Creole Spanish and Afro-Hispanic*

1. Introduction
The goal of this chapter is to present a comparative survey of research paradigms involving Creoles lexified from Spanish, as well as Afro-Hispanic dialects which promise to shed light on issues of Creole origins, the creolization process, and the formation of Spanish dialects. Among Romance-based Creoles, those lexified from Spanish are few in number, in comparison to Portuguese- and French-derived Creoles; they include Colombian Palenquero, Philippine Creole Spanish, and Papiamento, the native language of Aruba, Bonaire, and Curacao.

There is much evidence suggesting that several earlier creolized varieties of Spanish once existed, with some having disappeared only recently. As late as the turn of the 20th century, many African-born labourers in the Caribbean region spoke dialects of Spanish with Creole characteristics, which may furnish a missing link in theories of Creole formation and diffusion. The ethno-linguistic ceremonies of the negros congos of Panama’s Caribbean coast include speech patterns that strongly suggest the previous existence of a Creole (Lipski 1990a). There are also a number of marginal areas of Latin America where regional varieties of Spanish coexist with or contain Creole remnants, and there is good reason to believe that Afro-Hispanic Creole pockets were once more widespread. There have been occasional but as yet unconfirmed reports that Afro-Hispanic Creoles (or remnants thereof) similar to Palenquero may continue to be spoken in heavily Black remote areas of South America. Such accounts have not, however, all been personally verified by linguists.

The speech varieties alluded to above have quite differing amounts of contact with Spanish. The situation in El Palenque, Colombia, ranges from active Spanish-Palenquero diglossia to only passive knowledge of the Creole language. The Afro-Hispanic isolates are also spoken side by side with Spanish. Due to their social and geographical proximity to
Venezuela, speakers of Papiamento are generally also conversant in the language of that country. Philippine Creole Spanish is no longer exposed to the influence of everyday Spanish, as was still the case at the end of the Second World War when Creole speakers interacted frequently with Spanish nationalists and Filipinos fluent in Spanish. Zamboangueño, the only viable dialect remaining today, does, however, continue to receive new hispanisms through the influence of writers, journalists, and radio/television personnel who turn to Spanish in order to enrich their vernacular (Lipski 1987c).

2. Philippine Creole Spanish (Chabacano)

The only Spanish-lexicon Creole outside of Latin America is spoken in the Philippines, and its varieties are collectively known as Chabacano. This term derives from a Spanish word meaning ‘clumsy, bungling’, which reflects Spaniards’ attitudes toward what in urban form was also called español de cocina ‘kitchen Spanish’. While this term currently has no pejorative connotations in the Philippines, the belief is widespread (particularly among native speakers) that Chabacano is merely ‘broken Spanish’ and ‘has no grammar’. The following discussion will use only neutral regional designations.²

Despite significant lexical and morphological differences, Philippine Creole Spanish dialects are mutually intelligible and are unquestionably derived from a single source, usually identified with the precursor of Ternateño. Philippine Creole Spanish speakers not formally trained in Spanish are scarcely able to understand the latter, while native Spanish speakers who are unfamiliar with Philippine languages find much of Philippine Creole Spanish impenetrable, with Zamboangueño being the least intelligible.

 Philippine Creole Spanish holds an important place among Creole languages. It is the only Spanish-lexicon Creole lacking African influence, and is unique among Hispanic Creoles in flourishing where Spanish is not the matrix language, thus making decreolization impossible. Philippine Creole Spanish does not adhere to the usual SVO Creole typology, but rather prefers the VSO order of most areal languages. Despite these unusual features, Philippine Creole Spanish has attracted a relatively small research paradigm.

The first linguistic study of Philippine Creole Spanish was undertaken by Schuchardt (1884) as part of his monumental survey of Creole languages. Schuchardt gave some relevant details of what he called ‘Malay-Spanish’, but the study was based on secondary sources, and the full import of Philippine Creole Spanish not emerge. This early work was (1956), a milestone of research on Philippine Creole Spanish studies, still widely accepted, that Philippine relexification of an earlier maritime Bay from the former Spanish gar provides the next major studies of not explicitly deny the possibility of Bay Philippine Creole Spanish, but rather is based on relexification (Hiligaynon, of the Visayan family. His 1980 study contains a detailed phrase, including its aspectual-base several Visayan particles. Aside from Frake’s most important contribution (markedness) of the alternation of several closely knit semantic para- digmat ‘small’, si ‘yes’ versus kende. Finally, Frake offers a sociolinguistic-Philippine lexical items to the Span.

A number of scholars provide Philippine Creole Spanish dialects, including Riego de Dios (1976, 1978). Other Spanish data in wider comparative 1977a, 1977b, 1978) contributes to- Manil Bay Philippine Creole Sp.; Ternateño as the oldest variant. Lexico- logical variation in Philippine Creole Spanish is influenced by paraphasizations of Whinnom (1956) and Portuguese elements in Philippine Creole Spanish developments in other Spanish- and concludes that although some clear Pet- airtight case for relexification of a cannot be made solely on the stren.
import of Philippine Creole Spanish for comparative Creole studies did not emerge. This early work was not taken up again until Whinnom (1956), a milestone of research which constitutes the benchmark for Philippine Creole Spanish studies. To Whinnom is due the hypothesis, still widely accepted, that Philippine Creole Spanish results from the relexification of an earlier maritime Portuguese Pidgin, brought to Manila Bay from the former Spanish garrison at Ternate. Frake (1971, 1980) provides the next major studies of Philippine Creole Spanish. He does not explicitly deny the possibility of Creole Portuguese origin in Manila Bay Philippine Creole Spanish, but develops the hypothesis that Zamboangueño is based on relexification of a central Philippine language (Hiligaynon, of the Visayan family) not spoken natively on Mindanao. His 1980 study contains a detailed analysis of the Zamboangueño verb phrase, including its aspectual-based structure and the incorporation of several Visayan particles. Aside from the refined genetic reconstruction, Frake’s most important contribution is the analysis (in terms of relative markedness) of the alternation of Spanish and Visayan words, within several closely knit semantic paradigms, including grande ‘big’ versus dirute ‘small’, si ‘yes’ versus hende ‘no’, elo ‘he, she’ versus nila ‘they’. Finally, Frake offers a sociohistorical model for the transfer of central Philippine lexical items to the Spanish garrison in Zamboanga.

A number of scholars provide descriptions of individual Philippine Creole Spanish dialects, including Forman (1972), Llamado (1972) and Riego de Dios (1976, 1978). Other investigators use Philippine Creole Spanish data in wider comparative studies. For example, Molony (1973, 1977a, 1977b, 1978) contributes to the historical reconstruction of the Manila Bay Philippine Creole Spanish dialects, and supports ranking Ternateño as the oldest variant. Lipski (1986b, 1987b) evaluates phonological variation in Philippine Creole Spanish as a source of quantitative information on Spanish pronunciation in earlier centuries. Although Philippine Creole Spanish does not coexist in a matrix of Spanish speakers, Lipski (1987c) finds evidence that standard Spanish (as spoken by influential community figures such as priests, radio announcers, and teachers) is influencing Zamboangueño. Lipski (1988), updating the observations of Whinnom (1956) and Batalha (1960), surveys putative Portuguese elements in Philippine Creole Spanish, comparing them with developments in other Spanish- and Portuguese-lexicon Creoles. He concludes that although some clear Portuguese → Creole transfers exist, an airtight case for relexification of a Portuguese-lexicon Creole or Pidgin cannot be made solely on the strength of currently available evidence.
As with the study of other Creoles, such as Palenquero, a major obstacle to research on Philippine Creole Spanish has been excessive reliance on second-hand sources or questionable data, often collected by outsiders or by Philippine investigators lacking resources required for in-depth analysis. Most scholars have approached Philippine Creole Spanish either from the perspective of the Hispanist or comparative creolist who is relatively unfamiliar with Philippine languages, or from the viewpoint of the anthropological linguist specializing in the Philippines who may be unaware of the development of Romance or Creole structures. The number of individuals with professional competence in all these disciplines is vanishingly small, and the eventual resolution of issues involving Philippine Creole Spanish will probably be the result of collaborative efforts.

On the positive side of the balance, Philippine Creole Spanish enjoys a large population of mono- and bilingual speakers, and is spoken in readily accessible areas. There are no substantial reasons to impede future research on Philippine Creole Spanish, and key issues remain unresolved, some of which have been surveyed above. Certain of these questions are specific to Philippine Creole Spanish or to Hispanic Creoles in general, but the availability of a typologically unique and fully vigorous Hispanic Creole in a Southeast Asian Oceanic setting should encourage using Philippine Creole Spanish as a proving ground for a much wider range of theories and models.

3. Panamanian ‘Congo’
Aside from the linguistically famous Colombian Palenque de San Basilio, other Palenques exist in Latin America. Reports of Creole language exist for the Panamanian coastal village of Palenque (Granda 1978: 382, citing unpublished work of Whinnom), Drolet (1980), Joly (1981), Lipski (1986c, 1990a), and others who have investigated the linguistic situation of this area have demonstrated that no Creole has been actively spoken in recent memory. However, the Caribbean coast of Panama, centering on the villages of Portobeló, Nombre de Dios, and Palenque (a few kilometers from the original site), still contains a large Afro-Hispanic population who refer to themselves as negros congos, and who stage elaborate dramatic rituals each year during Carnival. An essential component of the ritual is the use of a special language, which, according to oral tradition, is derived from the speech of the negro bozal (native of Africa with limited abilities in Spanish).

Detailed study of congo community and Lipski (1986c, 1990a) has demonstrated the language learned ritually by most of the protagonists of the Carnival for a long time. Demonstration of ethnolinguistic isolation. Linguistically, congo is not an isolated language, it has incorporated deliberate phonological, involving consonantal epenthemic shifts centering on the idea of ‘vivo’ ‘dead’, e.g. < quebra ‘breach’, substantial component of congo was language elsewhere in Latin America, Panamanian Creole. Among such features, verbal morphology, frequent loss of as well as phonological features will be attributed to Afro-Hispanic areal influence.

Panamanian congo is important for the putative existence of an Afro-Hispanic region, but also as evidence against other theories. Absent from congo is a peculiarly use of originally disjunctive Papiamento mi, Palenquero i, Abakoi, which is a key component of A and Papiamento, and is also found in used elsewhere in rural Panama by most importantly, congo lacks verb sequences on link in theories claiming Afro-Iberian Creoles. Panamanian ample of spontaneous creolization of Portuguese-derived proto-Creole.

It is not feasible to postulate a used as a daily mode of communication. Perhaps as a result of increasing remembered and passed on to yo dialect, congo was supplemented with speech play. There are clear parts santaria and Puerto Rico espiritista Hispanic groups, where speaking the religious ceremony. Because of
Detailed study of congo communities by Joly (1981), Drolet (1980) and Lipski (1986c, 1990a) has demonstrated that congo is a ceremonial language learned ritually by most community members, particularly by the protagonists of the Carnival festivities; it is used principally during Carnival but sporadically at other times, for enjoyment and as a demonstration of ethnolinguistic solidarity when travelling outside the region. Linguistically, congo is not entirely the result of natural evolution: it has incorporated deliberate phonetic, syntactic and semantic deformations, involving consonantal epanthesis, vowel substitutions, and semantic shifts centering on the idea of speaking in opposites, as in vivi < vivo ‘dead’, entero < entero ‘broken’. On the other hand, there is a substantial component of congo which coincides with records of bozal language elsewhere in Latin America, evidently derived from an earlier Pidgin or Creole. Among such features are reduction of nominal and verbal morphology, frequent loss of prepositions, articles, and relativizers, as well as phonological features which in comparative studies have been attributed to Afro-Hispanic areal tendencies.

Panamanian congo is important not only as a demonstration of the putative existence of an Afro-Hispanic Creole in a relatively unexplored region, but also as evidence against monogenetic Afro-Romance Creole theories. Absent from congo is neutralization of pronominal case, particularly use of originally disjunctive object pronouns as subject, such as Papiamento mi, Palenquero i. Absent also from congo is the pronominal vos, which is a key component of Afro-Iberian Creoles such as Palenquero and Papiamento, and is also found in Philippine Creole Spanish. Vos is used elsewhere in rural Panama by individuals of non-African descent. Most importantly, congo lacks verbal particles such as ta, which form an important link in theories claiming a common origin for most if not all Afro-Iberian Creoles. Panamanian congo thus stands as a possible example of spontaneous creolization independent of a prior Hispanic- or Portuguese-derived proto-Creole.

It is not feasible to postulate a model of diglossia, since congo is not used as a daily mode of communication outside of Carnival season. Perhaps as a result of increasing similarity between earlier speech as remembered and passed on to younger learners, and the local Spanish dialect, congo was supplemented by distortion and exaggeration typical of speech play. There are clear parallels between congo speech and Cuban santeria and Puerto Rican espiritismo, both practised intensively by Afro-Hispanic groups, where speaking in bozal dialect is a requisite part of the religious ceremony. Because of fading recollection, imitators of bozal
speech increasingly improvize, stereotype and exaggerate in attempts to reproduce 'authentic' language. Herein lies a major potential pitfall when attempts are made to base comparative reconstruction of earlier creolized language on contemporary decretolized fragments.

4. Pan-Caribbean 'bozal' Spanish

Spanish-lexicon Creoles in Latin America are restricted to a few enclaves, while vestigial remains of earlier forms of Afro-Hispanic language are more widespread, having been detected in Cuba (Peré 1982), the Dominican Republic (Megenney 1990), Venezuela (Megenney 1988), Colombia (Graña 1977), Ecuador (Lipski 1987c), Trinidad (Lipski 1990 b), and Mexico (Aguirre Beltrán 1958). Several investigators have assembled a corpus of 19th-century Cuban and Puerto Rican texts which, it is claimed, give evidence of an originally pan-Caribbean or even pan-American Creole, a 'missing link' between Papiamento, Palenquero, and Portuguese-lexicon Creoles in Africa. Among elements of Caribbean bozal texts cited as evidence in favor of an Afro-Lusitanian Creole basis are: (1) unstable subject-verb and noun-adjunctive agreement; (2) retention of overt subject pronouns; (3) loss of some articles and prepositions; (4) occasional use of tener with existential force; (5) use of vos as familiar subject pronoun. Of these, (1)–(3) are general to pidginized or foreigner speech, and (4) is also documented for vestigial Spanish in areas removed from African influence (Lipski 1985b). *Vos* occurs only in a handful of bozal texts, and there is almost no use of disjunctive object pronouns — particularly *tia/mi* — in the role of subject. Concurrently, many common denominators found in other Afro-Iberian Creoles are conspicuously absent in reconstructed Caribbean bozal, including the fusion of proposition + article *la* (Pap. na Cononon ‘on in Curaçao’), plural formation via affixation of a plural pronoun (Pap. buki + nan ‘book(s)’), and clause- or sentence-final negation: as found in Palenquero (*i ab `i inglè na I don’t speak English*) and in popular Dominican and Cuban bozal Spanish (*no hablo inglés no*).

The idea of a prior Caribbean Creole Spanish is rejected categorically by López Morales (1980) and Laurence (1974); Lipski (1986a) reviews many examples offered as evidence and concludes that most do not point unequivocally toward a homogeneous Afro-Hispanic or Afro-Lusitanian Creole, but simply document an earlier stage of pidginized approximations to regional Spanish by bozales. Arguing against an earlier pan-Caribbean bozal Creole, Maurer (1987a) postulates divergent origins for even such structurally similar Creoles as Papiamento and Palenquero by invoking linguistic drift coupled with other varieties such as Cape Verdean.

There is one feature of early Iberian-lexicon Creoles (including Creole, and Philippine Creole) that cannot be explained by any plausible model of spread through the aspeptual particle *ta*/*ya*/*yos* because Carlot is dying. This is some 19th-century *bozal* texts from Cuba: the arrival of Papiamento-speaking in the first half of the 19th century, of African-born slaves, it may be some Papiamento combination platoed from Curaçao (see Lipski 1985b), by the occasional appearance of such elements coinciding with Papiamento.

The major difficulty in the investigation of linguistic evidence is the frequent occurrence of stereotyping in the occurrence of such miserable wretches, incapable of understanding the common human language, in repeated to spontaneous usage. The validity of many literary texts is that in order to produce genuine or illustrative texts, it sufficed to interchange elements which appear to have been interchanged in the absence of processes of phonological reduction (y > neglo) probably occurred in some nonstandard Spanish of many parts of Spain, which apparently occurred in a number of cases (*negro* > *negre*) and nasalized *dimperate* "foolish remarks". A result in 17th-century Spain and continues in various regions, is the present in:
invoking linguistic drift coupled with occasional contacts with speakers of other varieties such as Cape Verdan Creole Portuguese.

There is one feature of certain bozal texts which is shared by many Iberian-lexicon Creoles (including Papiamento, Palenquero, Cape Verdan Creole, and Philippine Creole Spanish), and which cannot be explained by any plausible model of spontaneous pidginization: the temporal-aspectual particle *ta: va yoray poque Calota ya ta mori* ‘I’m crying because Carlota is dying’. This combination is found only in a few 19th-century bozal texts from Cuba and Puerto Rico. Given the documented arrival of Papiamento-speaking workers in Cuba and Puerto Rico in the first half of the 19th century, coinciding with the last major importation of African-born slaves, it may be that newly-arrived bozalos acquired some Papiamento combinations through contact with workers transplanted from Curaçao (see Lipski 1987a). This hypothesis is supported by the occasional appearance, in the same bozal documents, of other elements coinciding with Papiamento, such as *riba* ‘on top of’.

The major difficulty in the interpretation of bozal texts is the questionable authenticity of linguistic details. Deliberate or subconscious stereotyping is seen in the repeated portrayal of Africans as buffoons or miserable wretches, incapable of more than sensual music and dance. A common lament, repeated in too many literary texts to be attributable to spontaneous usage, is “aunque negro, gente somo”. Linguistically, the validity of many literary texts is cast into doubt by generalizations such as that of the Golden Age author Quevedo (1988: 127), who asserted that in order to produce guineo (as he designated bozal language in Spain), it sufficed to interchange all instances of /l/ and /r/. Extracting elements which appear to have been minimally affected by stereotyping suggests that in addition to unstable concordance, bozal Spanish extended processes of phonological reduction already present in regional varieties of Spanish, especially neutralization and loss of syllable-final consonants. Interchange of syllable-initial or syllable-internal /l/ and /r/ (as in negro > negro) probably occurred sporadically (as it does to this day in nonstandard Spanish of many regions). Another phonetic modification which apparently occurred in bozal speech was intrusive nasalization (negro > negre) and nasalization of preconsonantal /s/ (disparrates > dispurate ‘foolish remarks’). A recurring element in bozal texts beginning in 17th-century Spain and continuing through 19th-century Latin America, of various regions, is the portmanteau word *lan*, with variant *nan* as in:
Lan is used variously as a singular or plural definite article, and as a combination of article + preposition. The origin of these forms is not known with certainty (Lipski 1987), but their occurrence in Spain, and in Latin America from Puerto Rico to Argentina, suggests that at least a few core items may have been in general circulation among *bozal* speakers.

Regardless of the nature of *bozal* language in Latin America, there remains the issue of influence on supraordinate varieties of Spanish. That lexical transfer occurred is beyond a doubt, but little conclusive evidence exists in other areas of grammar (but see Schwegler MS). Megenney (1982, 1990) suggests African influence on regional suprasegmental patterns. However, in the absence of information on suprasegmental attributes of *bozal* and post-*bozal* Spanish of the past, it is difficult to advance beyond mere speculation. Claims as to the African origin of reduction of syllable-final consonants, for instance, are undermined by the existence of identical processes in Andalusia and the Canary Islands, as well as the lack of these same phenomena in Afro-Hispanic contact zones where the original Spanish dialects did not exhibit them (Lipski 1985: 6, 1987: 4). We cannot at this time rule out the possibility that African speakers extended colloquial and regional patterns of articulation. New patterns could, in turn, filter upward and outward, away from Afro-American communities, producing the current Latin American sociolinguistic configuration, in which no distinguishably Afro-Hispanic speech patterns remain.

An interesting residue of previous Afro-Hispanic contacts has been produced in Latin America, in the form of sociolinguistic attitudes which have led many to believe that some form of “Afro-American” Spanish still exists. Stereotypes of “black” Spanish are invariably ascribed to poor, socially marginalized individuals, and literary examples are usually confined to phonetic “eye-dialect” (Lipski 1985a). In all instances, the speech patterns are typical of the colloquial speech of much wider segments of the respective societies, regardless of ethnic background. The reasons behind these attitudes are complex, and go beyond simple prejudice and ignorance, particularly when stemming from Afro-Hispanic writers such as Nicolás Guillén, Adalberto Ortiz, and Nicolás de Santa Cruz. Suffice it to say that it is not entirely inappropriate to speak of distinctly Afro-Hispanic ethnolinguistics, even at the present time.

On balance, the “true story” of written. The speakers have disappeared, as do dialect pockets with a high level of lexical and grammatical variation. Subsequent research must turn to other sources, and, as comparative Cr Jantti (1984) suggests, to reconstructed languages.

5. *Palenquero (Colombia)*

Limited to San Basilio de Palenque, the Creole is spoken by fewer than the original slaves who, early in the eighteenth century, were the result of repatriation from Spanish colonies. The present day population is estimated at around 85,000. The colony has long been bilingual in Spanish and indigenous languages, with Creole being the lingua franca among all groups. The legitimacy of Creole language use is supported by the presence of Creole speakers among both Palenqueros and black Colombians, as well as by the fact that the Creole is the language of the majority of the population.

Palenquero was first brought to the attention of the anthropological world by the work of the anthropologist Ochoa Franco (1945) and the ethnographer Giraldo de la Fuente (1962). The language has since been studied by a number of scholars, including Buckova (1968), who published a grammar and dictionary of the language, identifying the Creole as a distinct language.

The article by Buckova and Eling (1978) is a valuable resource for anyone interested in Caribbean Spanish, and it is written in English to date — recent developments in the study of Caribbean Spanish are rarely covered in English, and by no means all specialists agree.
On balance, the ‘true story’ of Caribbean bajal Spanish has yet to be written. The speakers have disappeared, although living memories remain, as do dialect pockets with a higher than average proportion of Africandists. Subsequent research must combine field work with archival searches, and, as comparative Creole studies advance, it is to be hoped that bajal reconstruction continues apace.

5. Palenquero (Colombia)

Limited to San Basilio de Palenque, Bolivar, Colombia, this Spanish-lexicon Creole is spoken by fewer than 4,000 descendants of runaway African slaves who, early in the 17th century, established their first palenques (primitive fortifications) in the hinterland of Cartagena. Until recently, the Palenqueros lived in relative cultural and geographic isolation. There is language-internal as well as external evidence (Del Castillo 1984: 80–85; Schweger 1990b) that despite such isolation this maroon society has long been bilingual in Palenquero (locally known as ‘engua’) and rural Colombian Spanish. The two languages share a vast number of lexical correspondences, but the Creole is hardly intelligible to outsiders. Although virtually all inhabitants of San Basilio still understand the local vernacular, those of the younger generation in particular are increasingly avoiding its use. Despite a growing awareness of ‘negritud’ among both Palenqueros and black Colombians, there is no institutional or political support to counter the current trend of Afro-Hispanic language loss.

Palenquero was first brought to the attention of the scholarly community by Ochoa Franco (1945). It was sampled in Escalante’s anthropological monographs (1954 [1979], 1964), briefly described by Montes Giraldo (1962) and Bickerton – Escalante (1970), and analysed in Lewis’ unpublished and difficult to obtain 1970 thesis. Between 1968 and 1978 there followed a series of short but important contributions by Granda (1968 and the collection of articles reprinted in his Estudios lingüísticos 1978), who, contrary to the claims made in the monumental Bibliography of pidgin and creole languages (Reinecke et al. 1975: 132), was first in identifying the Creole — rather than ordinary dialectal — character of Palenquero.

The article by Bickerton and Escalante (1970: 256) – pivotal for many linguists because it constitutes the only published survey of Palenquero written in English to date – recognized the centrality of Palenquero to the study of Caribbean Spanish and Creoles in general. Today, many but by no means all specialists agree that this Afro-Hispanic vernacular is a
survival of a once more widely distributed Creole which must have influenced the development of (Afro)Hispanic dialects elsewhere in the Caribbean. Due to its possible genetic relationship with, among others, Papiamento and Portuguese-based contact languages of West Africa (particularly the Creoles of Anomabo, São Tomé, Principe, Cape Verde, and Guinea-Bissau), the ‘lengua’ of San Basilio is of key importance to the debate on mono- versus poly-genesis, and is crucial to the question of 16th-century Afro-Portuguese language use along the coasts of West Africa and Asia. But because of (1) the widespread attitude among specialists of Spanish (as well as Romance philology at large) that African or Creole influence on American Spanish has been negligible or nonexistent even in the most heavily Afro-American Caribbean areas, and (2) the long unavailability of Palenquero grammars and/or raw data, the language of Palenque has remained virtually excluded from theoretical discussions on Creoles, American Spanish dialects, or language in general.

Within the past few years, the monographs of Patiño Rosselli (1983) and Megenney (1986), Del Castillo’s two lengthy contributions (1982, 1984), and, most recently, articles by Escalante (1988), Granda (1988: 225–233), and Schwegler (1989, 1990 b, 1991 a-c, 1992, in press a-c, d), as well as the more comparative studies by Lipski (1986 a, 1987a, 1987 b), Maurer (1987 a, b), Megenney (1984), and Schwegler (1988, 1990 a, chapter 6, and in press d), have marked the beginning of renewed interest in Palenquero.16 Lengua y sociedad en el Palenque de San Basilio (Friedmann – Patiño Rosselli 1983) constitutes the most solid description of Palenquero to date and, importantly, contains the only corpus of transcribed spoken Palenquero texts (with accompanying Spanish translation), as well as an incisive sociolinguistic analysis by the Colombian anthropologist Friedmann. Patiño Rosselli’s linguistic description, conceived in a structuralist vein, remains true to Latin American tradition in concentrating — in order of importance — on phonology, morphology, and syntax, always with a view towards uncovering potential Africanisms, such as pronominalization of some word-initial consonants (Pal. ndó ~ Sp. dos ‘two’; Pal. aga/la ~ Sp. agarrar ‘to grab’), plural marking with the Bantu prefix ma (Pal. mâkusa ~ Sp. las cosas ‘the things’), and postverbal negation (Pal. i mini ose abá lengua nua ~ yo no hablo lengua ‘I don’t speak lengua’).

Because of the strong genealogical and cultural affinity between today’s Palenqueros and their modern sub-Saharan relatives, specialists like Megenney, Del Castillo, and Granda have centered their attention primarily on putative African elements. In an effort to determine the precise geographical source of such in lengua post-criollo de Colombi origins of the slaves brought to analysis of ‘la lengua’ (phonology and, after a brief synopsis of lexis returns to African topics in his isms.16 An even greater fascinat ydly familiar with the history of assembles and analyses an imp Palenquero words of supposed findings of Megenney (1986). Green et al (1982) about the predom. Palenque. Although less firmly, Escalante’s latest contrib. Atlantic coast of Colombia, togo Palenquero (1988) and the readin to the field, may well signal the cooperation among the few but.

Despite relatively rapid advances studies still lag far behind those of importance. The inquiries of L. certain facets of the tense-and recent monographs by Megenn etivists to include Palenquero in a significant limit their efforts by data and imprecisions in their morphemic separations and occasionally in the verbal system, th which must be solved before they into cross-linguistic endeavours. Structure of the tense aspect may description of the frequent but ‘oké’ and the function of a aspect’ particle -bu, as in Pal. i bu here’. The currently available co more, excessively short and too R analyses (often statistical) that h modern investigations of better
geographical source of such influences. Megenney's El palenquero: un lenguaje post-cristián de Colombia (1986) first dedicates 50 pages to the origins of the slaves brought to Cartagena, then proceeds to a tripartite analysis of "la lengua" (phonology, morphology, and especially syntax), and, after a brief synopsis of lexical items of Romance origin, eventually returns to African topics in his discussion of 43 potential sub-Saharanisms. An even greater fascination for Africanisms marks Del Castillo's consecutive contributions (1982, 1984) to Palenquero lexicography. Solidly familiar with the history of the slave trade, this Colombian author assembles and analyses an impressive collection of over one hundred Palenquero words of supposed African descent, thus confirming the findings of Megenney (1986), Granda (1978, 1988), and Schweigler (1991 a. in press e. f) about the predominantly Angolan/Congolese ancestry of Palenque. Although less firmly grounded in principles of modern linguistics, Escalante's latest contribution (1988) on Bantu influence on the Atlantic coast of Colombia, together with Granda's rekindled interest in Palenquero (1988) and the recent arrival of Maurer, Lipski, and Schweigler to the field, may well signal the beginning of greater coordination and cooperation among the few but widely dispersed specialists.

Despite relatively rapid advances in less than a decade, Palenquero studies still lag far behind those of other Creoles of equal or even lesser importance. The inquiries of Lipski (1987 a) and Maurer (1987 a) on certain facets of the tense/aspect system are good examples of how the recent monographs by Megenney and Patino Rosselli enable comparatists to include Palenquero in their discussions, but at the same time significantly limit their efforts because of the limited availability of raw data and imprecisions in their source materials — such as questionable morphemic separations and occasionally doubtful transcriptions. Especially in the verbal system, there remain a number of serious problems which must be solved before these data can be incorporated satisfactorily into cross-linguistic endeavours. The problems include: the morphemic structure of the tense/aspect markers asè (or a-sè) and atú (or a-tú); the description of the frequent but heretofore overlooked (irrealis?) marker akè:; and the function and origin of the non-verbal enclitic (tense/aspect?) particle -ba, as in Pal. i taba aki-ha ~ Sp. yo estuve aquí: 'I was here'. The currently available corpus of spoken Palenquero is, furthermore, excessively short and too fragmented to permit the kind of thorough analyses (often statistical) that have constituted the foundation of many modern investigations of better known languages.
Future field workers should avoid basing their conclusions on information obtained from Palenquero informants now residing in the more hospitable neighbouring urban centres of Cartagena or Barranquilla. As shown by Schwegler (1990b), reliance on such data has, at times, been misleading, and threatens to blur further the already poorly delineated question of Palenquero decreolization.12 But perhaps the most severe criticism of past research efforts concerns the frequent lack of rigour in the pursuit of Africanisms. With the possible exception of Granda, participants in this 'African' word hunt -- admittedly an unusually difficult task for a variety of reasons (see Megenney 1986, chapter 7) -- are without exception Hispanists without a formal training in synchronic, and much less diachronic, sub-Saharan linguistics. Equally significant is the fact that scholars of Palenquero -- and in particular those who had most to say about supposed 'African' remnants -- have never spent a prolonged period in San Basilio, thus failing to acquire a (near) native-like familiarity with 'lingua'. Because of such shortcomings, a number of false segmentations (such as *palum Noah for palo manong ‘mamón tree’) or ‘strange’ yet (after careful inspection) irresistibly Romance-derived words (such as casona < Sp. casa de hambre ‘cemetery’) have been assigned erroneously to African etymology, thereby artificially inflating the tally of substratal influences on ‘lingua’.13 African languages clearly played an important, if not crucial, role in the genesis of Palenquero, but current evidence simply cannot sustain the tentative claim of Bickerton and Escalante (1970: 260, generally echoed in subsequent works) that as much as 10% of the Palenquero lexical stock may be of sub-Saharan origin.14

Given the strong signs of imminent language death in San Basilio, perhaps the most urgent task is the collection and publication of additional data: as Schwegler's recent monograph-length article (in press f) illustrates, much can still be learned about both the internal and external history of Palenquero by sampling archaic words still cherished by the last practitioners of the traditional Lumbalí songs. The unusually homogeneous Palenquero community (which is practically free of sociolinguistic variation) provides a relatively undisputed and, therefore, ideal testing ground for more theoretical issues such as language death, decreolization, or code switching. Several phenomena (like sandhi, topological, pluralization, possible variation in tone, negation) which may link Palenquero with African languages or other Creoles also beg for immediate further investigation. Thanks to the rapid advances that have been made in identifying the relative date as the principal homeland of Palenquero, comparative investigations are indeed possible.

6. Papiamento

Papiamento has the largest number of Hispanic Creoles in the Americas, and has an increasingly flows in many Hispanol languages. As the official tongue on all the already been recognized for its interactional role, this has been ininternational, and is commonly heard in television. The sociolinguistic perspective different from that of other Caribbean creoles, and is therefore not spread across the region. (Both in writing and on TV) will lead to increased awareness of the language.15

Because of its national prestige, if not at least as regards Creoles, Papiamento boasts a greater number of loans from Romance and other Romance Creoles (Reineck 1982: 636). Papiamento orthography should also be a concern, the second problem has been given little attention. The debate about Papiamento orthography is likely to be too heated to continue indefinitely. (Ferrol 1982: 84–85; Stein 1984: 157). Papiamento orthography may be explained through phonetic rules of Papiamento (Wood 1972: 861). Others (including Portuguese components in the Dutch colonies in the New World) can also be indirectly, to the exodus of Dutch
been made in identifying the relatively small northern Angolan territories as the principal homeland of Palenqueros, the outlook for such future comparative investigations are indeed very promising.

6. Papiamento

Spoken on the Caribbean islands of Curacao, Aruba, and Bonaire, Papiamento has the largest number of speakers (more than 200,000) of any Hispanic Creole in the Americas, and, unlike most other contact vernaculars, has an increasingly flourishing written language. Although Dutch is the official tongue on all three islands, Papiamento is an accepted national language, and is commonly used in most newspapers as well as on television. The sociolinguistic position of Papiamento is distinctly different from that of other Caribbean islands in that this Creole does not have a recognized standard to relate to directly (in contrast to Jamaican English or Haitian French). There exist only minor differences between the types of Papiamento spoken in the three adjoining islands, and there is reason to believe that the ongoing process of standardization (both in writing and on TV) will lead to even greater normalization (see Ahrens-Embleton 1987).

Because of its national presage, considerable number of speakers, and, at least as regards Creoles, unusually long tradition of written language, Papiamento boasts a greater number and variety of publications than any other Romance Creole (Reinecke’s monumental Bibliography (1975) reserves 63 pages for Papiamento alone!). Traditionally, two problems have attracted both attention and disagreement, and linguists continue to show considerable concern for them: first, whether Papiamento was originally lexified from Portuguese or Spanish; and second, how the infelicitous vacillation between Dutch, Spanish, and phonetic spellings in Papiamento orthography should be corrected. Being mainly of national concern, the second problem has received only minimal international attention. The debate about Papiamento genesis, on the other hand, has led to (often heated) discussion in international circles. According to some (Ferrot 1982: 84–85; Stein 1984: 15;), the Portuguese elements in Papiamento may be explained through extensive influence of Portuguese Sephardic Jews and slave traders living in Curacao, or via the operation of basic phonemic rules of Papiamento upon originally Castilian models (Wood 1972: 861). Others (including Goodman 1987), believe that these Portuguese components in the Dutch, English, French, and Danish colonies in the New World can in large part be traced, either directly or indirectly, to the exodus of Dutch and Jewish refugees from Brazil.
Diametrically opposed to these two positions are those who uphold the theory of an Afro-Portuguese origin of Papiamento (see the classic study of Lenz 1928; Navarro Tomás 1953; and, more recently, Granda 1974; Megenney 1984, 1985). According to them, the Portuguese components that have survived over the centuries in Papiamento (as well as other Caribbean vernaculars, including Palenquero) from larger stocks of Portuguese elements, must once have been an integral part of the original Portuguese-based Pidgin or Creole supposedly spoken by 16th- and 17th-century slaves on both sides of the Atlantic.

Although the basic tenets of either theory of Papiamento genesis have remained essentially unchanged and no definitive agreement has been reached, scholars now seek to formulate their arguments in a less categorical fashion. Thus Megenney (1985: 175), a long-time proponent of the importance of Afro-Portuguese "reconnaissance language" in the formation of Caribbean dialects, recognizes that Portuguese elements may have been imported into the various areas via a hybrid Afro-Hispanic language rather than a full-fledged Pidgin or Creole. Basing himself on an analysis — etymological as well as functional — of the Papiamento temporal system, Maurer (1986a) is equally cautious in concluding that, despite the unquestionable importance of the Afro-Portuguese contact language, Papiamento may have originated from a variety of languages (Afro-Portuguese, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch) rather than from a single source. Even more important perhaps is his recognition (1986a: 145) that the knotty issue of Papiamento genesis cannot be resolved satisfactorily without additional study of language-external factors, particularly the provenance of African slaves and their linguistic preferences once they became freemen.

On the whole, the past 15 years of research on Papiamento have not produced a coherent body of publications, nor a research program that might lead to a well-rounded analysis of the language. Although more theoretically oriented linguists clearly favor including Papiamento over other Hispanic Creoles in their discussions, Papiamento has generally been left out of the process of interpreting, testing, and refining the various linguistic theories that have been in vogue (with varying degrees of success) over the past thirty years. By the same token, researchers on Papiamento are notably absent at international symposia held outside Curacao, and few newcomers to linguistics appear to choose this vernacular as their field of inquiry.

There are, fortunately, a number of works that, though they have hardly set the stage for a new surge of research, are providing important new insights into the history or structure of Papiamento (1983) is interesting in that it ill complex ways, to a classification of semantic categories, through whi reence or non-occurrence of the ph categories. Bendix’s (1983) co because it investigates in consider Papiamento certain sandhi phenomena in other Creole languages, but e etically in a satisfactory manner be tend to hide these assimilatory different problem, Maurer’s ana reiteration (in press) and his brs on the semantics of the Papiame Bendix’s investigation in that the penta) languages as the primary phenomena. Kouwenberg (1990) Papiamento which are introduced by to the claim of some specialists, which provide proof for a distinct introduced by the complementization.

Until most recently, specialist Curacao Creole than with those of the Carib (bukal) speech areas — have rare diachrony of Papiamento by comp of (arguably) related speech varieties in the Congo. Recognizing the potential of bukal speech independently but with virtually the behaviour of bukal temporal, can conclude that Caribbe bukal speech as a phenomenon, but rather was characterized variation.

Because Papiamento does not lack a standardization towards a more presentational, though not absent, is less communities. Since Wood (1972) an with this issue, no one has examined the hispamization on Papiamento.
new insights into the history or structure of Papiamento. Dijkhoff's paper
(1983) is interesting in that it illustrates how pluralization is linked, in
complex ways, to a classification of the noun phrase in three distinct
semantic categories, through which it is possible to ‘explain’ the occur-
rence or non-occurrence of the plural marker -num with different semantic
categories. 22 Bendix's (1983) contribution is of particular importance
because it investigates in considerable detail (for the first time as regards
Papiamento) certain sandhi phenomena which are also unusually frequent
in other Creole languages, but could not easily be studied cross-linguis-
tically in a satisfactory manner because current orthographic conventions
tend to hide these assimilatory processes. 23 Although focusing on a
different problem, Maurer's analysis of Papiamento reduplication and
reiteration (in press) and his brief but penetrating “Substrate influence
on the semantics of the Papiamento particle di” (1987b) are related to
Bendix's investigation in that they all posit African (rather than Euro-
pean) languages as the primary source for the respective Papiamento
phenomena. 24 Kouwenberg (1990) discusses clausal complements in Pa-
pianento which are introduced by pa in an attempt to show that, contrary
to the claim of some specialists, there are syntactic and semantic tests
which provide proof for a distinction between finite and nonfinite clauses
introduced by the complementizer pa.

Until most recently, specialists — perhaps more familiar with the
Curaçao Creole than with those of other, more isolated and less populous
holal speech areas — have rarely attempted to gain insights into the
diachrony of Papiamento by comparing its grammatical features to those of
(arginably) related speech varieties such as Palenquero or Panamanian
Congo. Recognizing the potential utility of such an approach, Lipski
(1986a, 1987a) and Maurer (1987a) break new ground by contrasting
the behaviour of holal temporal/aspectual markers. Although working
independently but with virtually identical raw data, both investigators
conclude that Caribbean holal Spanish, though possibly influenced by
Afro-Hispanic Creole speech, can never have been a homogeneous phe-
omenon, but rather was characterized by considerable instability and
variation.

Because Papiamento does not suffer from strong pressures of stand-
ardization towards a more prestigious superlect (see above), decreoli-
zation, though not absent, is less imminent than in other Creole com-
munities. 25 Since Wood (1972) and Baum (1976) concerned themselves
with this issue, no one has examined the impact of the latest wave of
hispanization on Papiamento. Today's specialists should not, however,
fail to investigate points of cross-linguistic interference, however minor, since these could provide important insights into the mechanics of language change before decreolization is allowed to gain full momentum. Papiamento deserves wider attention not only because of the peculiar mixture of local languages and the individuality of the Creole spoken on the three Dutch islands, but also on account of its relevance to the question of maFontAwesome and Romance Creole theories.

7. Conclusions

Despite the intensity of research into Hispanic Creoles and Afro-Hispanic speech varieties in the past two decades, many of the issues surrounding the origin and spread of Iberian-based Creoles remain unresolved. The relative contributions of Spanish and Portuguese in the formation of the Creoles surveyed here continue to evoke controversy, as do strong versions of the monogenetic hypothesis, which posit a single, Portuguese-based, Pidgin or trade language as the precursor of all Romance-based Creoles. Much that has been said about the possible African contribution to the Latin American Creoles is still speculative and in need of further study. This should not be surprising in light of the fact that relevant research typically entails historical reconstruction, an enterprise beset by scanty, unreliable, and often contradictory source materials. The positive contributions of current research into Hispanic Creoles outweigh these inherent limitations, for nearly all contemporary investigation combines in-depth field work with refined theoretical perspectives. Much of the tenuous nature of earlier studies is due to an excessive reliance on anecdotal and second-hand information, as well as a superficial and empirically inadequate linguistic model. The contemporary trend is to apply to the study of Creole languages the same rigorous, theoretically solid and empirically verified models used to analyse other languages. Significant advances in sociolinguistics and variation theory, theoretical syntax and phonology, and historical linguistics are all reflected in current Creole research, and our knowledge of the nature of creolization, decreolization, and the specifics of individual Creole languages is increasing apace. Always needed are: additional field work in Creole-speaking areas, greater attention to the sociolinguistics of Creoles used in diglossic contexts, the formation of a verified comparative data-base, and a continued commitment to situate Creole studies firmly in the mainstream of linguistic research.

Notes
1. For example, Granada (1978: 417–418) among Afro-Hispanic residents (1991:4). Upon attempting to find evidence – either in the village of Playa grande – that an Afro-Hispanic Creole was spoken, the only positive evidence was a Creole similarity to the Creole of Ure.
2. VerANO was used in the village of Ajayal. It is spoken by a number of individuals in the village of Ajayal. The village of Ajayal is also by a number of Afro-Hispanic residents, who do not migrate to other villages. The village of Ajayal is also by a number of Afro-Hispanic residents, who do not migrate to other villages.
3. This theory is put forward by various authors, including Okita (1979), Granada (1978), and Alvarez (1978). The theory is also put forward by Okita (1979), Granada (1978), and Alvarez (1978). The theory is also put forward by Okita (1979), Granada (1978), and Alvarez (1978).
4. A combination of proposed and proposed region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia.
5. Recent language-survey evidence from the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia, as well as in the region of Colombia.
6. With the dubious exception of Papiamento. Papiamento, in the entire western hemisphere, phonological features suggest that Papiamento is the earliest Afro-Hispanic base (MacDonald, 1974).
7. Reviewed by Byrne (1984), Del C.
Notes

* This research and the preparation of this paper were supported in part by the President’s Fellowship in the Humanities, University of California.

1. For example, Granda (1978: 417–418) cites reports of what may be another vestigial Creole among Afro-Hispanic residents of the Colombian Chocó region (but see Schwegler 1991d). Upon attempting to follow up similar rumors, Lipski (1987c) found no evidence—either in the village of Palenque, or in Esmeraldas province—on a substantial anecdote that an Afro-Hispanic Creole had recently disappeared in coastal areas of Ecuador. On the positive side of the balance, Granda (1978: 416–417) was able to confirm that a Creole similar to Palenqueño existed until recently in the Colombian village of Urcú.

2. Ternateño is used in the village of Ternate, on Manila Bay, by an ever decreasing number of individuals (probably no more than a few thousand), all of whom are also native speakers of Tagalog. Caviteño is spoken in Cavite, another town on Manila Bay, also by a few thousand Tagalog bilinguals, and is disappearing due to the close proximity to Manila and its rising land values. This in turn results in inward migration of upwardly mobile suburbanites who do not know Philippine Creole Spanish, and in outward migration of Philippine Creole Spanish speakers to Manila. Both varieties are heavily influenced by Tagalog. An arguably distinct variety known as Tirmiño has recently disappeared from the Ermita district of Manila, but was once used extensively as a Pulgar throughout the Manila area. Zamboangoño, the only viable dialect of Philippine Creole Spanish, is spoken natively or near-natively by several hundred thousand residents of Zamboanga City (southwestern Mindanao). Transplanted Zamboangueño colonies, now on the verge of disappearing, exist in Cotabato and Davao, in the latter city arguably forming a separate dialect. Zamboangueño is heavily influenced by Cebuano and Hiligaynon (Higone), to a limited extent by normative Spanish, and, increasingly, by English. At least since Whinnom (1954) the contemporary existence of speakers of non-Creole Spanish in the Philippines has been acknowledged, but there continues to exist some confusion in the literature between Philippine Creole Spanish and what has been termed ‘Philippine Spanish’ (Quirós 1980). In an attempt to dispel the confusion, Lipski (1987d) studies samples of vestigial Philippine Spanish from throughout the country and encounters no creoleoid structures, except for billectal speakers in Cavite and Zamboanga.

3. This theory is put forward to varying degrees, by the following, among many others: Olhegyi (1973), Granda (1978), Megeney (1984, 1985), Perl (1982, 1989), and, less directly, by alunos Nazario (1974).

4. A combination of proposed and postposed negation appears frequently in the Choco region of Colombia, as well as in informal spoken Angolan and Brazilian Portuguese: não falava inglês não “I don’t speak English” (Schwegler 1991c and MS).

5. Recent language-external evidence suggests that Palenque was not one of the original hiding places of numerous rebellious slaves that escaped from 17th-century Cartagena (Schwegler in press d).

6. With the dubious exception of Papiamento, Palenque is the only true Spanish-based Creole in the entire western hemisphere. A number of lexical, morphosyntactic, and phonological features suggest that the language televized towards Spanish from an earlier Afro-Portuguese base (Megeney 1984; Schwegler 1991c, in press d, e).

10. Most of these have been taken from the famous and difficult to decipher funeral songs called ‘umbali’, analysed in Schwegler 1991a, in press f). See also Megens 1976, 1978, 1980.
12. Schwegler 1991b illustrates how preconceived notions about Palenquero decreolization have led specialists to conclude that seemingly extraneous constructions are not the result of Spanish influence but are rather intricate ‘native’ components of a complex Creole system.
13. See Schwegler 1989, 1990b, in press a–c and f, and especially 1991a, where it is explained why there exists no direct correlation between the relative low number of Africanisms in Palenquero and the considerable role sub-Saharan languages have played in its formation.
14. The true figure may be less than 3%.
15. Schwegler 1991a and 1991b contain numerous interpretive maps of the lower Congo River basin region that trace the ethnolinguistic origins of Palenquero.
16. According to Alvarez Nazario (1970) and Granda (1973), during the 18th and 19th centuries Papiamento may also have been spoken on other Caribbean islands in pockets of expatriated slaves from Curacao.
17. At least 10%–15% are native speakers of other languages (Dutch, Sranan, Spanish, or English).
18. These writings constitute a valuable body of research materials, now being studied by Salomon (1982) and Jeuda (1983).
20. The tendency to ignore Papiamento is so widespread that comparative studies of Creole languages must often exclude data from the Dutch islands (see, for example, Boretzky 1983). A notable exception is Andersen (1990) whose study of Papiamento tense-aspect forms part of a wider, cross-linguistic investigation into Pidgin and Creole tense-aspect systems.
21. Among the few dissertations on Papiamento are: Andersen 1974; DeBoise 1975; and Maurer 1988.
22. On which topic also see Munteanu 1981. Other studies on Papiamento syntax within a generative framework include: Maysken 1977; Richardson 1977; Römer 1977 – these three, atypically for Papiamento, conveniently united in a single publication. Römer 1983, on syntactic rules, and Muller 1983, on Papiamento tones, are likewise grouped in a single volume and accompanied by four articles concentrating on language education and language planning on the islands.
23. Palenquero, which appears to be genetically related, shows similar tendencies. The Palenquero data currently available are essentially phonological rather than phonetic (especially in Patino Rosselli 1983) apropos of natural speech. Manica system of Papiamento.
24. Also noteworthy are: Maurer 1986b a
25. It should be pointed out at this juncture about the Creole status of Papiamento-Aleyne’s claim that “there is no valid 1983.
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