show evidence for, inter alia, a lack of clear distinction between voiced and voiceless stops.

There are seven sociohistorical papers. Christine Jourdan (245-256) explains why Solomons Pijin took a long time to creolize (local multilingualism using languages with limited geographical ranges was already the norm) and suggests that culture change in the Solomons, including