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Afro-Hispanic language is attested from the 15th century to the early 20th century in Spain, Africa, and Latin America. The speech of bozales (slaves born in Africa and speaking Spanish only imperfectly) has frequently been used as evidence for monogenetic theories of Hispanic Creole formation, based on structural parallels and possibly Afro-Portuguese roots. The present study reviews the principal Afro-Hispanic manifestations over a period of more than 300 years, and traces those structures most frequently cited in monogenetic Afro-Iberian theories. The overall conclusion is that, while such cases as Papiamentu, Colombian Palenquero, and 19th century Cuban/Puerto Rican bozal language point to common origins or mutually shared influences, most other Afro-Hispanic language forms suggest merely imperfect learning and incipient pidginization which arose spontaneously each time Spanish and African languages came into contact.

1. Introduction

Monogenetic theories of Romance-based Creole formation cluster around a postulated Afro-Portuguese base, variously ascribed to medieval Mediterranean Sabir or lingua franca, to a form of pidginized maritime Portuguese that was spread around Africa and Asia from the 15th to the 18th century, or to an Afro-Lusitanian Pidgin and later Creole that developed in the Portuguese feitorias or slaving stations in São Tomé, Annobon, Cabo Verde, Fernando Poo, and Brazil. In the case of creoles with ostensible French, English, or Dutch bases, the required relexification and expansion of the original proto-creole has been the subject of much controversy and hypothetical reconstruction, while in the area of Iberian and particularly
Spanish-based Creoles, the inherent similarities are greater and the cited evidence is more ambiguous in its possible interpretation. The present study is dedicated to a comparative overview of Afro-Hispanic language from the 15th century to the present, with a view toward assessing (1) the nature and extent of essential structural similarities among the various dialects; (2) the demonstrable Afro-Hispanic dialects; and (3) the relative possibilities of transfer or spontaneous generation of creole structures in the various Afro-Hispanic dialects. This survey is offered since, although the claim has frequently been made that African slaves brought to Spanish America already spoke some form of Pidgin or Creole Portuguese (which later became extended in certain cases to full-blown creoles, while in other cases rapid decolonization in favor of regional Spanish took place), most studies have considered only a narrow range of evidence.

2. The Data

There is evidence for the existence of Africanized (sub-Saharan) varieties of Spanish beginning in the middle of the 15th century, since southern Spain, especially Seville, contained a significant population of black slaves and freedmen. Many of the black Spaniards came from Portugal, where nearly half the population of metropolitan Lisbon was constituted by black Africans and their descendents, and 15th century dramatist in both Spain and Portugal give literary evidence for the halting, broken attempts of these Africans to speak the metropolitan languages of the time. Slaves born or raised in Africa and who spoke Spanish or Portuguese only imperfectly were known as bozales, and literary "black" Spanish and Portuguese became popular in humorous dramatic sketches of the Golden Age, in the 16th and 17th centuries. At the beginning of the 17th century, evidence from Spanish America, particularly the Caribbean region and coastal Mexico, indicates that bozal Spanish was already recognized as a distinct variety in those territories. Following these early indications, literary and folkloric testimony of Afro-Hispanic language is virtually nonexistent until the end of the 18th century, when "black" Spanish again becomes a popular theme in poetry and narrative (Lipski 1985a; Jackson 1976a, 1976b). The 19th century saw the flowering of the habla bozal in Cuban and Puerto Rican literature, but testimony of distinctly Afro-Hispanic language also comes from the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Peru, and Central America.

Finally, at the present time, Afro-Hispanic dialect pockets exist in various regions of Latin America: the Samaná and pororó dialects of the Dominican Republic (González and Benavides 1982, Megensney in press), the Chota Valley of Ecuador (Lipski 1986a), and occasional vestigia elements in Lozúa Aldea, Puerto Rico (Mauleón Benítez 1971), the Chocó region of Colombia (Granda 1977, Montes Giraldo 1974), and possibly Cuila, Mexico (Aguirre Beltrán 1958) and central Cuba (García González and Valdés Acosta 1978, Valdés Bernal 1976). Also to be reckoned with is the region of sub-Saharan Africa, where Spanish is spoken in conjunction with several African languages (Granda 1984, 1985; Lipski 1984, 1985c).

In addition to the above cases of Africanized Spanish language usage, more stable long-lasting creole dialects were formed in several regions, the most noteworthy being the palenquero of Palenque de San Basilio in Colombia (Escalante 1954, Bickerton and Escalante 1970, Friedemann and Patino Rosselli 1983, Friedemann and Cross 1979), the congol dialect of northeastern Panama (Joly 1981; Lipski 1983b) and arguably Papiamentu of the Netherlands Antilles, in which the relative proportion of Spanish and Portuguese elements continues to be debated. Outside of Africa and Latin America, a Spanish-based Creole (Chabacano) continues to be spoken in the Philippines in which, while African elements have rarely been directly postulated, the Afro-Asian Creole Portuguese element is frequently cited as the primary source (Whinnom 1956; Molony 1973, 1977, 1978; Frake 1971; cf. also Lipski forthcoming a, b).

At one time or another, nearly all of the dialects just mentioned have figured in discussions regarding the prior existence of a Pan-American Creole or Pidgin bozal Spanish, and its putative Afro-Portuguese input. In the remaining remarks, we shall examine first the common structures which most frequently serve as evidence for monogenic/Afro-Lusitanian theories, next those structural elements common to most past and present Afro-Hispanic dialects and finally the likelihood of former widespread and essentially uniform Afro-Hispanic Creoles.

3. Possible Afro-Lusitanian Elements

The Afro-Hispanic dialects most frequently included in comparative analyses aimed at supporting Afro-Portuguese monogenic theories are Colombian Palenquero, 19th century Cuban and Puerto Rican (literary) bozal Spanish, and Papiamentu. These speech modes are compared with
Portuguese-based Creoles in Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Annobon, São Tomé, and Príncipe, and occasionally southern and southeast Asia. Of the three Afro-Hispanic dialects in question, at least two are the result of very special circumstances, which may be argued to influence each of them. The first is the result of a slave insurrection at the end of the 16th century, in which a handfull of slaves escaped from Cartagena and formed a fortified palenque, to which were added subsequent 17th century arrivals, with all early residents contributing various but as yet undetermined quantities of African (predominantly Niger-Congo) and Spanish Portuguese elements. Papiamentu is the distillate of several centuries of slave trading in Curaçao, in which the island was used as a slave depot and where a natural linguistic alembic was further aided by maritime traffic with Europe, Africa, and the American colonies. The influence of Portuguese-speaking Sephardic Jews arriving from Brazil also had an impact on the development of Papiamentu, which is arguably more Portuguese than Spanish-based (Granda 1973, 1974; Gosslinga 1979; Hartog 1968). Although major Papiamentu features are shared by many Portuguese-based Creoles, as are key lexical items, the contact between slaves, freedmen, and cinarrones from Curaçao and coastal areas of Venezuela and later with other Caribbean islands is not without significance, and a natural cross-fertilization appears to have taken place between the “broken Spanish” (español arañado) of the creoles and Spanish speakers. For at least a century, Papiamentu has been undergoing decrèolization in the direction of (Venezuelan) Spanish, and this process may have occurred, at a slower pace, from the very beginning. Even the 19th century Cuban and Puerto Rican bozal Spanish is not without problems, since around the turn of the 19th century, attestations of Afro-Hispanic speech in these two territories change dramatically, away from forms common to earlier centuries and to other Latin American areas, and closer to Afro-Lusitanian Creoles, including Palenquero and Papiamentu (Lipski forthcoming c). The new creole structures coexisted with more “traditional” Afro-Hispanic patterns, but the extraordinary parallels with Papiamentu may be due to factors other than an originally common creole base. With the boom of the Caribbean sugar plantations beginning at the end of the 18th century, current labor sources were inadequate, and massive importation of black slaves and freedmen was initiated in territories containing significant Afro-Hispanic populations which by that time had already been partially integrated, linguistically and socially, into the Spanish American fabric. The new arrivals came not only from Africa (the true bozales whose languages, including Yoruba and Kikongo, survived in Cuba until a few decades ago) but also from other Caribbean islands, principally the Dutch slave depot at Curaçao. Evidence exists that Papiamentu was spoken in Cuba and Puerto Rico during the first decades of the 19th century (Granda 1973, 1974; Álvarez Nazario 1970, 1972a; Bachiiller y Morales 1883; Díaz Soler 1981; Morales Carrón 1978), and the intermingling of Papiamentu, vestigial bozal Spanish of earlier generations, and regional popular Spanish appears to have played a decisive role in the formation of 19th century Caribbean bozal speech. The combination of these caveats suggests that while convincing cases may be made for genetic relationships among the three Afro-Hispanic speech modes in question, these same dialects result from special circumstances which preclude the uncritical extension of conclusions to other Afro-Hispanic speech modes. Bearing these considerations in mind, let us briefly consider putative parallels among Afro-Hispanic Creoles.

(a) Frequently cited as a key factor is the use of the second person singular pronoun bo(s) < vos, instead of tú. This pronoun is found in Palenquero and Papiamentu, but is very rare in Cuban bozal Spanish (e.g., Bálago 1946:92), and is not found in Puerto Rican texts (Álvarez Nazario 1974:190); vos is also found in most Portuguese-based Creoles in Africa and Asia, and in Philippine Creole Spanish. At the same time, use of vos is common in many Spanish American regions, including parts of coastal Venezuela, and was used vestigially in Cuba (but not in Puerto Rico) until well into the 20th century, precisely in the region whence come the few examples of vos in bozal Spanish (López Morales 1971:136-42). During the Golden Age, use of vos was still frequent in peninsular Spanish, whereas nowadays it is a regional Latin Americanism. In peninsular bozal Spanish of the 16th and 17th centuries, there is no extraordinary preference for vos; in fact, this form is relatively infrequent in comparison with tú, vossa mne(d) (which later gave Spanish usted) and other indirect forms of address. Among other Afro-Hispanic manifestations in Latin America, use of second-person forms of address generally follows regional Spanish usage; thus tú is found in texts from Mexico, Venezuela, most of Colombia, Peru (in alternation with vos—López Albíjar 1966:72), northwestern Ecuador, and even in such areas of widespread voseo as Argentina and Uruguay. The Panamanian negros congos use tú exclusively both in the congo dialect and in the local Spanish dialect, despite the fact that other
areas of Panama are characterized by the voxeo (Lipski 1985b; Robe 1960). Among contemporary (non-Creole) Afro-Hispanic dialects, only the Chota Valley dialect of Ecuador regularly employs vos (Lipski 1986a), and this follows regional Spanish usage.

(b) Neutralization of pronominal case, usually in favor of disjunctive pronouns. In addition to the use of vos, Palenquero and Papiamentu employ variants of the disjunctive pronoun mi for subjects and objects, but such usage is not attested in 19th century Caribbean bozal texts (Alvarez Nazario 1974:190), except in imitation of Haitian Creole speakers' Pidgin Spanish in the Dominican Republic (Juan Antonio Alix, in Rodríguez Demoriz 1973:267-90). Among Afro-Lusitanian Creoles, use of mi and ami (frequently reduced phonetically to mti) is the rule, and this form alternates with derivatives of the subject pronoun eu in Asian Portuguese Creoles; in Philippine Creole Spanish, only the Spanish subject pronoun yo is used, and there is evidence of mi or similar disjunctive variants having been used in the past. Use of (a)mi as subject is found in the earliest bozal Portuguese texts from 15th and early 16th century Portugal, and it appears that the Pidgin Portuguese formed during this time period solidified into the creoles of Annobon, Cape Verde, and São Tomé, and subsequently Palenquero and Papiamentu (Naro 1978, Leite de Vasconcellos 1933, Teppieri 1959, Goodman 1964:36). The earliest Spanish bozal texts also use this pattern; for example from Reinoza (1950:111): a mi llamar Comba de terra Guinea 'my name is Comba from the land of Guinea'. However, mi is not used as subject among attestations of Latin American bozal Spanish even in the Caribbean region, which suggests that this form was not in widespread use among Afro-Hispanics in the late 18th and 19th centuries elsewhere in Spanish America.

(c) Use of subject pronouns as possessives. Papiamentu and Palenquero, as well as Afro-Lusitanian and French Creoles regularly use some variant of the subject pronouns as possessive markers, sometimes postposed to the respective nouns; for example from Palenquero: bo é mamó mi nu 'you are not my mother' and pueblo mi tal plenxu ané 'my people are losing their language' (Friedemann and Patiño Rosselli 1983:130, 147). Papiamentu nan buki ta riba mesa 'their book is on the table' and bo buki nan ta riba mesa 'your books are on the table' (DeBose 1974:88). Such usage is conspicuously absent in Latin American bozal Spanish, even in the Caribbean, and is also absent in Latin American Spanish texts of previous centuries. Among vestigial Spanish dialects in which no Afro-Lusitanian connection is present, occasional use of subject pronouns as possessives does occur from time to time; for example, from vestigial Trinidad Spanish times (Lipski 1986b): la sarga e buena pa uté cabeza willow [bark] is good for your head'. As a variant of this pattern, the combination of the preposition de + pronoun instead of the possessive adjectives mi, tu, su, etc. has at times been cited as a common thread in Caribbean bozal Spanish, with possible connections to other Afro-Tiberian Creoles such as Philippine Creole Spanish, Palenquero, Papiamentu, and some African and Asian Portuguese Creoles (e.g., Alleyne 1980:11-3; Taylor 1971; Friedemann and Patiño Rosselli 1983:149; Goilo 1953:70). However, such usage has never been common in bozal Spanish dialects, current, 19th century, or Golden Age; at the same time, the use of de nosotros instead of nuestro(s) and de usted(es) instead of su(s) is common in many contemporary Latin American Spanish dialects (Kany 1951:68-70).

(d) Use of the third person plural subject pronoun (usually postposed) as a nominal plural marker. This combination is usual in Papiamentu (e.g., buk 'book', bukinan 'books'), as well as in most French Creoles, and may have occurred in 19th century Caribbean bozal speech in the form of the pronoun nan (variant lan) of possible Papiamentu origin: como lan gallo cuando pelea 'like robbers when they fight' (Cuba; Cruz 1974:118); me pega gan pasa 'he grabs me by the [woolly] hair (Puerto Rico; Alvarez Nazario 1974:387). However, this form, while at times used as definite article and possibly as a nominal plural marker (always preposed, unlike in Papiamentu), was never used as a true subject pronoun in bozal Spanish. It is also possible that the final /l/ of lan/nan results from the nasalization of the final /l/ of the definite articles los/las, since this process is also attested for bozal Spanish (Lipski forthcoming c; Perl 1981; Valdés Bernal 1978; Cruz 1974:37; Benitez del Crico 1930:132; Bachiller y Morales 1883:100-1). Significantly, Palenquero does not employ this third person plural pronoun to signal nominal plurality, but rather employs the (preposed) marker ma: me ngaina utere é ten pete 'your chickens stink' (Friedemann and Patiño Rosselli 1983:148).

(e) Use of invariant third person subject pronouns, of the form elelela for the singular, and eles (Papiamentu nan, Palenquero ané) for the plural (e.g., Otegui 1975; Granda 1968, 1978; Alleyne 1980:11-3). The scarcity of nan among bozal Spanish dialects has already been discussed, but use of a single third person variant (usually nelle, cf. Cruz 1974:168; Alvarez Nazario 1974:190) instead of the normal masculine/feminine dyad is found.
variably in 19th century Caribbean bozal speech: si yo lo tené uno ninos como nélle, yo va morir de contentamiento 'if I had a child like her, I would die of happiness' (Cuba; Cruz 1974:117-8). Use of invariable third person pronouns is normal in Philippine Creole Spanish, in Asian Portuguese Creole, and in most Afro-Lusitian dialects, including Papiamento and Palenquero. In other attestations of bozal Spanish, there is occasional confusion of él and ella and of ellos and ellas, but systematic neutralization is in favor of a single third person form is not reflected in any known text, although such may have occurred for some bozal communities.

(f) Loss of the copula. Loss or nonexistence of a copulative verb is characteristic of many Afro-Iberian Creoles and occurs as an occasional variant in nearly all of them; this feature has been cited as a common Afro-Hispanic trait (Ziegler n. d.; Perl 1982; Alvarez Nazario 1959:46, 1974:115-20). However, all principal Afro-Hispanic Creoles, including Papiamento and Palenquero, offer an alternative to the zero option; Papiamento has to, presumably derived from the verb estar, while Palenquero has tó and é (Friedemann and Patiño Rosselli 1983:130). In 19th century Caribbean bozal Spanish several examples of loss of the copula are found, in alternation with correct and incorrect use of the copulative verbs ser and estar, substantially the same holds for other Afro-Hispanic dialects in Latin America, although use of some form of the copula is the general rule. For example, from Los novios catedráticos (Benitez del Cristo 1930:133): si es ma sabroso que la jenjoli con la guarapo, cuerpo tuyo tan bonito...you are sweeter than honey and sesame, your body [is] so pretty... Philippine Creole Spanish contains no copula, although this appears to be an imitation of the Philippine languages which have shaped the various Chabacano dialects, none of which employs a copula in the Romance fashion. In Golden Age bozal Spanish and Portuguese, the copula was frequently present, in the form of the verb ser, apparently a blend of ser and estar (Alvarez Nazario 1974:121; Naro 1978:342; Lipski forthcoming c). The confusion of ser and estar (at times resulting in the verb santa[)], leading either to blended forms or apparently capricious variation, has occurred throughout the existence of Afro-Hispanic speech, and is found in Palenquero and occasionally in the Chota Valley dialect of Ecuador, as well as cropping up from time to time in non-Africanized vestigial Spanish (Lipski 1986a; 1986b; González and Benavides 1982; Megenney in press; Friedemann and Patiño Rosselli 1983:131-2).

(g) Lack of gender and number agreement in nouns and adjectives. Most Romance-based Creoles have eliminated the original systems of marking nominal and adjectival gender and frequently number, although in the latter case external morphemes such as a subject pronoun may be used to indicate plurality. From the earliest attestations of Africanized Spanish and Portuguese, gender and number have been unstable and variable, usually resulting in incorrect assignment of gender, partial lapses in adjectival nominal agreement, use of incorrect articles, use of singular forms for plural referents and vice versa. However, with the exception of established creoles such as Papiamento, Chabacano, and Palenquero, such neutralization was never carried to completion, if the evidence of Afro-Hispanic texts is to be believed. At the same time, instability and reduction of gender/number is one of the most frequently characteristic of learners' and foreigners' Spanish (González and Saltarelli 1983; Gili Gaya 1960, 1972; Hernández Pina 1984; Flann 1979), and of the Spanish dialect of Equitorial Guinea (Lipski 1984, 1985), as well as figuring prominently in vestigial Spanish (Saltarelli and González 1977, Lipski 1986b); it is, in fact, a function of imperfect learning or the erosion of grammatical systems.

(b) Loss of definite and indefinite articles. With respect to Standard Spanish and Portuguese, many Afro-Iberian dialects show drastic reductions in the use of articles, especially the definite article for generic functions, and the indefinite article with purely existential force. Despite the fact that this feature has been pointed out as a common feature of Afro-Hispanic Creoles (e.g., by Alvarez Nazario 1959; Perl 1982; Granda 1968, 1978), loss of articles is neither complete nor systematic in any dialect (cf. Janson 1984). Rather, as with reduction of nominal inflection, loss of articles is sporadic, somewhat idiosyncratic, and subject to modification during the first stages of decreolization, as well as in the beginning stages of language erosion. In the latter context, loss of articles is a key feature of vestigial Spanish dialects and idiolects. A typical example from bozal Spanish is: gallo ta nan so mi amo 'the roosters are in the sun, master' (Puerto Rico; Alvarez Nazario 1974:383).

(i) Loss of prepositions. Loss of possessive and material de and of directional a is frequent in bozal Spanish, and in other Afro-Iberian dialects (Alvarez Nazario 1959, 1974; Ziegler n. d.; Perl 1982, n. d.; Ottey 1975; Granda 1968, 1972, 1978). Loss of the same prepositions is also frequent in vestigial Spanish, and even in nonstandard variants of non-Creole Spanish (Lipski 1986b; Kany 1951: chap. 10), given the minimal phonetic substance of the prepositions, and the fact that de is frequently reduced to [e] or [i] in
rapid colloquial speech, while a is frequently absorbed by preceding or following vowels (e.g., él va a cantar ‘he is going to sing’). With respect to Standard Spanish, many specimens of bozal Spanish contain high rates of loss of de and a, but this is not sufficient to postulate a common origin for Afro-Hispanic Creoles, in view of the above observations. Typical examples from bozal Spanish are: *ya yo jahí mimoh hoy* [con] *don Ciriau* ‘I already talked to Mr. Ciriau today’ (BeníAñez del Cristo 1930:132); *bame [a] la casa Mundo ‘let’s go to Mundo’s house’* (Cabrera 1983:517).

(j) Use of tener ‘to have’ instead of haber ‘for there to be’ as the existential verb. Historically, Spanish haber suffered a modification from the original Latin meaning ‘to have’ to its present existential force, as well as being used as an auxiliary verb in the perfect tenses; the original meaning is retained in fixed forms such as haberes ‘possessions’, tener en su haber ‘to have in one’s possession’. Modern tener derives from a word meaning ‘to hold’ and is not normally used as an existential verb. In many English- and Romance-based Creoles, including Philippine Chabacano and even popular (non-Creole) Brazilian Portuguese, the verb ‘to have’ has developed an existential meaning, and this has been cited as evidence of monogenetic (Afro-Lusitian) origin for bozal Spanish dialects (Megneu 1984, 1985a; Granda 1968). While use of tener in bozal Spanish may indeed come from an earlier proto-creole, this is not a necessary conclusion, since use of existential tener is also found in vestigial Spanish of many regions, and even in some popular Latin American Spanish dialects with no demonstrable African creole connection. For example, in Louisiana isleño Spanish we find a [an] *caso [de] lo muchachos tienen una harmónica* ‘at the fellows’ house there is a harmonica’, and in vestigial Mexican Spanish in the United States: *los muchachos ranchos allí* ‘there are a lot of ranches there’ (Lipski 1986b, d). Even among bozal Spanish texts, use of tener with existential force is quite rare; one example (Cabrera 1969) is: *en botica tiene de té* ‘in the drugstore there is everything’. Much more frequent is the use of haber, albeit with highly nonstandard forms and syntactic patterns: *yo lo creíramiento que lo habé en la mundo quiere me lo tené insinuación y gáena goluntá* ‘now I clearly see that there are people in the world who like me and wish me well’ (Cort 1974:230).

(k) Categorical use of normally redundant subject pronouns. Standard Spanish permits and even requires elimination of subject pronouns in cases of semantic redundancy (Rosengren 1974), and the categorical employment of these pronouns in creole dialects has often been cited as a decisive con-

n feature, a natural consequence of minimal verbal differentiation (e.g., Peñ 1962, Otheguy 1975). However, even in non-Creole Spanish dialects categorial use of subject pronouns may arise when, for example, natural processes of consonantal reduction (e.g., /sl/ > [h] O; /nh/ > [v] > O) partially obliterate verbal endings; this has occurred in some parts of Andalusia and in Caribbean Spanish (Lipski 1977, Monéjar 1970, Poplack 1980). Vestigial Spanish of many areas also features a high percentage of subject pronouns, in some cases perhaps due to calquing from English, and in others to a simple loss of a rule of deletion under conditions of reduction (Lipski 1986b).

(l) Constructions based on a preposition (frequently para) + subject pronoun + infinitive instead of a subordinate clause involving the conjunction que and a subjunctive verb form: *pa tú tener = para que tú tengas* ‘in order for you to have’. This combination has at times been claimed as a creole remnant in several Caribbean Spanish dialects (Alvarez Nazario 1959-66), and is found among many Afro-Hispanic Creole dialects. At the same time, the same combination is frequent in popular Spanish of southern Spain and the Canary Islands, and is attested in many areas of Latin America (Kany 1951:159; Padrón 1949:164; Ñórez 1946:377), as well as being a concomitant of many vestigial Spanish dialects, at times with a disjunctive object pronoun instead of the more usual subject pronoun: *pa ti ten un bote teneh que se sosedano americano* ‘in order for you to have a fishing boat, you must be an American citizen’, from Louisiana isleño Spanish (Lipski forthcoming d). It is likely that this construction has arisen spontaneously in more than one area, since it results from the reduction of a marked conjugated form to the maximally unmarked infinitive. It occurs in Spanish child language (Gili Gaya 1960:29, 1972) and has also occurred in Portuguese, where a conjugated ‘personal infinitive’ has arisen (Maurer 1966).

(m) The frequent Caribbean preposing of más in negative expressions (más nada ‘no more’, más nunca ‘never again’), instead of the more usual phrase-final position, has been claimed as the result of an earlier Portuguese-based Creole language (Megneu 1985a). The Portuguese connection is quite likely, but the presence of this construction in Caribbean Spanish is more likely due to the heavy Canary Island influence, in which such constructions (apparently due to earlier Galician-Portuguese maritime contacts) are common (D'Albuquerque 1953; Lorenzo Ramos 1976; Pérez Vidal 1944; Kany 1951:363-4; Torres Stinga 1981; Alvarez Nazario...
Postposed demonstratives, of the form *piera ese* 'that rock' (Calera 1983:108), are found in many Afro-Iberian Creoles, and have been claimed as evidence in monogenetic theories (Taylor 1971; Ziegler n.d., Otheugny 1975). Clearly Spanish and Portuguese predominantly use preposed demonstratives, but in colloquial Spanish, postposed demonstratives are by no means unusual: *el hombre ese* 'that man', *el trabajo ese* 'this job'. Within bozal Spanish texts, postposed demonstratives are used very infrequently, alternating with preposed demonstratives and lack of demonstratives.

(b) In the lexical dimension, a number of items have been claimed at one time or another to point to a common origin for Afro-Iberian Creoles, although none is found in all dialects. The portmanteau preposition *na* (found in many African and Asian Portuguese Creoles, in Philippine Creole Spanish, Papiamentu and Palenquero, and in other bozal dialects) with varying values including *on*, *in*, *to*, has been attributed to Portuguese *em a* in the (fem.). This form may have a multiple locus, given its phonological simplicity as a maximally unmarked CV element and the nature of creoles, pidgins, and bozal speech as approximative varieties. In Philippine Creole Spanish, *na* may come from native Philippine articles, while in Caribbean/Atlantic Creoles, *na* may have a single or multiple West African origin (Alleyne 1980:130). Even within bozal Spanish, *na* may stem from the frequently observed process of progressive nasalization, or from reduction of *nada* 'nothing', at times used in conjunction with following nouns in bozal speech.

Use of *caba(r)* < *acabar* with the meaning 'after' is found in Palenquero, Philippine Creole Spanish, and Papiamentu, and occasionally in Caribbean bozal Spanish, as well as in many African and Asian Portuguese Creoles (Megenney 1984; Whinnom 1956). Other recurring items include: *vira(r)* 'to turn, become', *vai/va* 'to go', *ma* 'but', *(que) cosa* 'what', and *(que) lado* 'where'; all of these elements may have a Portuguese base, possibly stemming from earlier Portuguese maritime contacts rather than from a single proto-creole. These same items are absent in most bozal Spanish attestations, from the 16th to the 20th century, with the exception of the three special dialects, and it is difficult to justify their inclusion as essential elements of any monogenetic theory.

Perhaps the most frequently cited structural parallel among Afro-Iberian Creoles is the use of verbal aspectual particles in combination with unconjugated verb stems; the particle *ta* is used for present/imperfective and durative aspect, with *vafa* and sometimes *va* a frequent concomitant in the past/imperfective. In the future/irrealis series, more variation exists, with *lo* < Ptg. logo 'later' being a common denominator in many instances. In particular, *ta* and its variants occurs in Palenquero, Papiamentu, Philippine Creole Spanish, and most African and Asian Portuguese Creoles, and its existence in these dialects is a strong bit of evidence in favor of a common origin or at least mutually shared influences. Among bozal Spanish dialects, however, the combination *ta + V inf* is found only in 19th century Cuban and Puerto Rican texts, where this construction alternates with the archetypical bozal pattern of partially or incorrectly conjugated verb forms. Typical examples include: *siempre ta regalá dinero a mi* 'he always gives me money' (Puerto Rico; Alvarez Nazario 1974:384); *horita ta ben pa cá* 'soon she will come here' (Cuba; Morales 1976:188). In a detailed study (Lipski forthcoming c), I have traced the appearance of *ta + V inf* combinations in bozal Spanish and have demonstrated that such expressions were unknown in Golden Age Spanish and Portuguese texts, despite the fact that Afro-Iberian dialects such as those of Annobon, São Tomé, Palenquero, Suramakan, and Papiamentu were apparently formed during this time period; among Latin American bozal texts, no trace of aspectual particles is found in any region other than Cuba and Puerto Rico, and in the latter countries only following the turn of the 19th century. While the existence of aspectual particles in Palenquero and Papiamentu is likely the result of common or shared Afro-Iberian antecedents, the presence of such particles in 19th century Cuban and Puerto Rican bozal speech is more likely the consequence of the importation of Papiamentu- and other creole-speaking slaves into these nations around the beginning of the 19th century (Alvarez Nazario 1959; 1974:65, 218-9; Granda 1973). An overview of Puerto Rican bozal texts reveals only a small number of cases of the aspectual particle *ta* (Alvarez Nazario 1974:193-4), and the same texts also mention the presence of Curaçao natives in Puerto Rico; while Cuban texts provide more examples, the most frequently employed imitations of bozal speech, in literature, theater, and popular culture, do not use such constructions, but merely employ a somewhat random assortment of incorrectly assigned conjugated verb forms. In many cases, *ta* is used an invariant form of the copulative verb *estar* in combination with adjectives, which when distorted in bozal speech may appear to take the form of a verbal infinitive; for example, the 19th century Cuban writer Creto Gangá wrote *yo ta mort etar*
(Cruz 1974:36) which is preferably translated as ‘I am dead’ [Sp. yo estoy muerto, using the regularized participle morído] than as ‘I am dying’; also found is yo ya son libre, yo ha casa ‘I’m free now, I’m married’ (Cruz 1974:67); we see a true progressive construction in yo lo ta dibindo la casa ‘I am owing [on] the house’ (Cruz 1974:133). In the 19th century play Los novios catedráticos we also find ya ya ya ta contento ‘now I am happy’ (Benítez del Cristo 1930:133) and similar examples of the ambiguous use of ta.

4. Similarities and Differences in bozal Spanish

The preceding overview has demonstrated considerable disparities among bozal Spanish manifestations, in which the three special Latin American cases (Papiamentu, Palenquero, and 19th century Cuban/Puerto Rican bozal speech) form a nucleus of shared characteristics which suggest Afro-Iberian origin, whereas other Afro-Hispanic manifestations over a period of nearly four centuries, exhibit more diversity. The very earliest attempts at representing bozal Spanish, in 16th century Spain, are merely imitations of contemporary Portuguese literary patterns, while also reflecting the speech of slaves recently arrived from Portugal. From the middle of the 16th century until the beginning of the 20th, bozal Spanish existed in its own right in various regions, with the following shared features:

1. Unstable and variable nominal gender and, occasionally, number inflection.
2. Unstable verb conjugation, manifested as incorrect conjugated forms (often gravitating toward the 3rd person singular) and occasional uninflected infinitives.
3. Variable loss of definite and indefinite articles.
4. Variable loss of prepositions, especially a and de.
5. Occasional confusion of pronominal case (usually involving the first person singular pronouns), at times resulting in use of disjunctive pronouns as subject (mi saber) and at other times in the use of subject pronouns as verbal or prepositional objects (para yo).
6. Frequent phonetic and phonological deformation, at times reflecting regular processes (loss of syllable-final /l/ and /r/, neutralization and interchange of syllable-final /h/ and /r/; neutralization of /l/ and /y/ and of /t/ and /d/), and equally as often representing more idiosyncratic deformation and misidentifications.21

Of the above features common to Peninsular and Latin American bozal Spanish, all are frequently found in vestigial Spanish worldwide i which no African connection can be demonstrated. They are also found in the non-Creole Spanish of Equatorial Guinea and in cases of marginal bilingualism with non-African languages in such areas as Mexico (Siade 1974) Paraguay (Meliá 1974, 1980; Usher de Herreros 1976; Gifford 1973 Granda 1979; Welzl 1979), Argentina (Quant and Irigoyen 1980), Peru (Cerrón-Palomino 1976), Ecuador (Muyssen 1981b), Venezuela (Rile 1992), etc. Moreover, features (1), (4), and (6) are frequently found in popular rural Spanish of many regions, and features (2) and (5) are no unknown in nonstandard Spanish dialects. All of these characteristics exhibit natural consequences of imperfect learning, of the possible interference of a variety of non-Romance languages, of the lack of a wide pool of adequate native speaker models, and of the absence of individual and society monitoring and feedback mechanisms that would partially counteract reductive tendencies. The fact that the same features are found in established Romance- and English-based Creoles is less indicative of potentially common origins than of quasi-universal tendencies of drift, reduction, and structural simplification. In particular, none of the features points convincingly to an Afro-Iberian base for general bozal Spanish. In Cuba, Pichardo (1836:iii) noted that bozales spoke “un castellano desfigurado, chaparrado, sin concordancia, número, declinación ni conjugación . . .” [a disfigured, babbling Spanish, without concordance, number, declinations, or conjugations]; this description is more appropriate for an emergent pidgin than for a well-established creole governed by a system of rules and endowed with consistency across the linguistic community. Although it is unlikely that Pichardo was totally free of the ethnocentric bias which frequently ascribed totally chaotic and distorted patterns to black speakers (as suggested by his somewhat disparaging remarks about Chinese speakers’ Spanish), he evidently had considerable firsthand experience with bozal Spanish. His observations and examples are consistent with those of other 19th and 20th century Cuban observers of bozal Spanish, none of whose descriptions suggests a stable usage which might signal an incipient creolization.

5. Homogeneity of bozal Spanish across Time and Space

It is evident that African slaves brought to Spain or Latin America and who learned Spanish as a second language would speak the latter language
imperfectly, and that under conditions of social marginality such as characterized large sugar plantations as well as communities of *cimarrones*, the offspring of such *bozal* Spanish speakers might also speak the language less than perfectly. In other conditions, however, it is assumed that *bozal* speech was by definition a transitory phenomenon, which arose and fell each time the Spanish language passed from the generation of recently arrived African slaves to their children (López Morales 1980; Monton 1916:112-8; Mintz 1971; Alleyn 1971; Bachiiller y Morales 1883:103; Laurence 1974:487; Alzola 1965:365). We may even question the existence of homogeneous patterns of *bozal* Spanish, such as found, for example, in Golden Age literature, since purely literary devices, stereotyping, exaggeration, and metaphorical language may have been responsible for the texts which we consider today as legitimate examples of 16th and 17th century Afro-Hispanic language (Lipski 1985a). The earliest *bozal* Spanish of the Golden Age is demonstrably an imitation of the Africanized Portuguese already spoken in Lisbon, but it is not equally clear that African slaves in 16th century Seville continued to speak such Portuguese-influenced *bozal* Spanish (Weber de Kuralt 1962, Russell 1973, Naro 1978). Available evidence indicates that all but the most recently arrived generation spoke “normal” Spanish which, however, was of no interest for literary stereotyping (Russell 1973:237-8). It has also been suggested (Russell 1973:239) that literary *habla de negros* may have been used to represent not *bozal* Spanish but dialogues carried out entirely in African languages. The *Fidgín* Portuguese which is assumed to have arrived from Lisbon with the new arrivals may also have been “Hispanized” by Spanish writers for ease of recognition by an audience unaccustomed to any variety of either Portuguese or creole (Russell 1973:237). Thus there is no guarantee that “black” Spanish widely existed in Spain except in the minds of poets and dramatists, and a comparison of literary texts over a period of nearly a century suggests that once the negro became a comic figure (since virtually without exception *bozal* speakers were portrayed as buffoons or at best as unwise victims of fate), imitation of an established stereotype took precedence over linguistically accurate portrayals.

In Latin America, there is no doubt that some form of Africanized Spanish arose in each situation in which large-scale importation of African slaves occurred. The same as in Spain, however, it appears that the offspring of such *bozal* speakers learned regional popular varieties of Spanish, and that any attempt to portray the speech of criollo blacks as any different from that of their non-black counterparts stems from literary exaggeration and racist stereotypes, many of which characterize Latin American literary representation of blacks even today (Lipski 1985a). Until the advent of black Latin American writers toward the end of the 19th century, all literary portrayals of *bozal* Spanish came from white writers, nearly all of whom depicted *bozales* speakers in humorous, comic, and carnivalesque modes. Beginning in the second half of the 19th century, literary examples of Latin American “black” Spanish contain few if any creole-like grammatical modifications, and few phonological modifications that are not characteristic of regional popular Spanish dialects. What is found is an attempt at literary phonetic transcription of popular speech tendencies, common to rural uneducated speakers of all races in the regions in question, and at times also found in the colloquial speech of educated individuals. This tendency was extended by black writers like Nicolás Guillén, Candelario Obeso, Adalberto Ortiz, Nicomedes Santa Cruz, Arnoldo Palacios, and others, whose “black” speech is in reality indistinguishable from that of non-black comparators of comparable sociocultural situations (Arroz 1950:128).

The survey of grammatical tendencies common to Latin American *bozal* Spanish indicates that none is likely to have resulted from the propagation of an initial common creole from one zone to another. In each region where Africanized Spanish is attested, the characteristics are those of a spontaneously formed pidgin, or at best of an advanced stage of foreigner talk, which eventually merged with local varieties of Spanish. There is also little evidence to suggest literary imitation of Latin American *bozal* Spanish between countries in Latin America, such as occurred in Golden Age Spain and Portugal; despite evident exaggeration and burlesque, it appears that writers in each area gave some approximation of the speech that they actually heard among African slaves and their descendents. Only in the case of the triad of Pampamantu, Palenquero, and 19th century Cuban/Puerto Rican *bozal* speech is there highly suggestive evidence of both common origins and of an Afro-Lusitianian basis, and it has been seen that in this case Africanized Spanish was widely represented in Latin America over a period of nearly 300 years, it is suggested that a high degree of homogeneity never existed from one region to another, except for those features resulting naturally from imperfect learning, and that any early Afro-Lusitianian basis neutralized once the recently arrived *bozales* came into contact with sub-
sttantal Spanish-speaking populations. The preceding remarks, while based on a wide range of data, must nonetheless be revised in the light of future documentary discoveries, which will undoubtedly occur as the investigation of the Latin American slave trade continues. This simply underscores the need for an expanded cross-disciplinary perspective in creole studies, particularly in the case of historical and demographic data regarding the Afro-American connection.

NOTES


4) The first major examples come from Sor Juan Inés de la Cruz and Gabriel de Stillas in the second half of the 17th century (Mansur 1957:31); for others early Mexican examples, cf. Megenney (1985b), Mendoza (1956).
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