

Contact Languages

A Comprehensive Guide

edited by

Peter Bakker
Yaron Matras

2013

De Gruyter Mouton

Social factors in contact languages

Donald Winford

1. Introduction

Since the publication of Weinreich's (1953) pioneering book, the study of language contact has blossomed into a rich and diversified field of study, encompassing a wide variety of contact situations and outcomes. Weinreich saw the goals of language contact studies as being "to predict typical forms of interference from the sociolinguistic description of a bilingual community and a structural description of its languages" (1953: 86). For Weinreich, it is only "in a broad psychological and sociocultural setting that language contact can best be understood" (1953: 4). Weinreich's insight also led him to distinguish the non-structural factors that operate on both the macro (societal) level, and those that operate on the micro (individual level). For instance, on the macro level, he identified the following factors, among others (1953: 3–4):

- The size of the bilingual group and its socio-cultural homogeneity or differentiation;
- The breakdown of the community into sub-groups using one or the other language as their mother tongue;
- Demographic facts;
- Social and political relations between these subgroups.
- The prevalence of bilingual individuals with given characteristics of speech behaviour in the several sub-groups (see the micro-level factors below).
- Stereotyped attitudes toward each language ("prestige"); indigenous or immigrant status of the languages concerned.

And with regard to micro-level factors relevant to individuals, he identified the following:

- The speaker's facility of verbal expression in general and his ability to keep two languages apart.
- Relative proficiency in each language;

- Specialisation in the use of each language by topics and interlocutors;
- Manner of learning each language;
- Attitudes toward each language, and whether idiosyncratic or stereotyped.

Despite Weinreich's guidelines for the field, scholars have for the most part devoted more attention to the 'structural' aspects of language contact than to the social aspects. As a result, we now have various models of the linguistic processes that underlie and shape contact induced change, but the field still lacks a coherent framework within which to investigate the social parameters of language contact situations. This in turn means that we are still far from achieving Weinreich's vision of a unified framework that would integrate the linguistic, social, and psychological aspects of language contact. This chapter is meant to be a modest overview of the ways in which social factors come into play in situations of language contact. Its focus is primarily on the conventionalised or 'crystallised' outcomes of language contact, to which the label 'contact languages' has traditionally been applied. Thomason (1997) includes only three types in this category – pidgins, creoles and "bilingual mixed languages". However, the general consensus is that the set of contact languages includes other outcomes such as the 'indigenised' varieties of colonisers' languages, for example Indian English, as well as so-called 'converted' languages or cases of 'metatypy', for example Sri Lanka Portuguese. It is of course possible to adopt an even broader view of what constitutes the class of contact languages. An extreme position would be that every language is a contact language in some sense, since all languages have been subject to some degree of influence from at least one other external language. Most contact linguists, however, restrict their attention only to cases of significant cross-linguistic mixture that have resulted in new, conventionalised creations that have achieved autonomy. In this, they follow Thomason's (1997: 75) characterisation of a contact language as "comprised of grammatical and lexical systems that cannot all be traced back to a single parent language".

Such an approach, of course, excludes a significant number of languages that contain a high degree of mixture, including languages like English or Chamorro that have borrowed a majority of their vocabulary from other sources. It also excludes many cases of mixture that have not achieved autonomy, including for example, the L2 varieties of a host language produced by immigrants, and the various types of language mixture produced by bilinguals. Such instances of unstable, yet to be crystallised language mixture still have the potential to shed valuable light on the processes, both social and linguistic, that led to the more conventionalised

outcomes. For that reason, I will refer to them where relevant. For the most part, however, the following discussion will focus on the traditionally recognised set of contact languages, and the ways in which social factors have shaped both their emergence, and where applicable, their continuing functions and statuses within their respective speech communities.

2. Social settings and language contact

Different scholars have taken very different positions on the issue of the relative importance of social as opposed to linguistic factors in shaping contact-induced change. On the one hand, Thomason and Kaufman claim that "it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact" (1988: 35). On the other hand, scholars like Müller (1875) and Jakobson (1938) argued that structural (linguistic) constraints were the primary determinants of contact-induced change. Their view is echoed, more recently, by Heine and Kuteva, who claim that "there is evidence to suggest that social variables are largely irrelevant as determinants of contact-induced change – at least of the kind studied here" (2005: 12–13). The unfortunate fact is that statements such as these are often made without any real attempt to investigate the sociolinguistic details of the contact situations in question. And it remains true, in general, that contact linguists have paid far more attention to linguistic processes and constraints than to the extra-linguistic factors that might affect their operations and results.

The evidence now available to us strongly supports the view that social factors play a significant, and in some cases a more important role than linguistic factors, in shaping the consequences of language contact. The social factors that come into play depend to a large extent on the nature of the contact situation, the communities involved, and their sociolinguistic profiles. In general, contact languages arise in two broad types of situation – those involving language maintenance, and those involving language shift, both in the context of differing degrees of bilingualism. Within such settings, as Thomason and Kaufman rightly observe, "both the direction of interference and the extent of interference are socially determined; so, to a considerable degree, are the kinds of features transferred from one language to another" (1988: 35). We will see abundant evidence of this in the way different social ecologies lead to different types of contact languages, as well as to diversity within each type of contact language.

The issue of directionality of change is directly related to the distinction Thomason and Kaufman make between situations of language mainte-

nance, which they associate with borrowing, and situations of language shift, which they associate with mechanisms of "interference via shift" or substratum influence. In the former case, native speakers incorporate features from an external source language into their maintained native language. In the latter, speakers learning another language transfer features of their L1 into their version of the target language. While this broad distinction is a good starting point for analysis of the role of social factors in the creation of contact languages, the distinction between the two types of contact situation is by no means as clear-cut as Thomason and Kaufmann make it appear. In the first place, both situations of maintenance and shift are characterised by differences in dominance relationships between the languages in contact. Traditionally, more attention has been paid to social dominance relationships than to linguistic dominance, that is, the degree of proficiency that speakers display in each of their languages. The latter undoubtedly plays a far more crucial role than social dominance in determining the nature of contact-induced change, and is more directly related to the actuation of change, as opposed to its implementation or diffusion within the speech community. This is particularly relevant to those contact languages that arose in situations of language maintenance, whose creation has sometimes been incorrectly described because of a misunderstanding of the dominance relationships between the contributing languages. Since linguistic dominance relationships can and do differ significantly both within and across speech communities even in situations of language maintenance, they can lead to very different linguistic outcomes. The same is true in situations of shift.

The issue of the extent to which one language exerts influence on another has traditionally been explained in terms of social factors such as 'intensity of contact' and 'cultural pressure'. These relate to matters such as the demographics of the groups in contact, their socio-political relationships, their patterns of interaction, and so on. Factors like these, along with groups' attitudes to the languages in contact, and to language mixture, are particularly relevant to the conventionalisation of changes in a developing contact variety, and ultimately to the crystallisation of the variety as an autonomous language in its own right. Again, such factors vary from one contact situation to another, leading to differences in the outcomes in both maintenance and shift situations. This is not to say that we must abandon the traditional distinction between the two broad types of contact situation, but rather that we need a more comprehensive and nuanced classification of contact situations, which takes into account all of the non-linguistic factors we have outlined above, as well as others that may be relevant to specific situations. We will assume, therefore, that the broad distinction we have made between situations of language

maintenance and situations of shift are crucial to explaining the outcomes of language contact.

Finally, of course, social factors also determine the synchronic status and functions of contact varieties within their respective communities. The social ecology determines whether they survive as vibrant community languages, what roles they play in the social life of the community, whether they become standardised, or are recognised as official languages, and so on. Many of the contact languages that we know to have arisen in the past have died, many more are in danger of extinction, while others flourish, and new ones appear to serve the needs of new communities. Some of these social aspects of contact languages will be included in the discussion below.

To sum up, in order to fully understand the creation and development of contact languages, we must begin with the speech community, which represents the broadest social context for language contact. In essence, the diffusion of linguistic and other cultural practices depends on social interaction within and across speech communities. Hence we need to understand both the speech economy and the social structure of the community in order to explain the outcomes of language contact. We have suggested that all contact situations share a certain set of social variables, including the types of community settings, the demographic characteristics of the groups in contact, the patterns of social interaction among them, and the ideologies that govern their linguistic choices. Other general factors that play a role include the degree of bilingualism among the individuals and groups in contact, the history and length of contact, the power relationships between the groups, and so on. The factors identified so far operate at the macro-level of social relationships, and have been investigated more extensively than the social factors that operate at the micro-level of interpersonal relationships and interaction. The latter factors are far more difficult to investigate and analyse, particularly for past contact situations which we can no longer observe, but even for contemporary cases, which require long and extensive investigation using sociolinguistic and ethnographic methods. Obviously, it is no easy task to integrate all the relevant factors into a complete and coherent picture of the social ecology of a given contact situation. In the following sections, we will try to examine the social settings of various contact situations in more detail, and show, as far as possible, how they contribute to the particular outcomes we find.

3. Bilingual mixed or 'intertwined' languages

Situations of language maintenance simply involve the preservation of an ancestral language by a speech community from generation to generation. Within these situations, however, we must distinguish those that involve relatively little bilingualism within the community, and those in which a significant part of the population is bilingual in the ancestral language, as well as another group's language. Group bilingualism of the latter type is a prerequisite for the emergence of contact languages. Such situations may include cases of stable communal bilingualism, where speakers preserve and use both languages, as well as cases of unstable bilingualism, where there is an unequal dominance relationship between the languages in contact, and speakers of one are under varying degrees of pressure to shift to the other. In general, situations of relatively stable communal bilingualism produce the kinds of contact language referred to as bilingual mixed languages, or 'intertwined' languages.

Bilingual Mixed Languages, in general, combine the lexicon of one language with the grammatical apparatus of another. From a sociolinguistic perspective, they emerge in situations of group bilingualism, and they are created to serve as in-group languages, rather than to meet a pressing need for communication. From a structural perspective, Thomason (2003: 21) describes them as languages "whose grammatical and lexical subsystems cannot all be traced back primarily to a single source language." Thomason (1997: 80) sums up the characteristics of bilingual mixed languages as follows:

- They evolve or are created in two-language contact situations.
- The setting involves widespread bilingualism on the part of at least one of the two speaker groups.
- In the resulting mixture the language material is easily separated according to the language of origin.
- There is little or no simplification in either component of the mixed language (reflecting the bilingualism of its creators).

This characterisation matches the sub-type of mixed languages that Bakker (2003) refers to as "intertwined" languages, which are my primary focus here. Bakker identifies two other subtypes of mixed languages, viz., lexically mixed languages, and "converted" languages. The former include languages like Chamorro and Maltese, which have borrowed lexicon extensively from another language, but still preserve a substantial portion of their inherited lexicon, including basic vocabulary. "Converted"

languages arise under conditions of language shift, and involve processes of convergence due to imposition. They preserve the vocabulary of one language, but "copy the grammatical structure of another language" (2003: 116). They will be discussed later.

Intertwined languages differ from both of the other types in that they typically combine the lexicon of one source language, with the morphosyntactic frame of another, with the two components preserved relatively intact. Bakker refers to them as "lexicon-grammar mixed languages" (2003: 109). Among the best known of these are *Media Lengua* (Spanish lexicon in a Quechua frame), *Ma'á* (mostly Cushitic lexicon in a Bantu frame), and *Angloromani* (Romani lexicon in an English frame). Various other mixed languages emerged in situations in which communities of mixed ethnicity arose, for example in Indonesia, where Dutch and Chinese men formed unions with Indonesian women. Other examples include *Michif* (French noun phrases and prepositional phrases inserted into a Cree frame) and *Mednyj* or *Copper Island Aleut*, whose grammatical frame combines Aleut and Russian elements, while most of the vocabulary is Aleut. According to Bakker (2003), there are about 25 documented intertwined languages.

The position adopted here is that intertwined languages are the result of a process of insertional codeswitching taken to an extreme. This perspective allows for a unified account of their creation, and helps us to understand the social contexts and motivations that led to their conventionalisation. All intertwined languages manifest an across-the-board insertion of lexical (sometimes phrasal) constituents from an embedded language into a morphosyntactic frame drawn from a different matrix language. Exceptions include *Mednyj Aleut* and *Gurindji Kriol*, each of which has a "composite" grammatical frame derived from both input languages, as discussed below. In some cases, like *Media Lengua*, the ancestral language served as the matrix language, while in other cases such as *Ma'á* and *Angloromani*, it was the newly-acquired L2 that served this purpose. It also seems clear that the process involved was essentially the same as that found in insertional codeswitching. The only difference is the degree to which the process was applied, and then conventionalised, in intertwined languages. This view has been criticised on the grounds that the quantity of embedded lexicon is far greater in intertwined languages, and no transitory stage between the initial codeswitching behaviour and the resulting mixed language has been documented (Bakker 2003: 217). However, Mous rightly argues that "[codeswitching] may well lead to the emergence of a mixed language and in particular such a development is conceivable through conventionalization of the switches" (2003: 217). He also notes that there are in fact well documented cases of languages that

represent an intermediate stage between codeswitching and language intertwining, including mixed codes used in urban settings in Africa such as Tsotsitaal and Isicamtho (South Africa), and Sheng (Kenya) (see Kießling and Mous 2004). In fact, some intertwined languages are essentially similar to these urban mixed codes both in structure, and in terms of social motivations and functions. The only differences are that intertwined languages involve two further developments not found in urban mixed codes.

Compelling evidence of the relationship between codeswitching and the emergence of an intertwined language comes from the recent creation of Gurindji Kriol, a contact language spoken by the Aboriginal Gurindji people in Northern Australia. It combines elements of the grammars of Gurindji, a Pama-Nyungan language, and Kriol, an English-lexicon creole, with a vocabulary drawn from both languages. Gurindji supplies most of the noun phrase grammar, while Kriol provides most of the VP grammar. Both languages, however, supply small parts of the grammar to the systems they do not dominate (Meakins 2008: 73). Meakins demonstrates convincingly that the language “has a close diachronic and synchronic relationship to code-switching between Gurindji and Kriol, and [that] its structure bears a strong resemblance to patterns found in this code-switching” (2012: 105).

Meakins offers the following examples to illustrate the similarities in structure between the contact language (1) and Gurindji/Kriol codeswitching (2). Note that Gurindji-derived forms are in boldface.

- (1) *An skol-ta=ma jei bin hab-im sport*
 And school-LOC=TOP 3PL.SBJ PST have-TR sport
karu-walija-ngku
 child-PAUC-ERG
 ‘And the kids had sport at school.’
 (Meakins 2012: 112)
- (2) *kaa-rni-mpal-said orait yutubala kat-im ngaji-rlang-kulu.*
 east-up-across-side alright 2DU cut-TR father-DYAD-ERG
 ‘You two, father and son, cut it across the east (side of the cow).’
 (Codeswitching 1970s collected by Patrick McConvell; Meakins 2012: 113)

In both cases, the core VP structure including tense such as *bin* ‘past’ and transitive marking *-im* is derived from Kriol while the NP structure, including ergative markers *-ngku* and *-kulu* as well as locative case-marking *-ta*, is from Gurindji (Meakins 2012: 112).

According to Meakins (2008), the social context in which Gurindji Kriol emerged was shaped by contact between non-indigenous colonists and the Gurindji people, beginning in the early 1900s. White settlers established cattle stations in the Victoria River District area, including the Gurindji homelands. Battles over land led to the death of many Gurindji people, and the rest were forced to labour on Wave Hill cattle station in slave-like conditions, along with other Aboriginal groups. This situation led to the introduction of pidgin English and later Kriol as common means of communication across the groups. By the 1970s, as reported by McConvell (1988), codeswitching between Gurindji and Kriol had become the dominant language practice of Gurindji people, particularly in the town of Kalkaringi. The mixed language arose out of this situation during the 1960s to 1970s, when the Gurindji people led a historic (and successful) political struggle to regain control of their traditional lands. The emergence of the new contact language was particularly significant in view of the fact that many other Aboriginal groups in the area were giving up their ancestral languages in favour of Kriol. Meakins (2008: 70) argues that the retention of Gurindji features in the mixed language was directly linked to the lands right movement, and can be viewed as an expression of an enduring Gurindji identity. Like the political struggle, the contact language was “an act of resistance against the massive cultural incursion which accompanied colonization” (2008: 70). Though the mixed language is viewed negatively by older people as incorrect Gurindji, it has covert prestige among the young, who are the main speakers of this variety (Meakins 2012: 108).¹

The case of Gurindji Kriol is an instructive illustration of the social motivations that promote the creation of an intertwined language. Some of these motivations apply also to the use of codeswitching in situations of stable bilingualism. In both situations, we find that extensive bilingualism in the community leads to frequent mixing of the languages, with a preference for intra-sentential or insertional codeswitching. Then patterns of codeswitching become associated with an in-group identity, and the community develops a positive attitude to mixture of the codes as a marker of the group’s identity. We find evidence of this in communities such as Strasbourg where bilinguals alternate between French and Alsatian (Treffers-Daller 1999), and the Puerto Rican community of New York City, where speakers codeswitch freely between Spanish and English (Zentella 1997). Codeswitching in such situations becomes an accepted discourse strategy that is governed by social conventions. Switching between languages may mark a change in topic, interlocutors, role relationship, or situation type, or the interaction of all of these. Patterns of switching in such situations have been described as an ‘unmarked choice’ that is used either to express neutrality with respect to language preference, or to

express social cohesiveness. This type of codeswitching reflects the “speaker’s wish to symbolize the dual membership that such code switching calls up” (Myers-Scotton 1993: 119). This is what Walters (2005: 200) describes as “code switching meant to express one’s ethnolinguistic identity, to bond with a listener, or to show awareness and cognizance of a particular setting, listener, or topic”. Poplack (1987: 67) contrasts the situation in Ottawa-Hull, where codeswitching between English and French is not a widely accepted mode of discourse, with the preference for codeswitching among New York City Puerto Ricans, in terms of differences in attitude toward the mixed code, and goes further: “These attitudes may reflect the fact that bilingualism is seen to be emblematic of NY Puerto Rican identity [...] whereas in the Ottawa-Hull situation, knowledge of English does not appear to be associated with any emergent ethnic grouping.”

Such patterns of mixture may endure for generations in a community without being conventionalised as a new contact variety. But under special circumstances, a group may embark on the creation of a more systematic pattern of mixture that eventually becomes an autonomous variety in its own right. For the Gurindji, the political struggle for their land, and the new consciousness of their traditional ethnic and cultural identity as a people was the main motivation for creating a new contact language to serve their speech community.

Conventionalisation of the mixture found in intertwined languages involves a number of developments not typical of codeswitching. These include extension of the process of lexical insertion to the point where it is complete and predictable, and crystallisation of the grammatical frame, so that it becomes fixed. These are clearly driven more by social than by linguistic processes. In the first place, there is wide agreement that the extreme degree of lexical insertion that we find in intertwined languages seems to be the result of conscious acts of “folk engineering” (Golovko 2003), or “change by deliberate decision [...] a quintessentially social factor” (Thomason 2003: 35). The ensuing conventionalisation of the mixture is reflected in the consistency with which speakers use the mixed code. With regard to Gurindji Kriol, Meakins (2012: 116) notes that “the choice of lexical items and syntactic constructions is very consistent across speakers [...]. As a result, Gurindji Kriol speakers use virtually identical constructions to express the same event.” Such uniformity of usage supports the status of Gurindji Kriol “as a language independent of its sources” (2012: 117). Another crucial factor in the conventionalisation of a new contact variety is that it typically becomes a target for L1 acquisition. Meakins’ observations of children up to the age of 3 in the Gurindji Kriol community revealed that they were indeed acquiring the mixed code, and

that “clearly a separate linguistic entity is being identified and singled out for specific attention by children” (2012: 116). As we will see, children play a similar role in the conventionalisation of other intertwined languages and in the creation of other contact languages as well.

The social contexts that produce these “deliberate creations” differ in some ways, but also share much in common. We can identify at least three broad types of situation in which they arise. First we find cases such as Gurundji Kriol where a bilingual group creates a new language primarily to assert its separate identity. A similar case is Media Lengua, a blend of predominantly Quechua grammatical structure and Spanish-derived lexical forms that make up about 90% of the vocabulary (Muysken 1981: 52). The following examples illustrate the mixture (Spanish-derived forms in boldface):

- (3) *Unu fabur-ta pidi-nga-bu bini-xu-ni.*
 one favour-ACC ask-NOM-BEN come-PROG-1SG
 ‘I come to ask a favour.’
- (4) *No sabi-ni-chu Xwan bini-shka-da*
 NEG know-1SG-NEG John come-NOM-ACC
 ‘I don’t know that John has come.’

The language came into being quite recently, apparently between 1920 and 1940, in Salcedo and other small towns or in the central Ecuador highlands. It is used as an in-group language among Indian peasants, craftsmen and construction workers, particularly among younger men who work in the nearby capital city Quito in industry and construction. Muysken explains its genesis as due to the fact that “acculturated Indians could not identify completely with either the traditional rural Quechua culture or the urban Spanish culture” (1981: 75). Hence they created Media Lengua as a means of expressing their allegiance to both the Quechua and Spanish worlds.

Bakker (2003) identifies two other broad types of social situations in which most intertwined languages have arisen. In one type, nomadic groups settle in an area where a different language is used, and create a mixed language for use as a secret or in-group language. In most such cases, the grammatical system of the new language comes from the newly-acquired local language, while most of the vocabulary comes from the ancestral language, which itself may be lost. Along with Angloromani and Ma’á, we find languages like Caló and Kayawaya (Callahuaya) in this category. Languages like Caló began as argots; while Kayawaya functioned as a spirit language, or ritual code. Other intertwined languages have been

documented for nomadic groups in Afghanistan, Ireland and Scotland (Hancock 1984), India, the Middle East (Kenrick 1976–77) and elsewhere.

The case of Ma'á is representative of this group of intertwined languages. The language is spoken in several communities in the Usambara mountains of Northeastern Tanzania by groups who migrated to the region several hundred years ago. These groups refer to themselves as Ma'á, while outsiders refer to them as the Mbugu, which is also the name of the Bantu language they speak (Mous 1994). Ma'á draws its morphosyntactic frame from Mbugu, which is closely similar to Pare, a neighbouring language spoken by immigrants from the Pare mountains. Much of its lexicon comes from (mostly) Southern and Eastern Cushitic, chiefly Eastern Cushitic, but also includes words from Maasai (Nilotic) and Gorwaa (South Cushitic) and manipulated words from Pare (Mous 2003: 213).

The following examples, from Mous (2003: 212) illustrate the make-up of the language:

- (5) Ma'á: *áa-té mi-hatú kwa choká*
 3SG:PST-cut 4-trees with axe
 Mbugu: *áa-tema mi-tí kwa izoka*
 3SG:PST-cut 4-trees with axe
 'He cut trees with an axe.'
- (6) Ma'á: *w-áa-bó'i koré mé*
 2SG-PST-make 10.pot how:many
 Mbugu: *w-áa-ronga nyungú nyi-ngáhi*
 2SG-PST-make 10.pot how-many
 'How many pots did you make?'

There is general consensus that the Mbugu originally spoke some variety of (Southern?) Cushitic, and preserved it for a long time before shifting to Pare (or in some cases to Shambaa, the dominant language of the Usambara region). Those who call themselves Ma'á apparently resisted assimilation the longest, and created a mixed language as a sign of their resistance and their autonomy as a distinct ethnic group. The language is incomprehensible to their neighbours.

The third broad type of social situation in which intertwined languages arise is one in which men migrate to a new region and form unions with local women of a different language and ethnicity. As Bakker (2003: 139) points out, the offspring of such unions will often give themselves names that translate as 'new people', 'mixed' or 'locally-born persons'. To reflect their new identity as a distinct community, such groups often create a new mixed language, which derives its grammatical frame primarily from the mothers' language with the lexicon of the fathers' language. This general

tendency has been documented for about a dozen cases. Among them are the mixed languages of Indonesia (Petjo, Javindo and Chindo), as well as Michif and Mednyj Aleut. We will briefly discuss some of these creations so as to get a sense of the social contexts in which they arose.

Michif arose during a period of sustained contact between French-speaking traders, canoe-men, guides and the like, and speakers of Plains Cree, beginning in the mid-18th century in the Hudson Bay area. The French migrants co-habited with Cree women, producing offspring who are now referred to as Métis – a French term for a person of mixed race. The morphosyntactic frame is mostly derived from Cree, which supplies the VP structure and the vast majority of the verbs, as well as various function elements such as demonstratives, postpositions, personal pronouns and question words. French supplies the NP structure, including nouns, adjectives, as well as some function items such as prepositions and negative markers. The following piece of a narrative recorded by Bakker (1997: 78) in Brandon, Manitoba illustrates the nature of the mixture. French items are in boldface.

- (7) *eekwaniki lii savaaz kii-paashamw-ak la*
 DEM.AN.PL PL Indian PST-dry-PL ART.DEM.F.SG
vjand la vjand orjaal, la
 meat ART.DEM.F.SG meat moose ART.DEM.F.SG
vjand-di shovreu, tut kii-paashamw-ak eekwanima
 meat-POSS deer all PST-dry-PL DEM.INAN.SG
eekwa kii-shikwahamw-ak daa di pchi saek
 then PST-mash-3PL in PART little bags
kii-ashtaaw-ak maana
 PST-dry-3PL usually
 'These Indians dried the meat. Moose meat, deer meat, they dried it all. And then they mashed it. They used to put it in little bags.'
 (Bakker 1997: 78; spelling adjusted to Michif orthographic conventions)

The structural mixture in Michif is similar in many respects to that found in mixed languages such as Gurundji Kriol and Light Warlpiri, except that the latter two have lexicons that are more mixed, with nouns and verbs from both of their source languages (Meakins 2012: 112). These creations differ from the prototypical cases of intertwining we discussed earlier in that they have "composite" morpho-syntactic frames, similar in principle to cases of composite codeswitching (Myers-Scotton 2002). This may be attributed to the probability that these languages were created by bilinguals, probably school-age children or adolescents, who learned their

mothers' language as a first language, but also had a certain degree of proficiency in their fathers' language. Differences in such proficiency may explain the differences in the extent of incorporation of structural elements from the paternal language that we find from one case to another. At the same time, the fact that the structural frame comes mainly from the mother's language would follow from its status as the language of the home and the wider community.

Michif also illustrates another characteristic of many intertwined languages, namely that once they have been transmitted to future generations, their speakers may no longer be familiar with the source languages. Most Michif speakers are not fluent in either French or Cree, and in fact most of them are elderly. The language is now in decline, having been replaced by English in most Michif communities (Bakker 1997: 74–76).

Another interesting case of bilingual language mixture is Mednyj (Copper Island) Aleut, which was once widely spoken on Copper Island, one of the two Russian-owned Commander Islands in the Aleutian Islands chain. The language is all but dead now, and like Aleut, has been replaced by Russian on these islands. The contact language is similar in some respects to Gurundji Kriol, in that its morphosyntactic frame is a blend of Russian and Aleut (primarily Attu) elements, particularly in the verbal morphology. Golovko and Vakhtin (1990: 111) summarise the mixture thus:

[The Aleut component] comprises the majority of the vocabulary, all the derivational morphology, part of the simple sentence syntax, nominal inflexion and certain other grammatical means. The [Russian component] comprises verbal inflexion, negation, infinitive forms, part of the simple sentence syntax, and all of the compound sentence syntax.

The following examples illustrate some of the complex patterns of mixture that characterise the syntax of the language. Russian elements are in bold type.

- (8) *ja segodnja čxuuxi-n inka-ča-l qaka-ča-anga*
 I today linen-PL hang-CAUS-3SG.PST dry-CAUS-INT
 'Today I hung linen in order to dry it.'
 (Golovko 1996: 72)
- (9) *iglu-ŋ n'i tuta-qaxi-it*
 grandson-1SG.POSS NEG hear-DETRAN-3SG.PRS
 'My grandson doesn't listen (obey).'

The language arose during the 19th century in the context of trade between Russia and the Aleutian Islands, after the Russian-American company established permanent settlements on the two previously uninhabited Commander Islands, Copper Island and Bering Island, in 1826 (Golovko and Vakhtin 1990: 98). Dozens of Aleut and creole families were brought in from the Aleutian, Kurch and Pribylof Islands, and Kamchatka. They were engaged in the processing of skins and other activities associated with the trade in seal furs. A minority of Russian employees of the company, mostly men, also settled on the islands. Unions between these men and Aleut women produced a creole population that eventually came to outnumber the Aleuts by 1897 (Golovko and Vakhtin 1990: 116). It was this creole population that created Mednyj Aleut, which eventually became an expression of their distinct identity as a mixed ethnicity group. The language apparently arose sometime between 1826 and 1900.

Further insight into the social contexts and linguistic processes involved in the creation of mixed household contact languages comes from Indonesia, where a variety of intertwined languages arose during the 18th to 19th centuries. Men of different language backgrounds and ethnicities – Dutch and Chinese – formed unions with Indonesian women of Malay, Javanese, and other ethnic and language backgrounds. These unions produced mixed ethnic groups called 'Indos' who created mixed languages such as Petjo (Malay grammar with Dutch lexicon), Javindo (Javanese grammar with Dutch lexicon) and Chindo or Peranakan Chinese (Javanese grammar with Malay lexicon). The term 'petjo' refers to "colored persons of the lower classes" (de Gruiter 1994: 153), while "Peranakan" refers to a locally-born person or a person of mixed ancestry.

Javindo, the mixed language spoken in Semarang, derives its grammar from Javanese, and the vast majority of its lexicon from Dutch. Its word order is Javanese, and it employs various structural elements from that language, including passive prefixes, a causative suffix, a subjunctive suffix, reduplication, etc. At the same time, Dutch structural elements such as post-verbal negator *niet*, passive inflection on verbs, and NP word order are also found in Javindo (de Gruiter 1994). Petjo, spoken in Batavia, draws its grammar from Malay, most likely the variety known as 'Low' or 'Bazaar' Malay, and its lexicon from Dutch. The Malay input includes word order, TMA marking, preverbal negation, and various syntactic structures such as relative clauses, yes/no interrogatives, passives, etc. Dutch input to the grammar includes negative marking, some copulas, and rare passive morphology on verbs, as well as the vast majority of prepositions, articles and conjunctions.

The social contexts in which Javindo and Petjo arose seem to be quite similar. It would appear, first, that the mothers learned Dutch as a second

language, and were partly responsible for passing it on to the children. At the same time, the mother's language was the everyday language of the wider community, and was the children's first language. This would explain the greater contribution of this language to the grammar of the mixed code. Children were further exposed to Dutch outside the home and in school, though education was limited. Moreover, most children were not recognised by their fathers, and lived with their mothers in poor neighbourhoods without opportunity for a full education. Still, the nature of the Dutch input suggests more than a passing acquaintance with that language, and testifies to acts of deliberate mixture that went well beyond the bounds of lexical borrowing. It was probably young school-age children who created Javindo, Petjo and other mixed-household languages in Indonesia, as a mark of their mixed ethnicity. The languages then spread to other children – mostly boys – at school. Drawing on his own experience, de Gruiter (1994: 153) notes that all children were forced by their peers to speak Javindo at school, under penalty of being beaten up and/or excluded from games. School-age children seem to have played a role both in the creation and spread of mixed languages in various situations, including those that produced outcomes like Hawaii Creole English, Singapore colloquial English, and of course mixed household languages.

To summarise, we have seen that there is a general correlation between the social contexts in which bilingual mixed languages arose, and the type of mixture they manifest. Ex-nomadic creations generally derive their entire morphosyntactic frame from the language of their new host community, and their lexicon from the ancestral language. Mixed-household languages generally have composite morphosyntactic frames, though primarily derived from the mother's language, with lexicon and function elements from the father's language. However, not all of these languages conform to a single fixed social or linguistic profile. Media Lengua, for instance, does not entirely fit the structural profile of ex-nomadic creations since it derives its morphosyntactic frame from the ancestral language, nor does it fit the social circumstances, since the people who created it were not immigrants. Similarly, mixed-household languages differ to varying extents in both their structural and social profiles. Mednyj Aleut, for instance, stands out within this subgroup of mixed languages in the way it blends so many structural features of Russian and Aleut in its grammar, to the point where there is still debate over whether it is primarily Aleut or Russian in structure. Matras (2003) suggests that the Russian input has in fact increased over time, as a consequence of growing shift in language dominance from Aleut to Russian. This reminds us that too little attention has been paid to historical developments in contact languages

over the course of time, and how changes in the social context may have influenced them.

We might also note that some mixed-household languages arise in quite different ways from those described here. For example, people have speculated that Sri Lanka Malay (discussed below) originated as a second language variety of Malay which was acquired by Tamil-speaking women from their Malay spouses (Hussainmiya 1987). Its lexical and grammatical elements are Malay, while its abstract grammatical structure is primarily Tamil in character. Its structural profile therefore departs significantly from the L-G split that we find in intertwined languages, and more closely resembles that of what Bakker calls "converted" languages. The primary reason for this appears to be the fact that mothers transmitted their L2 variety of Malay to their children as a first language. On the whole, we cannot always establish clear and consistent correspondences between the social contexts and linguistic processes involved in the creation of intertwined or other mixed languages. Different social circumstances can lead to similar processes of mixture, while different types of mixture may arise in what seem to be similar social settings. We still need to investigate the reasons for this – whether they lie in the typological relationships between the languages, the degree of bilingualism involved, speakers' attitudes to or preferences for different kinds of mixtures, or social motivations peculiar to different situations.

We can also learn a lot about the social motivations for the creation of intertwined languages from contemporary situations in which mixed codes have become symbols of identity for various other social groups throughout the world. For instance, a variety of urban vernaculars have emerged in Africa and other parts of the world, especially among younger speakers who have been socialised in the cities (see Kiebling and Mous 2004). Some of these have been adopted as *lingua francas*, to facilitate communication among people of different language backgrounds, for example, urban-based Zulu in Pretoria and Johannesburg. Others seem to have originated as argots used by gangs, criminals, or prison populations, or by other social groups, and tend to be used primarily by younger males. Among these are Tsotsitaal, literally 'tsotsi language'² and Isicamtho, both of which arose in the Black urban townships of South Africa. Tsotsitaal and Isicamtho draw their grammatical frame and much of their lexicon from Afrikaans and Zulu respectively. Both employ many words from other languages, including English, Afrikaans, and Bantu, along with a liberal infusion of slang. According to Childs, "these urban varieties symbolize the high life of the city – the urban, the cool, the hip, and the sophisticated" (Childs 1997: 342). Some varieties of Tsotsitaal may have developed as vehicles of interethnic exchanges, but for the most part, both the two urban codes are

language, and were partly responsible for passing it on to the children. At the same time, the mother's language was the everyday language of the wider community, and was the children's first language. This would explain the greater contribution of this language to the grammar of the mixed code. Children were further exposed to Dutch outside the home and in school, though education was limited. Moreover, most children were not recognised by their fathers, and lived with their mothers in poor neighbourhoods without opportunity for a full education. Still, the nature of the Dutch input suggests more than a passing acquaintance with that language, and testifies to acts of deliberate mixture that went well beyond the bounds of lexical borrowing. It was probably young school-age children who created Javindo, Petjo and other mixed-household languages in Indonesia, as a mark of their mixed ethnicity. The languages then spread to other children – mostly boys – at school. Drawing on his own experience, de Gruiter (1994: 153) notes that all children were forced by their peers to speak Javindo at school, under penalty of being beaten up and/or excluded from games. School-age children seem to have played a role both in the creation and spread of mixed languages in various situations, including those that produced outcomes like Hawaii Creole English, Singapore colloquial English, and of course mixed household languages.

To summarise, we have seen that there is a general correlation between the social contexts in which bilingual mixed languages arose, and the type of mixture they manifest. Ex-nomadic creations generally derive their entire morphosyntactic frame from the language of their new host community, and their lexicon from the ancestral language. Mixed-household languages generally have composite morphosyntactic frames, though primarily derived from the mother's language, with lexicon and function elements from the father's language. However, not all of these languages conform to a single fixed social or linguistic profile. Media Lengua, for instance, does not entirely fit the structural profile of ex-nomadic creations since it derives its morphosyntactic frame from the ancestral language, nor does it fit the social circumstances, since the people who created it were not immigrants. Similarly, mixed-household languages differ to varying extents in both their structural and social profiles. Mednyj Aleut, for instance, stands out within this subgroup of mixed languages in the way it blends so many structural features of Russian and Aleut in its grammar, to the point where there is still debate over whether it is primarily Aleut or Russian in structure. Matras (2003) suggests that the Russian input has in fact increased over time, as a consequence of growing shift in language dominance from Aleut to Russian. This reminds us that too little attention has been paid to historical developments in contact languages

over the course of time, and how changes in the social context may have influenced them.

We might also note that some mixed-household languages arise in quite different ways from those described here. For example, people have speculated that Sri Lanka Malay (discussed below) originated as a second language variety of Malay which was acquired by Tamil-speaking women from their Malay spouses (Hussainmiya 1987). Its lexical and grammatical elements are Malay, while its abstract grammatical structure is primarily Tamil in character. Its structural profile therefore departs significantly from the L-G split that we find in intertwined languages, and more closely resembles that of what Bakker calls "converted" languages. The primary reason for this appears to be the fact that mothers transmitted their L2 variety of Malay to their children as a first language. On the whole, we cannot always establish clear and consistent correspondences between the social contexts and linguistic processes involved in the creation of intertwined or other mixed languages. Different social circumstances can lead to similar processes of mixture, while different types of mixture may arise in what seem to be similar social settings. We still need to investigate the reasons for this – whether they lie in the typological relationships between the languages, the degree of bilingualism involved, speakers' attitudes to or preferences for different kinds of mixtures, or social motivations peculiar to different situations.

We can also learn a lot about the social motivations for the creation of intertwined languages from contemporary situations in which mixed codes have become symbols of identity for various other social groups throughout the world. For instance, a variety of urban vernaculars have emerged in Africa and other parts of the world, especially among younger speakers who have been socialised in the cities (see Kießling and Mous 2004). Some of these have been adopted as lingua francas, to facilitate communication among people of different language backgrounds, for example, urban-based Zulu in Pretoria and Johannesburg. Others seem to have originated as argots used by gangs, criminals, or prison populations, or by other social groups, and tend to be used primarily by younger males. Among these are Tsotsitaal, literally 'tsotsi language'² and Isicamtho, both of which arose in the Black urban townships of South Africa. Tsotsitaal and Isicamtho draw their grammatical frame and much of their lexicon from Afrikaans and Zulu respectively. Both employ many words from other languages, including English, Afrikaans, and Bantu, along with a liberal infusion of slang. According to Childs, "these urban varieties symbolize the high life of the city – the urban, the cool, the hip, and the sophisticated" (Childs 1997: 342). Some varieties of Tsotsitaal may have developed as vehicles of interethnic exchanges, but for the most part, both the two urban codes are

not used for this purpose but rather to exclude non-group members. The rise of negative attitudes toward Afrikaans after the attempt to force everyone to learn it in 1976, has led to the increasing demise of Tsotsitaal, which has now been almost entirely replaced by Isicamtho as the language of young, Black, urban males (Childs 1997: 343). Speakers of Tsotsitaal today are primarily middle-aged or older males. Still, both vernaculars perform the same social functions for their speakers – that of unifying the group, and separating it from others.

Other mixed codes that serve similar social functions include Sheng and Engsh, used by younger males in Nairobi and other cities in Kenya (Abdulaziz and Osinde 1997). Sheng, which developed among less affluent slum dwellers, draws its morphosyntactic frame and most of its lexicon from Swahili, with copious borrowings from English and other mother tongues. Engsh emerged in the richer suburbs of Nairobi, and is based on English structure and vocabulary, but with borrowings from Swahili and other local languages. In both cases, there is a great deal of creativity and innovation in the vocabulary, with many slang terms and other new coinages, which parallel strategies of disguising English and other words in Tsotsitaal. Both mixed registers seem to have developed initially as secret codes, but “they have become more stabilized expressions of youth mixed culture and modes of speaking” (Abdulaziz and Osinde 1997: 44). Indeed, it seems that the mixed codes are slowly becoming primary languages for an emerging community of young speakers.

All of the urban mixed codes described in the literature share a number of important characteristics, both social and linguistic. Socially, they are spoken mostly by the young and almost entirely by males. They are used as markers of a distinct group identity and as a means of excluding non-group members. Abdulaziz and Osinde (1997: 49) point out that “the major factor in the formation of Sheng is the usual yearning for belonging to a group with which one identifies, a group that in most cases excludes other groups”. In addition, many of these urban vernaculars originated as secret codes, associated with groups such as criminals, but also just peer-groups who sought to establish a language and identity of their own. Linguistically, these codes are characterised by a high degree of variation and innovation in the vocabulary, which can change at any time according to fashion, or the need to re-establish distinctiveness. The slang element, in particular, is always in flux. Hence these codes are not completely stable, nor have they (yet) been conventionalised as autonomous languages that can be passed on to children as first languages. As Childs (1997: 358) notes, it’s doubtful where Isicamtho is sufficiently different from Zulu on a linguistic basis to constitute a separate language. The same seems to apply to the other urban mixed codes. One reason why the status of these codes

remains indeterminate is because they are really cases of insertional codeswitching, which preserve the morphosyntactic frames of their matrix languages, whether Swahili, Zulu, Afrikaans, or English. Their insertion of words from the ‘external’ languages is quite similar to what we find in other cases of insertional codeswitching, though their sources are more variable, and the borrowing is more prolific than in most other cases. Slabbert and Myers-Scotton demonstrate convincingly that “the structures of Tsotsitaal and Isicamtho both conform to [codeswitching] as it is described and explained by the Matrix Language Frame model” (1996: 329).

Despite the trend toward more widespread use and some degree of stability, the fact is that these urban mixed codes have not yet achieved autonomy as independent systems. This is largely because their speakers do not make up separate and unified speech communities that would provide the social context for conventionalisation of the respective varieties. Childs (1997: 360) notes that the speakers of Isicamtho “constitute a large set of atomistic and even antagonistic groups”. Social heterogeneity such as this is not conducive to stabilisation of a community norm. But the situation in which these mixed codes are used still offer us valuable insight into both the linguistic and social processes that led to the emergence of stable bilingual mixed languages.

4. Convergence and the creation of ‘converted’ languages

So far we have considered cases of relatively stable bilingualism in which communities maintain both languages relatively well, and cases where bilingualism has led to a new mixed creation, used in addition to a language of wider currency. But there are other situations that involve unstable bilingualism, in which a minority group continues to preserve its ancestral language despite tremendous pressure to shift to the socially dominant language. Many of these situations correspond to what Loveday (1996: 20) refers to as settings of “bounded” or “subordinate” bilingualism, where there is more or less restricted contact between a dominant group and a linguistic minority. This kind of contact may be brought about by migration, invasion, or military conquest, the redrawing of national boundaries or the establishment of intergroup contact for purposes of trade, marriage and so on. According to Lewis (1978), some of the factors associated with settings of this type include the following:

- geographical isolation (e.g. Gaelic speakers in the Scottish Highlands);
- urban segregation (e.g., Hispanics in the United States);

- the persistence of ethnic minority enclaves (e.g., Basques in Southern France)
- a tradition of limited cultural contact (e.g., the Pennsylvania Dutch in the US).

In situations like these, the ancestral language of the minority group often becomes subject to intense influence from the socially dominant language. In the earlier stages of contact, this influence may be restricted to substantial lexical borrowing into the minority language. Eventually, such minority groups tend to become bilingual, or to shift entirely to the host language. The greater intensity of contact during the phase of bilingualism and shift, as well as the asymmetry in power and prestige of the languages involved, promote increasing structural influence from the dominant language on the subordinate ancestral language.

Some groups, like the Greek communities in Asia Minor, manage to preserve their language and even resist any kind of overt borrowing for long periods of time. But the pressure to accommodate to the dominant community, and the ongoing language shift that ensues, can have serious consequences for the minority language, including structural interference from the majority language, language attrition, and even language death. The transfer of abstract structure in such situations involves the agency of bilinguals who have become increasingly more proficient in the socially dominant language that is the source of the structural innovations. Of course, this claim requires supporting evidence from the nature of the social setting itself. Let us therefore examine some situations that lend support to this claim.

4.1. Asia Minor Greek

Vibrant Greek communities existed for hundreds of years in Asia Minor, until the catastrophe of 1922, when most Greeks were expelled. In the Cappadocian region, Turkish had a particularly strong impact on the variety of Greek spoken there, as reflected in Dawkins' (1916) famous pronouncement that "the body has remained Greek, but the soul is Turkish". Pervasive Turkish influence could be found in all domains of the language – lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax. Janse (to appear) provides a comprehensive account of this influence. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) ascribe all of these changes to borrowing, in keeping with their assumption that, once a language is maintained, any changes in it must be due to this transfer type. They argue that "[i]f Turks did not shift to Greek, all of the interference must be due to borrowing" (1988: 218). This

rests on their assumption that what they call "interference via shift" can only come about if a group shifts to another language, carrying over features of their original language to the new one. But this kind of language shift is not in fact a prerequisite for the transfer of structural features into an ancestral language via the mechanism of interference. It can also happen when the linguistic dominance relationship between the two languages changes – which is a consequence of ongoing language shift by speakers of the affected language. In other words, it is quite possible for bilinguals who achieve high levels of proficiency in another language to impose structure from that language onto their ancestral language. This is exactly what seems to have happened in the case of Asia Minor Greek. It seems quite probable that the changes in this contact language were introduced under the agency of bilinguals who had become Turkish-dominant (see Winford 2005 for further details). The sociolinguistic situation in Cappadocia at the time provides strong support for this scenario. Augustinos (1992) notes that Greeks and Turks often lived in the same communities and shared the same culture. Janse points out that, even before the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Turkish had replaced Greek in many Cappadocian villages. By 1922, "49 out of 81 Greek settlements in Cappadocia were Turkophone, while the remaining 32 were Grecophone" (Janse to appear: 1). Dawkins (1916) notes that seasonal migration of men to Constantinople led to their use of Turkish among themselves, while many women used Turkish in the home, so that children grew up bilingual, or speaking no Greek. The long term contact situation was clearly one of widespread bilingualism among Greeks, with continuing shift toward Turkish as their linguistically dominant language. All of these facts suggest that imposition of Turkish structure on Greek was the primary mechanism of change.

Situations like that in Asia Minor teach us that only a strict examination of the sociolinguistic contexts of language contact can illuminate the direction and mechanisms of change. There are many other situations like these, which demonstrate that bilingualism in and of itself does not necessarily lead to structural diffusion across languages. Rather, it is changes in the linguistic dominance relationships between the languages involved, which in turn is related to growing restrictions on the contexts in which the ancestral language is used. It is these aspects of the sociolinguistic history of a speech community that are crucial to determining the nature and direction of change, and the kinds of mechanism that brought it about. Of course, we are not in a position to observe the social forces that led to contact-induced changes in the historical past, so our conclusions are not based on solid empirical evidence. Fortunately, however, there are contemporary situations that reveal how changing language dominance relationships lead to structural

changes in ancestral languages, and in which we can profitably observe and study how social forces play a role in such changes. Among these are the situations described for L.A. Spanish by Silva-Corvalán (1994) and for Prince Edward Island French by King (2000).

4.2. 'Converted' languages

Situations of unequal and unstable bilingualism have sometimes produced new contact languages created through massive structural imposition from a socially dominant language on an ancestral language. Such new creations carry the processes of convergence observed in languages like Asia Minor Greek to an extreme. Bakker refers to them as "converted" languages, which he defines as "languages which changed their typological outlook radically, kept their vocabulary, and used native language material in order to copy the grammatical structure of another language" (2003: 116). In other words, such creations derive all overt morphemes, lexical and grammatical, from an ancestral language, and their grammatical structure from the socially dominant language. Hence Bakker refers to them as "Form-Semantics" (FS) mixed languages. The position taken here is that such languages arise when speakers of an ancestral language gradually adopt the socially dominant language as their primary means of communication, and it becomes their linguistically dominant language. They then impose features of the newly dominant language on their ancestral language. This scenario clearly applies to Sri Lanka Portuguese, a maintained ancestral language that came under heavy influence from Tamil after its speakers became dominant in the latter language. Smith (1979a, 1979b) describes many structural characteristics that modern Sri Lanka Portuguese has adopted from Tamil (with possible reinforcement from Sinhala). These include SOV basic word order, postpositions, left-branching relative clauses without relative pronouns, tense-aspect categories, and a variety of other features. Most of these characteristics are not found in older Sri Lanka Portuguese, which was in fact a creole language that shared many of its structural traits with other Portuguese-lexicon creoles. We are fortunate in this case to have descriptions of older Sri Lanka Portuguese that demonstrate how much it has been influenced by Tamil. As a result, the language has "changed from an analytic, prepositional, and SVO language to an agglutinative, post-positional and SOV language" (Bakker 2003: 117). There seems to be little doubt, then, that the dramatic changes in Sri Lanka Portuguese were the result of imposition from the socially dominant language.

Another possible case is that of Sri Lanka Malay, which Bakker includes in his category of "converted languages". Here, however, the situation seems somewhat more complex than that of Sri Lanka Portuguese. Sri Lanka Malay, according to some, would have first emerged as a result of unions and intermarriage between Malay-speaking Indonesian men (soldiers and others) and Tamil-speaking women. The former were brought to Sri Lanka from the Indonesian and Malay peninsulas by Dutch and British colonial administrations from about the mid-17th through the 18th centuries. These men associated closely with the local Tamil-speaking 'Moor' community with whom they shared the Muslim religion (Hussainmiya 1987: 45). Contact between the groups, reinforced by frequent inter-marriage, led to the creation of a new contact language with Malay lexicon and a grammatical structure derived from Tamil, which departed radically from Malay structure. There is some controversy over the precise chronology of the contact-induced changes introduced from Tamil into this contact variety. Smith and Paauw (2006) argue that some features, such as the Tamilised TMA categories, emerged early during the "creolisation" process that gave rise to Sri Lanka Malay. On the other hand, Bakker (2003) suggests that the language later underwent a process of "conversion" similar to Sri Lanka Portuguese, in which Tamil influence was brought to bear on the earlier creole-like or second language variety of Malay. There is also disagreement about the timing of this "conversion". Smith (to appear) suggests that it took place as early as the 19th century, affecting primarily the vernacular varieties spoken in the villages. According to him, the early 20th century texts, which manifest relatively little of the massive Dravidian-influenced changes in the vernacular, reflect only an H variety that was on the decline. Bakker and others think the conversion took place in the 20th century. It is possible that both views are partially correct, but deciding this requires data on earlier Sri Lanka Malay, so as to determine whether its structure was significantly different, say, 150 years ago. Unfortunately, we lack such historical texts. But the social history of the community does provide support for the view that Sri Lanka Malay was further influenced by Tamil and Sinhala from the late 19th century on (cf. Nordhoff 2009 for an overview of the issue.) The language appears to have remained quite vibrant, though not necessarily stable, during most of the 19th century. The establishment of the Malay Ceylon Rifle Regiment by the British had provided an anchor for the community, as well as instruction in Malay. But after the regiment was disbanded in 1873, there was increasing shift toward Tamil and Sinhala. This was encouraged by increasing education of Malay children in Tamil- and Sinhala-medium schools. Tamil increasingly replaced Malay in mosques and other religious contexts, while Malay-speaking women gained access

to education and became bilingual in Tamil. All of these social changes would have encouraged growing linguistic proficiency in Tamil, leading to growing imposition of the latter on the ancestral language.

In principle, the social and linguistic processes that led to the "conversion" of languages like Sri Lanka Portuguese and Sri Lanka Malay are similar to those that led to structural change in other ancestral languages such as Asia Minor Greek. This kind of scenario for the creation of a mixed language has not generally been recognised in the literature. It therefore emphasises the need for us to have adequate documentation of the social contexts of the contact, if we are to understand the true causes and mechanisms of change. Since such documentation is not always available to us, it isn't clear how many ancestral languages may have changed their typology in this way. Other possible cases include the varieties of Urdu and Kannada spoken in Kupwar, India (Gumperz and Wilson 1971), which converged primarily toward Marathi, while retaining their ancestral vocabulary. Marathi was the socially dominant language of the region where Kupwar is located, and was widely used as a *lingua franca* in the community. It is therefore reasonable to assume that frequent use of Marathi led to it becoming linguistically more dominant for speakers of Urdu and Kannada. This in turn would have led to structural imposition from Marathi on to the ancestral languages.

On the whole, cases of massive typological change in a community's language under imposition from a socially dominant language appear to be relatively rare. Contact languages that fit the structural profile of "Form-Semantics" mixed languages appear to arise far more commonly from group second language acquisition of a socially dominant language. However, in these cases, it is the newly acquired L2 that is transformed via structural imposition from the L1 or ancestral language. There is a wide range of such contact languages, which will be discussed in the following sections.

5. Second language acquisition and the emergence of new contact languages

The vast majority of contact languages appear to have arisen in situations where groups speaking entirely different languages come into contact for various reasons, and circumstances demand that one of the groups acquire some version of the other group's language, or some compromise between the two languages. Depending on the nature of the contact, the newly acquired L2 may manifest differing degrees and types of restructuring, of the sort associated with processes of second language acquisition. The

outcomes of such restructuring include the languages referred to as pidgins, creoles, indigenised languages, and second language varieties that have been referred to variously as 'converted' languages, or cases of 'metatypy'.

5.1. Pidgin formation

Pidgins arise to facilitate communication between groups of different language backgrounds in restricted contexts such as trading, forced labour, military occupation, master-servant domestic relationships and other types of marginal contact. Because of such limitations in scope of use, pidgins are highly simplified and reduced versions of their major input language, usually the socially dominant one. Pidgins that emerged in domestic settings include Indian Butler English (Hosali 1992), Pidgin Madam and Gulf Pidgin Arabic (Bakir 2010; Avram 2010). Those that arose under military invasion or occupation include Japanese Pidgin English and Vietnamese Pidgin French, both now extinct. The two most common types of pidgin, however, are those that arose in contexts of trading and in situations involving mass migrant labour, especially on plantations and mines. Among the pidgins that served as *lingua francas* on plantations were Pidgin Hawaiian and Hawaii Pidgin English.

Many trade pidgins arise in situations of contact between geographically contiguous groups. Typical examples of these include indigenous American pidgins such as Chinook Pidgin (also known as Chinuk Wawa or simply Wawa 'speech'), Delaware Pidgin, and Mobilian Pidgin. These appear to have originated in pre-colonial times, as *lingua francas* for use among various Native American groups, but they were eventually also used for communication between Indians and Europeans. According to Drechsel (1996: 1226), they all shared a set of sociolinguistic characteristics. Their primary contexts of use included trade, hunting, and similar activities, as well as political alliances and associations. They were also used for communication across groups linked through intermarriage, and in gatherings of kinsfolk. All arose in situations of extensive linguistic diversity involving much bi- and multilingualism. They were also characterised by much use of gesture or sign language. Many of these sociolinguistic characteristics can also be found in other indigenous pidgins, such as those of Papua New Guinea (Dutton 1983; Foley 1988).

Many other trade pidgins, including Pacific Pidgin English, Chinese Pidgin English, Russenorsk, and Eskimo Pidgin, arose as a result of contact between indigenous and foreign groups. Russenorsk, for instance, was used in trade between Russian merchants and Norwegian fishermen in Northern Norway from about the end of the 18th century to the 1920s. It is somewhat

different from most pidgins in that it draws almost equally from both source languages for its vocabulary, a further consequence of which is that its phonology is also a compromise between the phonologies of the source languages. Similar cases of mixed vocabulary include Chinook Pidgin and Ndyuka-Trio Pidgin, which is referred to as both Ingii 'Indian' and Mekolo 'Black'. The mixture in these cases is usually attributed to the fact that the groups in contact were of equal social status. In most other cases, it is the language of the more numerous or more powerful group that supplies the bulk of the pidgin's vocabulary.

In general, then, pidgins arise in situations involving limited contact between groups in restricted contexts of use, where neither group has either the need or the opportunity to learn the other's language fully. This accounts for the fact that pidgins are very similar in structure to early interlanguage, or what Klein and Perdue (1997) refer to as the "Basic Variety", being characterised by absence of inflectional morphology, and a grammar stripped to the bare essentials, lacking TMA systems, embedding processes, movement phenomena and other grammatical characteristics associated with more highly developed languages. In all these respects, these contact languages conform to Hymes' classic definition of pidginisation as "that complex process of sociolinguistic change comprising reduction in inner form, with convergence, in the context of restriction in use. A pidgin is the result of such a process that has achieved autonomy as a norm" (1971: 84).

Pidgins remain highly reduced in structure and marginal to their speakers' communities as long as their scope of use remains highly restricted. In most cases, when the reasons for their use end, they simply become extinct. But extension of their functions beyond the narrow contexts of trade or labour etc., has often led to their expansion into more complex languages, which can become stable community languages. For instance, Chinook Pidgin developed into a more elaborate vernacular on the Grande Ronde reservation of Northwest Oregon. This was because it continued to serve as a lingua franca for members of six Native American tribes languages from three different families. Zenk (1984: v) pointed out that the pidgin was "an important factor in the sense of identity and solidarity that many Natives of the reservation period came to feel as 'Grand Ronde Indians'".

Similarly, the history of early Pacific Pidgin English offers an excellent illustration of how changing social circumstances can affect the development and evolution of a pidgin. Thus, the earliest forms of pidgin English that were used in the whaling trade of the early 1800s started to expand when this pidgin was adopted for use in various southern Melanesian islands that were involved in the lucrative sandalwood and

bêche-de-mer trades. This economic enterprise required the establishment of more or less fixed settlements, which promoted regular contact between speakers of English and Melanesian languages, as well as among the linguistically heterogeneous Melanesians themselves. Conditions therefore became ripe for the establishment of a more efficient and stable form of communication. Similar conditions emerged in the Sydney area of New South Wales, Australia, which was the most frequent port of call in the Pacific for ships engaged in trading and related activities. Here too a relatively stable pidgin emerged, which shared many features with the Melanesian pidgin varieties as a result of continuous diffusion by sailors, islanders, and other travellers. The pidgin of the Sydney area later spread to other parts of Australia, including Queensland, where it evolved into Queensland Pidgin English. Forms of Pidgin English were initially used for interaction between English speakers and Aborigines, but also became important means of communication among Aboriginal groups speaking different languages, and consequently spread throughout Australia.

When plantations were established in Queensland after 1863, labourers were recruited from various parts of Melanesia, many of whom already spoke some form of pidgin English. Thus, both Queensland Pidgin English and early Melanesian Pidgin English provided input to the plantation pidgin that emerged on the plantations in the latter half of the 19th century (Clark 1983). By the 1870s, this pidgin had evolved into a more elaborate and stable form of communication, with an expanding and more efficient grammatical apparatus. Eventually, it would develop further into the so-called 'expanded pidgins' of Melanesia, which I will designate as creoles, and discuss later.

5.2. Indigenised varieties

The colonisation of various parts of the world by European powers during the 15th to 19th centuries led to the spread of European languages and their transformation by indigenous peoples into new contact varieties. This phenomenon, of course, was not restricted to Europe, nor to this time period. It has occurred time and again throughout history, for instance in the spread of Greek and Latin throughout the Greek and Roman empires respectively, or in the spread of Arabic throughout the Muslim world. The adoption of the languages of the colonisers led to the emergence of a range of L2 varieties, diverging to varying degrees from the target language. Such divergence, as Thomason and Kaufman have pointed out, is due primarily to the effects of "imperfect" or "natural" second language acquisition by groups shifting to the socially dominant language. Such effects are brought

about by imposition, which involves the use of L1 language production processes in attempting to use the L2.

The degrees of restructuring that took place depended on a variety of sociolinguistic factors, including the demographics of the colonising and colonised groups, the extent of inter-group versus intra-group interaction, the contexts in which language learning took place, and the learners' attitudes toward the new creations. What happened to the colonisers' languages in their colonial settings depended to a large extent on how they were introduced. As Gupta (1997) notes with regard to English, there were three ways in which European languages spread – by migration of Europeans; through informal or 'untutored' second language acquisition; and through instruction in schools. But each colony experienced a different mixture of these three types of transmission. For instance, the American colonies of England experienced significant immigration of English speakers, but also massive importation of African slaves. In places like Singapore, English was learned via instruction, but many people also acquired it informally, leading to a significantly different local variety. In Australia, new contact varieties of English emerged as a result of the introduction of Pacific Islanders to work on plantations in Queensland, and as a result of contact with Aboriginal languages. In short, the correlation between the ways in which European languages were introduced to the colonies and the types of outcome that resulted is by no means neat or clear cut. Still, certain general observations can be made.

In the first place, the greater the number of European settlers, the more likely it was that their varieties would survive relatively unchanged in the colonial setting. This was the case in the former English colonies in North America, Australia, and New Zealand, where the English settlers became the majority population. As Crosby (1986: 5) points out, these places are situated in the temperate zone, and were therefore ideal places for Europeans to settle in large numbers. Not surprisingly, it was in these places that the indigenous inhabitants were systematically suppressed and massacred. By contrast, the tropical regions were not conducive to Europeanisation, and slavery involving forced relocation of Africans to these areas proved most convenient. It was in these settings that creoles emerged. Even here, differences in demographics and codes of interaction led to quite different outcomes. Finally, in the colonies established in places like Ireland, India and South East Asia, there was greater reliance on indigenous populations for purposes of economic exploitation and political control. Europeans here formed small minorities, and local inhabitants, particularly those of higher social status, were provided the opportunity to learn the European language, usually in school, so they could serve European interests. But the language also spread to the wider population

through untutored learning, undergoing different degrees of transformation. Such contact situations led to the emergence of 'indigenised' varieties.

'Indigenised' varieties display varying degrees of approximation to the colonisers' language, depending on the extent of influence from learners' L1s, which depends in turn on the social ecology of the contact situation. We can illustrate such differences through a comparison of the spread of English to places like Ireland and South and South East Asia.

5.2.1. Irish English

Though English was first introduced to Ireland in the 12th century, modern Irish English has its true roots in the 17th century, when British colonial settlements were established in Ulster (Northern Ireland) and eastern Ireland (Kallen 1997). Large numbers of settlers were introduced to Ulster from Scotland and Northern England, while Southern Ireland attracted smaller numbers of settlers from other parts of England, especially the south and southwest. As a result, northern varieties of Irish English show strong continuities from Scots, while Southern Irish English shows more affinities with southern and south-western English dialects. All varieties show influence from Irish (Gaelic), but that influence is more pronounced in western and other parts of Ireland where English settlers remained a small minority, and the indigenous population preserved its first language longer.

The social contexts in which Irish English emerged in many ways parallel those of indigenised varieties more generally. They all arose in settings characterised by limited interaction between native speakers of the target language and the groups learning it. Only the more affluent or elite sections of the community had full access to native target language models, including instruction in schools. Most members of the community interacted primarily among themselves rather than with native speakers, hence the contact variety itself became the primary target of learning. This reinforced the use and eventual establishment of features due to substrate influence from Irish. The patterns of contact between the locals and English speakers also played a role in the emergence of distinct varieties of Irish English. Migratory labour was an important aspect of this contact (Odlin 1997: 11). Workers from Ulster tended to go to Scotland, thus reinforcing the establishment of Ulster Scots in the north. On the other hand, southern Irish workers tended to migrate to the English settlements in eastern Ireland, or to southern England, thus reinforcing the southern English influence on varieties of Irish English in the south on their return home. Another important factor in such cases of language shift is the persistence

of bilingualism within the shifting group. In the Irish case, just as in Singapore later on, the majority of those who acquired English as a second language maintained their ancestral languages as well. Odlin (1997: 4–5) suggests there were large numbers of illiterate bilinguals in 19th century Ireland, based on his analysis of the 1851 census data. It seems likely that childhood bilingualism was also common, and that bilingual children played a role in imposing Irish influence on Irish English grammar. Irish features are most pronounced in those varieties of Irish English that are spoken in areas that had or still have large numbers of bilinguals.

5.2.2. Indigenised varieties of English in Asia

The spread of English to Ireland was part of the much wider British colonial expansion in the 17th century, which also embraced the Americas and the Caribbean. By contrast, the spread of English to South and South East Asia took place during the second phase of British colonisation, after the declaration of American independence and the abolition of slavery in 1808. The colonisation of India and parts of South East Asia as well as Africa, was motivated by the desire to expand trade and political control to those areas, which supplied vast new markets and sources of raw materials. In such colonies, English was initially restricted to contexts such as administration, business, and the legal system. Eventually, however, the language spread to wider sections of the population as a result of broader contact between speakers of English and the indigenous languages, and the rise of English-medium schools. Again, however, we find very different outcomes, depending on the ways in which English spread and was used. In India, for example, a continuum of L2 varieties emerged, which depended primarily on the type and amount of education one received. Proficiency in English became associated with high social status, and elite families transmitted it to their children as a native language, along with other languages such as Hindi. But for the majority of the population, English was learned as a second language, to be used only in certain domains such as education, or as a lingua franca for interethnic communication. In most other domains of everyday life, people continued to employ their ancestral language. The varying degrees of exposure to English and the differences in its use have resulted in a continuum of L2 Englishes. Gupta (1997) points out that, in this situation, speakers do not change their variety much, but maintain the particular level of proficiency they have obtained. This means that, apart from the standard variety, there is no single established variety that has attained the status of an autonomous, conventionalised vernacular.

In Singapore, by contrast, a very different picture emerged after the colony was established in 1819. Here too, English was introduced primarily through the school system, and was acquired as a second language by speakers of various language backgrounds, including varieties of Chinese, Malay, and various Indian languages. As Platt et al. (1983: 9) note, English became widely established in the course of the early 20th century partly because it was the language of Western science and technology, and an avenue to social advancement. Members of the more prosperous Chinese and Indian groups saw the advantages of an English-medium education and a growing number of English-medium schools were established in the course of the later 19th and earlier 20th centuries. In addition, English functioned as a valuable lingua franca for use in interethnic communication, and was transmitted through natural second language acquisition. In due course, a continuum of English varieties emerged, ranging from Standard English to a basilectal variety now referred to as (Colloquial) Singapore English, and mesolectal varieties in between. Unlike the situation in India, some form of English is spoken today by most, if not all, Singaporeans, and English is in fact a native language for a significant minority. Also, while the acrolect is certainly associated with higher social status and official functions, use of the colloquial variety is by no means restricted to lower-status groups. Speakers of all social backgrounds can move along the continuum, depending on the context of use, their interlocutors, etc. Moreover, the colloquial variety has become conventionalised as a stable system in its own right. All of this makes Singapore similar in many respects to the creole continua of the Caribbean.

Platt et al. (1983: 9) suggest that Singapore English emerged among school children during the period 1930–1960 because “children were using English in natural communication situations while still in quite early stages of acquisition – some of them acquiring some competence in it before school years from elder siblings”. This would explain the strong influence of local languages, especially Chinese and Malay varieties, on the new contact language. To add to this, Ansaldo (2004: 143) argues that the earliest forms of Singapore English emerged among two ethnically-mixed groups – Babas and Eurasians – who acted as go-betweens for the British in their dealings with the local population during the 19th century. The Babas were descendants of Hokkien traders and Malay women who spoke a contact variety referred to as Baba Malay. The Eurasians were descendants of mixed marriages between Asians and Europeans (primarily Portuguese), who played a role in establishing English-medium schools in Singapore. According to Ansaldo, the children of Baba and Eurasian families were the first to be exposed to education in English; hence they and their parents must have been the founder group that created and spread early forms of

Singapore English. This would suggest that the earliest substrate influence on Singapore English came from varieties of Malay, with later and more pronounced influence from Chinese varieties, as Singapore English spread. Ansaldo (2004: 144) argues that “[Singapore English] is the product of an evolution that pre-dates the arrival of the Standard English medium by at least a century”. This would mean that English-medium schools contributed to the spread and development of Singapore English, but were not its original birthplace. Moreover, this scenario challenges the view that Singapore English is a restructured form of Standard English that arose in the 20th century. It seems rather to have stabilised and become conventionalised in this period as a result of its wide adoption as a *lingua franca* among schoolchildren of different ethnic and language backgrounds. This is reminiscent of the conventionalisation of Hawaii Creole English, as described by Roberts (1998) and Siegel (2000). As in that situation, the use of the contact variety was reinforced by its symbolic value as a marker of local identity, despite the fact that official policy opposes its use.

This brief overview omits many details relating to the community settings and patterns of interaction that played a role in these outcomes of shift. Gal's (1979) pioneering study of the shift from Hungarian to German in Oberwart, Austria, provides a model for the kind of detailed exploration that is still lacking. She appeals to various social factors – economic change, social mobility and opportunity, changing social network structures, and choices of social identity – to explain the patterns of shift in Oberwart. All of these have yet to be fully explored in studies of the emergence of the indigenised varieties. Other factors that played a role include differences in the demographic distributions of settler versus indigenous populations, which made for significant differences both within a colony, as in northern versus southern Ireland, and between colonies, as can be seen in the differences in the forms of English that emerged in India as opposed to Singapore. Differences in the nature of access to the target language (e.g. formal versus ‘natural’ acquisition), and in the target language itself (native as opposed to indigenous models) also made for differences in the type of outcome. Finally, Gal's emphasis on speakers' choices of social identity is particularly relevant to the conventionalisation of the indigenised varieties. The preservation of distinctive features due to substrate influence and other causes has much to do with the value of the new contact languages as symbols of group identity, whether based on ethnicity or nationality. Their conventionalisation as new languages typically follows from their association with a (new) speech community that sees itself as distinct from the target language community. In their contemporary sociolinguistic settings, this has led to an ideological conflict between their value as badges of identity and the prestigious status of the

standard varieties with which they co-exist. It goes without saying that the synchronic sociolinguistic study of these situations can shed much light on the social forces that led to the emergence of these varieties in the first place. This is true of other contact languages that arose through processes of group second language acquisition, and became established as new community languages associated with new cultures.

5.3. Creole formation

Creoles make up another major sub-classification of the second language varieties of European and other languages that emerged as a result of colonial expansion and military conquest. The traditional view is that creoles all arose from pidgins (Hall 1966), but that view finds support only in certain cases of creole formation. It undoubtedly applies to Hawaiian Creole English, which is the result of the expansion of Hawaiian Pidgin English, as well as to Kriol and other creoles of Australia, which evolved out of Australian Pidgin English. Very similar developments occurred in the case of the Melanesian pidgins, which evolved into the so-called ‘expanded pidgins’, Tok Pisin, Bislama, and Solomon Islands Pijin. I will refer to these languages as creoles, since they share much in common with other creoles in terms of their sociohistorical background and processes of restructuring. I also extend the term to the expanded English-lexicon pidgins of West Africa, which serve as *lingua francas* for millions of speakers in countries like Cameroon, Ghana, and Nigeria, and are being acquired as first languages by many children. They too arose through similar processes of change, involving the types of restructuring associated with natural second language acquisition.

5.3.1. Pacific creoles

As we saw earlier, the expansion of Melanesian Pidgin can be traced back to the establishment of permanent settlements in Melanesia for purposes of cultivating sandalwood and other products for trade. Further expansion took place when the pidgin, along with Queensland Pidgin English, was employed for everyday communication on the plantations of Queensland, and later, Samoa. When the labour recruits from various parts of the Pacific took this pidgin back with them to their home territories, it became a vital medium of interethnic communication there as well. As a result, further elaboration of the pidgin's structure took place in each territory. Each pidgin continued to expand its resources through lexical borrowing,

structural innovations due to imposition from native languages, as well as internal developments. Thus were born the three contemporary creoles – Tok Pisin (Papua New Guinea), Bislama (Vanuatu), and Pijin (Solomon Islands), which serve not only as *lingua francas*, but also as semi- or co-official languages in their respective countries, and have become first languages for many. As Singler (2008) argues, urbanisation played a significant role in the spread and expansion of these pidgins and their increasing use as a medium of communication in the multilingual urban setting. Siegel (1998, 2008) discusses their history and development in greater detail.

In Australia itself, as mentioned earlier, forms of Pidgin English appeared very soon after the arrival of English colonisers, beginning with the British occupation of the area around Port Jackson in New South Wales. Contact between Aborigines and English speakers led to the emergence of pidgin varieties that functioned as *lingua francas* not just between the English and Aborigines, but among the latter as well. New South Wales Pidgin became an important and widespread means of communication, and was the basis for the emergence of associated pidgins, and later creoles, in many parts of Australia (Malcolm 2008: 126). The expansion of the pastoral industry beyond New South Wales led to the spread of New South Wales Pidgin through Queensland into the Northern Territory, where it merged with other pidgin varieties to become Northern Territory Pidgin English. Colonisation led to serious social disruption among the Aborigines, particularly with the expansion of the pastoral industry. The Aborigines were systematically massacred, or succumbed to diseases such as smallpox which the settlers brought with them. They were forcibly removed from their traditional lands, and many of them were forced to labour as kitchen hands and stockmen on cattle stations under conditions very similar to those of slavery (Meakins 2008: 78). Aborigines of very different linguistic backgrounds ended up in towns, farms, or mission stations, where they adopted forms of Pidgin English as their common means of communication. According to Harris (1991: 201), Northern Territory Pidgin evolved into a creole at an Anglican Church mission established in 1908 at Roper River, which provided refuge for Aborigines faced with annihilation. A generation of children at the mission adopted the pidgin as their language, and were instrumental in restructuring it into what was then known as Roper River Creole. The name was changed to 'Kriol' in 1976 following the orthography that had been developed for the language. According to Malcolm (2008: 126), it has at least 20,000 speakers.

In the Torres Strait Islands, a different picture emerged. Here the need to exploit various products of the sea brought together Europeans, and people

from Papua New Guinea and the South Sea Islands. The common language chosen in this case was the earlier Pacific Pidgin English, which was adopted by Torres Strait Islanders who worked in the marine industry. Malcolm (2008: 126) notes that, by the 1890s, the pidgin was being used by children of Torres Strait Islanders and immigrant origin on at least two islands, and the resulting creoles spread throughout the islands and along the north coast of Queensland. 'Broken' now has about 3,000 native speakers and 12,000 second language speakers (Malcolm 2008: 126).

Perhaps the best documented case of the evolution of a pidgin into a creole is that of Hawaii Creole English, which emerged out of Hawaii Pidgin English in the early twentieth century. The emergence of this contact language is highly instructive with regard to how social factors, particularly the demographic make-up of the population, can influence the course of creole creation. Hawaii Pidgin English was used on the plantations and elsewhere as the *lingua franca* among Hawaiians and various immigrant groups, including Portuguese, Chinese, and later, Japanese, Koreans and others. Eventually, it became a target of learning by children born to these immigrants, who were the chief architects of its expansion into the creole. Using socio-historical and sociolinguistic evidence drawn from contemporary archives and studies, Roberts (1998, 2000) demonstrated that the first generation of locally-born children, chiefly Portuguese and Chinese, were bilingual in their parents' language and Hawaii Pidgin English. They continued the process of expanding the pidgin, appealing mostly to transfer of features from their ancestral languages into the budding contact language (Siegel 2000). The second generation of immigrant children learned this expanded pidgin as their L1, and contributed further to its elaboration and stabilisation as a new contact language. Roberts' account of the social factors that led to the emergence of this creole provides a convincing rebuttal of Bickerton's (1981, 1984) view that creoles are products of first language acquisition by infants whose only input was a deficient pidgin, and who appealed to an innate language bioprogram to elaborate the grammars of creoles.

These languages demonstrate well how pidgins evolve when called upon to fulfil the functions of an everyday vernacular. From a linguistic perspective, the most significant aspect of their evolution is that it involved a high degree of substrate influence from the L1s of the speakers who acquired pidgins as L2s and later L1s, and continued to reshape their grammars in response to new communicative needs. In this respect, they match the once widely accepted description of 'creoles' as languages that result from the structural elaboration of pidgins. The social contexts and social motivations for their creation were similar in many ways, but quite different in others. For instance, they share with each other, and with other

creoles, the fact that they were first adopted as media of interethnic communication, and were elaborated by speakers who drew on the resources of their L1s. In cases such as Kriol, Torres Strait Creole and Hawaii Creole, the elaboration was accomplished primarily by children of different language backgrounds, who adopted the pidgin as an in-group language. By contrast, the elaboration of Hawaii Pidgin English varieties was largely achieved by adults who needed a lingua franca for wider communication in a linguistically heterogeneous environment. The survival of these languages in all cases depended on the emergence of a stable community of speakers for whom the contact variety was not just a convenient tool, but a primary vernacular, a first language, and a badge of social identity. The same can be said of other creoles such as those that originated in the New World.

5.3.2. Atlantic creoles

By far the largest group of creoles arose in the Atlantic area, including parts of West Africa, the Caribbean and parts of the Americas, as a result of European colonisation expansion from the 15th century on. This began with the Portuguese, who established settlements on various islands off the West African coast in the 1400's, and soon began importing slaves from the mainland to cultivate crops and raise livestock. This kind of plantation economy was carried over the Atlantic to Brazil in the early 16th century, and became a model for the plantation colonies established by other European powers in the New World and elsewhere.

These plantation settings shared a number of broad socio-political, demographic, and economic characteristics, including the use of large numbers of slaves who were transplanted from their African homelands and subjected to control by a small but powerful minority of Europeans. In most cases, particularly in the Caribbean, colonisation involved the subjugation and even extermination of indigenous peoples, and the re-peopling of their lands by Europeans and Africans. But there were also significant differences in the social ecologies of different colonies, which led in turn to differences in the ways in which the colonial languages were acquired and changed. Mintz (1971: 48) outlined the three broad social conditions that shaped the emergence of creole languages in the New World:

- The demographic make-up of each colony, including population ratios between the groups, and their places of origin;

- The types and patterns of contact among the groups, which were generally determined by the codes of social interaction governing their relative statuses and relationships;
- The nature of the community settings in which the groups interacted.

This tri-partite division of the social ecology of plantation settings has become one of the classic frameworks for investigating how creole cultures and languages emerged. We are fortunate to have a great deal of information about the settlement histories of certain European colonies, which allows us to determine how these social factors affected the fate of the European languages. For a start, differences in the numbers and ratios of Europeans to Africans, and among the Africans themselves, certainly played a major role in determining the paths of creole formation. In Barbados, for instance, large numbers of indentured servants were brought to the colony, particularly from Southwest England, and the high ratio of such workers to African slaves in the first 40 years of settlement led to a contact variety, Bajan, which was in many respects modelled on Southwest English dialects. On the other hand, in Suriname, the rapid growth and increasing size of the African population, and the numerical dominance of speakers of Gbe languages in the first 70 years or so of the colony, ensured a significant Gbe influence on the grammar of the Surinamese creoles (Migge 2003). The following brief extract from an Anansi story shows how radical that influence was.

- (10) a. *Unu ben e leri altijd over dagu nanga anansi*
 1PL PST IMPF learn always about dog and spider
- b. *Dus den man ben go a onti.*
 so the.PL man PST go LOC hunt
- c. *Den man ben go onti, go suku stimofo,*
 the.PL man PST go hunt go seek meat/fish
- d. *den man e waka, den man e waka, te*
 the.PL man IMPF walk the.PL man IMPF walk until
ini a busi.
 inside the jungle
- e. *Now di den man waka wan pisi, den man*
 now when the.PL man walk a piece the.PL man
si tu titei,
 see two rope
- f. *wan deki titei nanga wan fatu titei.*
 one thick rope and one fat rope
- a. 'We always used to learn about Dog and Spider.
 b. So they went hunting.

- c. They went hunting, looking for meat,
- d. they walked and walked until they were in the jungle.
- e. Now when they had walked for a while they saw two ropes,
- f. one thick rope and one fat rope.'

One of the important lessons from the Surinamese situation is that overall importation figures and population ratios by themselves cannot inform us reliably about the relative importance and impact of potential substrate languages. The overall figures for this colony show that far higher numbers of slaves were imported from areas other than the Slave Coast, where most Gbe speakers originated. But, as Arends (1995: 252) points out, both the timing and compactness of various African inputs have to be considered, if we are to explain the nature and degree of substrate influence on creole formation. The evidence from Suriname suggests that it was the first two or three cohorts of slaves – that is, those imported in the first 70 years – whose languages exerted most influence on the early Surinamese plantation creole.

Another important demographic factor is the rate of nativization of the population, particularly the enslaved and those of mixed race. Singler (1986) has argued that the higher and faster the rate of nativization, the closer the creole will be to the superstrate. This view gains support from colonies like Réunion and Barbados, where the slave population grew primarily through natural increase. By the mid-17th century, only some 30 years after settlement, the majority of Barbadian slaves were locally born (Rickford and Handler 1994: 237). Moreover, co-habitation between settlers and slaves in these colonies produced significant numbers of locally born persons of mixed race who were free and had closer contact with settlers and their languages. The status and linking function of such mixed race groups must have contributed to the emergence and consolidation of close second language approximations of the superstrate. By contrast, in colonies where the slave population increased through continuous large-scale importation rather than natural increase, the creoles that emerged displayed greater typological distance from the superstrates. When this was coupled with the departure of most superstrate speakers, as in Suriname, it led to even more 'radical' creole formation, since slaves were mostly targeting contact varieties used by other slaves.

But demographic evidence is only part of the picture, and needs to be supplemented by close scrutiny of the changing situational contexts and patterns of interaction among the groups concerned. Most colonies were characterised by an initial period of settlement referred to as the *société d'habitation*, which involved small farms and homesteads in which settlers (including indentured servants and owners) lived and worked closely

together. It is generally accepted that such situations allowed the earliest cohort of slaves to acquire close approximations of the colonial language. The length of time such social conditions prevailed had a direct bearing on how closely the vernacular that survived in the colony approximated the superstrate. The switch to a plantation economy, especially sugar cultivation, ushered in a totally different type of social organisation, the *société de plantation*, which brought with it significant changes in demographics and types of social interaction. In most cases, it led to not just a massive increase in the African population, but also to the demise of small farms, the withdrawal of indentured servants from the labour force, and a general reduction in contact between Africans and Europeans. This also set the stage for the emergence of creole varieties that were much further removed from their lexifier languages. Under such conditions, creoles became subject to much heavier influence from the L1s of the slaves, who were now creating a new medium of communication for use primarily among themselves, rather than with Europeans.

In addition, we cannot overlook the role played by the codes that regulated interaction between settlers and slaves. The *société d'habitation* clearly allowed far greater contact and interaction than the *société de plantation*, with its more rigid social hierarchy and laws of segregation. But there were differences in the slave codes from one colony to the next. These determined whether slaves could participate in institutions like the church, how quickly they could attain freedom, whether they could acquire property, and so on. Such differences were crucial to the linguistic outcomes in each situation. In most of the Spanish colonies, for example, the rate of manumission was generally rapid and continuous, far more so than in the French and English colonies. Freed slaves had greater privileges and opportunity for social mobility. These and other differences in the political and social milieu of the Spanish colonies may explain the paucity of Spanish-lexicon creoles in the New World, as Diaz-Campos and Clements (2008), Sessarego (to appear) and others have argued, contra McWhorter (2000). Finally, there were differences within each colony in the status and privileges afforded different categories of slaves. 'Elite' slaves, including Black overseers, skilled and domestic slaves, had more freedom of movement and access to Europeans than those who laboured in the fields. In many colonies, such differences led to linguistic continua ranging from L2 varieties of the superstrate to highly divergent or 'basilectal' varieties.

To sum up, differences in the social ecologies of different colonies over time led to a continuum of outcomes both across and within colonies. At one extreme we find second language varieties such as Réunionnais and Bajan, representing closer approximations to the settler dialects. At the

other extreme we find 'radical' creations such as the Surinamese creoles, whose grammars bear mark of the heavy effects of imposition from Gbe and other West African languages. Each combination of demographic, social, political and economic factors led to its own linguistic outcome. However, while we know a great deal about the ecological mix in certain colonies, a great deal remains uncertain about other colonies. Moreover, our knowledge of the micro-level of social organisation and interaction in the colonies is much more limited than our knowledge of macro-level factors such as population demographics. Arends (2001) is an attempt to address these shortcomings, but much more work still needs to be done. Hence, we are not in any position to formulate complete explanations of how social forces shaped the nature and outcomes of creole formation.

In some ways, however, what we now know about the social histories of several creoles does constitute a good basis on which we can evaluate, and in some cases refute, theories of how creoles originated. For instance, thorough examination of the socio-historical evidence has allowed us to reject earlier claims that creole genesis was the result of children targeting a deficient pidgin as the only input to their L1 acquisition process, and appealing to an innate language bioprogram to create a new creole grammar (cf. Bickerton 1981, 1984.) The evidence from Hawaii (Roberts 2000), Suriname (Arends 1995), Haiti and Martinique (Singler 1995) and elsewhere convincingly shows that creole formation was essentially a process of second language acquisition in which speakers of substrate languages, both children and adults, were the chief agents of restructuring and change.

This is what accounts for the fact that creoles manifest, to varying degrees, the effects of three types of restructuring associated with second language acquisition – processes of simplification, imposition and internally-motivated developments. The effects of simplification include absence of inflectional morphology, a preference for analytic over synthetic structures, uniform word order in basic syntactic structures, a tendency toward transparency in the form-function relationship, and other phenomena that reflect the need for ease of perception and production in the language learning process. The effects of imposition are seen in the varying extents of substrate influence, which, in extreme cases, produced radical creoles that are typologically more similar to their substrates than to their superstrates. This occurred especially when continuing importation of slaves over many decades led to successive stages of second language acquisition, in which later arrivals continued to impose features of their L1s on the evolving creole. As we have suggested, demographic factors play a crucial role in determining the degrees of substrate influence that occurred. For instance, where groups speaking the same or typologically quite similar

substrate languages were in the majority, the creoles that emerged show greater evidence of their influence (Singler 1988). Siegel (1999) treats such demographic factors as part of the 'availability' constraints that determine what substrate and superstrate features find their way into the 'pool' of features that are potential input to the emerging creole. Finally, creoles manifest various types of internally motivated change at every stage of their development. The social factors that played a role in these developments have scarcely been explored.

5.4. Metatypy and 'converted' second languages

The processes of change that we observe in indigenised varieties and creoles can also be found in other contact languages that have received less attention in the literature. Among these are various Austronesian languages of Papua New Guinea, which show evidence of massive influence from indigenous Papuan languages. Ross (1996) describes two such Austronesian languages, Takia and Maisin, whose semantic and syntactic structures have been reshaped on the model of neighbouring Papuan languages, but whose lexicon, including grammatical elements, are Western Oceanic. Ross refers to this kind of restructuring as "metatypy" (a change in typology), and ascribes it to bilinguals who attempted to ease the burden of processing two languages by bringing their semantic and syntactic structures into line with each other (1996: 204). Similar shifts in typology have been described by Thurston (1987, 1994) for several Austronesian languages in Northwest New Britain (Papua New Guinea). Here too there has been a long history of contact between the indigenous languages and the Austronesian languages that were introduced by groups migrating from other parts of the Pacific. At present, only one of the indigenous languages, Anêm, still survives in Northwest New Britain, along with eight Austronesian languages. All of the latter have become markedly Papuan in their typology, sharing a common Papuan-derived grammatical and semantic structure, but preserving much of their ancestral vocabulary. As Thurston (1987: 68) points out, "in switching between languages, a speaker is mostly switching between wordlists while using the same semantic and syntactic structures". Bakker includes these restructured Austronesian languages in his category of "converted" or "Form-Semantics" mixed languages. As we saw earlier, several of these contact languages arose in situations where a group shifted to a socially dominant language, and then imposed its features on their ancestral language. In the Papua New Guinea situation, by contrast, the socio-historical evidence suggests that the Papuan influence on the Austronesian languages resulted from the fact that

speakers of Papuan languages acquired the latter as second languages, transferring features of their L1s to them in the process. There was also a significant amount of transfer in the other direction, from Austronesian to Papuan languages. As the influx of Austronesian migrants increased, they merged with the indigenous inhabitants, who gradually adopted more of the newcomers' culture, including their languages. Thurston's sketch of the socio-historical context of the contact suggests that Austronesian culture became dominant in the coastal areas where they settled. He points out that "new recruits to the culture came largely from the indigenous population, who, by virtue of shared culture, became Austronesian themselves" (1987: 103). This supports the view that speakers of Papuan languages adopted Austronesian languages, imposing features of their L1s on them. A similar explanation was offered by Strong (1911: 382) for the heavy Papuan influence on Maisin, which he describes as "a Melanesian [i.e., Austronesian] language which has been modified, as is to be expected if a Melanesian language was imperfectly learned by a non-Melanesian [i.e., Papuan] speaking people". The language shift scenario is also supported by the fact that most of these Austronesian languages appear to have undergone extensive simplification and regularisation of structure. Such simplification is typical of untutored second language acquisition, particularly when the L2 varieties are used as lingua francas by groups speaking mutually unintelligible languages, as was the case in Northwest New Britain.

It seems clear, then, that indigenised varieties, creoles, and the 'converted' languages of Papua New Guinea all arise via similar processes of change, even though their social ecologies differ in many respects. The common factor they share is the fact that they arose as a result of language shift, or 'natural' second language acquisition, which set the stage for processes of imposition accompanied in many cases by simplification.

6. Questions of status and function

It remains for us to investigate briefly the social functions that contact languages perform and the status they enjoy in their respective communities. I will confine my attention to those languages that are still in use in contemporary societies, the vast majority of which are indigenised varieties and creoles. Very few of these serve as official languages, or have been standardised. Typically, it is the standard varieties of their respective lexifier languages, or some other colonial language, that are employed in official functions in domains such as education, government, the law, literature, the mass media and so on. The standard varieties are therefore

associated with high status and prestige, and are the yardstick by which the non-standard contact varieties are judged. The sociolinguistic situations in which contact varieties function are in fact similar in many respects to cases of diglossia. As in the classic cases first identified by Ferguson (1958), such situations are characterised simultaneously by socially based differences in speakers' linguistic repertoires and by functional or stylistic specialisation of the varieties employed. Moreover, this functional differentiation has a socio-cultural value, in that the standard (High, H) variety has superior status and prestige than the vernacular (Low, L) variety. These differences in social evaluation are reinforced by the fact that H is codified as a model of usage, is associated with a literary tradition and with higher learning, and must be acquired at school, as an avenue to social advancement. None of these applies to L, the creole, which is for the most part ignored and denied any role in public life.

As Tabouret-Keller (1978) points out, "diglossia has become synonymous with the inequality of the roles which each of the languages present in a complex situation could serve, and of the corresponding inequality of values which each of them represents" (p. 139; my translation). This inequality has consequences for the linguistic status of the contact varieties, as well as for the social functions they fulfil.

6.1. Questions of status

Creoles have been particularly susceptible to negative treatment and evaluation of their status as languages. Among the exceptions are the Pacific creoles, Tok Pisin, Bislama and Solomon Islands Pijin, which enjoy more recognition and status because of the unifying function they fulfil in situations of extreme linguistic heterogeneity. In the vast majority of cases, creoles co-exist alongside their lexifier language, which functions as the official language. In such situations, as De Camp (1971: 26) pointed out, "the creole is especially unlikely to be granted status as a real language", and tends to be "inseparably associated with poverty, ignorance and lack of moral character."

Similar kinds of evaluation seem to apply to the contact varieties of English used in places like Singapore, Malaysia, Fiji, Australia, and various countries in West Africa, all of which co-exist with local standard varieties. In these situations, the contact variety is viewed as a deviant, even corrupt version of the standard, and is not accepted as an autonomous system in its own right. This is further encouraged by the fact that such situations involve a great deal of variability between standard and non-standard varieties, leading to linguistic continua in which the boundaries between the

two varieties are difficult to determine. However, this conception of creole and other continua is really an artefact of the way patterns of variation have been described, particularly in quantitative sociolinguistic studies. It is true, of course, that there are correlations between linguistic variation and social stratification in these societies, with creole features being linked to speakers of lower social status, and standard features to those higher up in the social hierarchy. It is one thing to recognise this, but quite another to claim that the variation occurs within a single grammar or linguistic system. The creole continuum is, in fact, a purely sociolinguistic phenomenon similar to other continua that have arisen between quite distinct languages, for example in bilingual border communities in Europe, or in cases of diglossia such as German-speaking Switzerland or Arabic communities in the Middle East. In all of these cases, the intricate patterns of lexical, phonological and grammatical variation that have arisen are due to interaction between two quite distinct linguistic systems. However, the very fact of variability has encouraged the view that the non-standard varieties have no separate status.

Situations like these remind us that the status of a language variety is not solely, or even primarily, a linguistic question, but involves socio-political, historical, and socio-cultural considerations as well. In situations where contact varieties co-exist with unrelated official languages, for example Papiamentu in the Dutch Antilles, or Sranan Tongo in Dutch-official Suriname, their status as autonomous languages is not in question. It is interesting that such languages (unlike most creoles) tend to have names of their own. In the Francophone Caribbean, where French-lexicon creoles are side by side with French as the official language, there is also greater recognition of the autonomy of the creole vernaculars, and scholars often refer to these situations as 'bilingual'. Haitian Creole now has its own official orthography, and is being increasingly used in public communication. The French-lexicon creoles of St. Lucia and Dominica, where English is the official language, have also gained recognition as languages of national identity. However, despite this, these contact languages do not stand in a relationship of equality with the official languages.

6.2. Attitudes to contact varieties

Systematic investigation of language attitudes by Mühleisen (1993) for Trinidad and Beckford-Wassink (1999) for Jamaica reveal that social evaluation of the respective contact varieties is more complex and ambiguous than earlier assumed. While speakers agree that the standard variety is appropriate for more formal and public use, they still attach

positive value to the contact variety as a badge of solidarity and identity, and as the language of intimate personal relationships. This tension between the overt evaluation of standard varieties as superior and the covert sense of pride in the contact variety is slowly being resolved – at least in some communities – in favour of more tolerant views of contact varieties and their place in their societies. This extends even to the increasing tendency for the public to view contact varieties as legitimate languages. For instance, Beckford-Wassink (1999: 66) found that 90 percent of informants in a language attitude survey regarded Jamaican Creole as a distinct language, basing their judgments primarily on lexicon and accent. The changes in attitude have been due to several factors: the growing sense of nationalism in these communities since independence; the emergence of a substantial body of scholarship that demonstrates the validity of the contact varieties as languages in their own right; the growing tendency to use the contact language in literary works; and the readiness of the powers-that-be to allow its use in contexts such as education.

6.3. Contact languages in literature and other media

As Schneider (2010: 375) points out,

Another sign of the newly-established self-confidence that comes with new nationhood and the cultural acceptance of indigenous language forms and cultural habits is the appearance of literary productivity in a New English variety.

In the Caribbean, the use of creole in literature and other written media has expanded greatly within the last few decades. Well-known literary figures such as Vidia Naipaul and Earl Lovelace in Trinidad, Louise Bennett in Jamaica and others have exploited the resources of the creoles to evoke the distinctively Caribbean voice of their characters. Similarly, in many countries of Asia and Africa, writers such as Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka, Amy Tan and others "have produced highly influential and acclaimed artistic products which employ and reflect local language habits" (Schneider 2010: 375). In addition, translation of other literature such as the Bible into creole and other contact languages has contributed to the lexical and stylistic elaboration of these languages. As Mühleisen (2005) points out, literature and creative writing in creole have played an important role in the negotiation of creoles as 'legitimate' varieties, not least by contributing to the establishment of orthographic conventions. In addition, the growing acceptance of contact varieties has been reflected in the

expansion of their use in the mass media and in public communication in general. For instance, in Suriname, Sranan Tongo is now used exclusively by some community radio stations, and is increasingly used in communication between the government and the people, in areas such as health, taxes, and of course politics. Sranan is also used in certain forms of popular music, such as Kawina and Kaseka (Arends and Carlin 2002: 285). There is even a creole version of the national anthem. Similarly, in the Dutch Antilles, Papiamentu competes with Dutch in the written media and is used almost exclusively in radio and TV broadcasts (Kouwenberg 2006: 2107). Similar developments have taken place all over the Caribbean.

In short, speakers of these contact languages have become increasingly proud and accepting of them, though they are still far from being adopted as official languages, and are still not fully standardised. Most of them still lack official orthographies, or dictionaries and grammars, a fact that militates against their use in the domain of education.

6.4. Contact languages in education

Problems relating to educational policy are shared by many communities where contact varieties are acquired as first languages and used as everyday vernaculars. The debate over the use of the contact varieties as media of instruction dates back to the 1970s in the Caribbean, and has been repeated, for example, in Hawaii in the 1980s (Watson-Gegeo 1994), in many countries of the 'outer circle' of English such as Singapore and Hong Kong (Kachru 1997), and most recently in the US with respect to African American Vernacular English or Ebonics. Governments have become more supportive of the idea of using creole as a medium of instruction in the schools, and indeed in public education as a whole. Both in Trinidad and Jamaica, for example, educational policy calls for maintaining English as the official language, while promoting the oral use of the creole at school in the early years of primary education. Eventually, such policies may be extended to include the use of creole as both the medium of instruction, and the language in which literacy is first taught, as is happening in bilingual creole situations such as that in the Dutch Antilles. Indeed, the Jamaican government approved the establishment of the Jamaican Language Unit at the University of the West Indies, and permitted it to implement a bilingual education experiment in three public elementary schools in 2004. The four year project yielded somewhat positive results, but so far has not led to wider implementation of the bilingual policy. (See Carpenter and Devonish 2010 for an assessment of the project's achievements.)

The situation in Haiti is an instructive illustration of the disastrous consequences of a language education policy that ignores totally the linguistic reality of a society. According to Hebblethwaite (2012) Creole is natively spoken by all 10 million Haitians, while French is spoken by less than 500,000 members of the elite. French-language dominance in Haitian schools adversely impacts millions of children and it is the source of broad societal inefficiency. The effects of the current educational policy are devastating: According to recent records from the Haitian government's statistics bureau, 61% of the population over the age of 10 is illiterate; the rural rate is 80.5% and the urban rate is 47.1% (Hebblethwaite 2012: 267). Contrasting strongly with Haiti is the situation in Curacao, where the private Papiamentu primary and secondary school, Kolegio Erasmo, has operated successfully since 1987 and has proved itself to be a worthy model for the expansion of first-language education on that island (Dijkhoff and Pereira 2010: 252). The use of the students' native language has resulted in a much higher success rate than found among students educated in Dutch (Dijkhoff and Pereira 2010: 253). In 2003 the government of the Netherlands Antilles announced plans to include Papiamentu through the university level and use the Kolegio Erasmo as a pilot school.

In order for this kind of educational policy to work, language planners must address problems of status planning (code selection and the assignment of new functions to the vernaculars), corpus planning (codification and elaboration), and implementation of the new policy. Deciding which variety to codify and what orthography to use continues to pose the greatest problems. While orthographies have been proposed by linguists for varieties such as Jamaican and Belize Creole, they have not been generally accepted by the public. Resolution of the problem of the orthography will go a long way toward establishing the autonomy of the creoles. It seems to be only a matter of time before at least some contact varieties finally assert themselves as distinctive languages with their own history, and achieve the prestige and recognition they deserve.

Notes

1. Meakins also observes that a similar mixed language, Light Warlpiri, arose in an Aboriginal community close to the Gurundji. It also combines an Indigenous language (Warlpiri) with Kriol (O'Shannessy 2009).
2. Tsotsitaal is a compound made up of *tsotsi* and *taal*, which means 'language.' Glaser (2000: 50) suggests that the term 'tsotsi' was coined around 1943–1944 to refer to the style of urban youths, including gang members, but notes that many people view tsotsis as harmless adherents to fashion. Others say that the term derives from the Sotho verb *go tsotsa* 'to rob'.

References

- Abdulaziz, Mohamed H. & Ken Osinde. 1997. Sheng and Engsh: development of mixed codes among the urban youth in Kenya. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 125. 43–63.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2004. The evolution of Singapore English: Finding the matrix. In Lisa Lim (ed.), *Singapore English: A Grammatical Description*, 129–164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arends, Jacques. 1995. Demographic factors in the formation of Sranan. In Jacques Arends (ed.), *The Early Stages of Creolization*, 233–85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arends, Jacques. 2001. Social stratification and network relations in the formation of Sranan. In Norval Smith & Tonjes Veenstra (eds.), *Creolization and Contact*, 291–307. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arends, Jacques & Carlin, Eithne B. 2002. The languages of Suriname today and tomorrow. In Eithne B. Carlin & Jacques Arends, (eds.), *Atlas of the Languages of Suriname*, 283–286. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Augustinos, Gerasimos. 1992. *The Greeks of Asia Minor: Confession, Community, and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Avram, Andrei A. 2010. An outline of Romanian Pidgin Arabic. *Journal of Language Contact. Varia* 3. 20–38.
- Bakir, Murtadha J. 2010. Notes on the verbal system of Gulf Pidgin Arabic. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 25(2). 201–228.
- Bakker, Peter. 1997. *A Language of Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bakker, Peter. 2003. Mixed languages as autonomous systems. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*, 107–150. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beckford-Wassink, Alicia. 1999. Historic low prestige and seeds of change: Attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. *Language in Society* 28(1). 57–92.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7. 173–88.
- Carpenter, Karen & Hubert Devonish. 2010. Swimming against the tide. Jamaican Creole in education. In Bettina Migge, Isabelle Léglise & Angela Bartens (eds.), *Creoles in Education. An appraisal of Current Programs and Projects*, 167–181. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Childs, G. Tucker. 1997. The status of Isicamtho, an Nguni-based urban variety of Soweto. In Arthur Spears & Donald Winford (eds.), *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles*, 341–370. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clark, Ross. 1983. Social contexts of early South Pacific pidgins. In Ellen Woolford & William Washabaugh (eds.), *The Social Contexts of Creolization*, 10–27. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Crosby, Alfred W. 1986. *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawkins, Richard M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Gruiter, Miel. 1994. Javindo, a contact language in pre-war Semarang. In Peter Bakker & Maarten Mous (eds.), *Mixed languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining*, 151–159. Amsterdam: Uitgave IFOTT.
- Dijkhoff, Marta & Joyce Pereira. 2010. Language and education in Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao. In Bettina Migge, Isabelle Léglise & Angela Bartens (eds.), *Creoles in Education: An Appraisal of Current Programs and Projects*, 237–272. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diaz-Campos, Manuel & Clancy Clements. 2008. A creole origin for Barlovento Spanish? A linguistic and sociohistorical inquiry. *Language in Society* 37. 351–383.
- Drechsel, Emanuel J. 1996. Native American contact languages of the contiguous United States. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas, Vol. II. 2*, 1213–1239. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dutton, Tom. 1983. Birds of a feather: A pair of rare pidgins from the Gulf of Papua. In Ellen Woolford & William Washabaugh (eds.), *The Social Context of Creolization*, 77–105. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1958. Diglossia. *Word* 15. 325–340.
- Foley, William A. 1988. Language birth: The processes of pidginization and creolization. In Frederick Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey Vol. 2*, 162–183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Glaser, C. 2000. *Bo-tsotsi: The Youth Gangs of Soweto, 1935–1976 (Social history of Africa)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Golovko, Evgeniy V. 2003. Language contact and group identity: The role of ‘folk’ linguistic engineering. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*, 177–207. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Golovko, Evgeniy V. & Nikolai B. Vakhtin. 1990. Aleut in contact: the CIA enigma. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 22. 97–125.
- Gumperz, John J. & Robert Wilson. 1971. Convergence and creolization: a case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border in India. In Dell H. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 151–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gupta, Anthea F. 1997. Colonisation, migration, and functions of English. In Edgar W. Schneider (ed.), *Englishes Around the World: Vol. 1, General Studies, British Isles, North America*, 47–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1966. *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Ithaca, NJ: Cornell University Press.
- Hancock, Ian. 1984. Shelta and Polari. In Peter Trudgill (ed.), *Language in the British Isles*, 384–403. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Harris, John W. 1991. Kriol – the creation of a new language. In Suzanne Romaine (ed.), *Language in Australia*, 195–203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hebblethwaite, Benjamin. 2012. French and underdevelopment, Haitian Creole and development: Educational language policy problems and solutions in Haiti. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 27(2). 255–302.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hosali, Priya. 1992. Syntactic peculiarities of Butler English. *South Asian Language Review* 2(2). 58–74.
- Hussainmiya, Bachamiya Abdul. 1987. *Lost Cousins: The Malays of Sri Lanka*. Bangi: Institut Bahasa, Kesusasteraan dan Kebudayaan Melayu, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Hymes, Dell. 1971. General conceptions of process: Introduction. In Dell H. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 65–90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1938. Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques entre des langues. Actes du Quatrième Congrès Internationale de Linguistes, 48–59. Reprinted in *Selected Writings, Vol. 1*, 234–246. The Hague: Mouton.
- Janse, Mark. to appear. The Cappadocian Dialect. In Christos Tzitzilis (ed.), *Modern Greek Dialects*, Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation).
- Kachru, Braj B. 1997. World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17. 66–87.
- Kallen, Jeffrey L. 1997. Irish English and World English: Lexical perspectives. In Edgar W. Schneider (ed.), *Englishes Around the World. Vol. 1. General Studies, British Isles, North America*, 139–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kenrick, Donald. 1976–1977. Romanies in the Middle East. *Roma* 1(4). 5–8; 2(1). 30–36; 2(2). 3–39.
- Kießling, Roland & Maarten Mous. 2004. Urban youth languages in Africa. *Anthropological Linguistics* 46(3). 303–341.
- King, Ruth. 2000. *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing: A Prince Edward Island Case Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1997. The Basic Variety. Or: Couldn't natural language be much simpler? *Second Language Research* 13(4). 301–47.
- Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2006. Dutch-speaking Caribbean. In Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier & Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* 3, 2105–2114. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lewis, Glyn E. 1978. Types of bilingual communities. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*, 19–34. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Loveday, Leo J. 1996. *Language Contact in Japan: A Socio-linguistic History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Malcolm, Ian G. 2008. Australian creoles and Aboriginal English: phonetics and phonology. In Kate Burridge & Bernd Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australia*, 124–141. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2003. Mixed Languages: Re-examining the structural prototype. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*, 151–176. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1988. Mix-im-up: Aboriginal codeswitching old and new. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 97–124. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McWhorter, John H. 2000. *The Missing Spanish Creoles: Recovering the Birth of Plantation Contact Languages*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Meakins, Felicity. 2008. Land, language and identity: The socio-political origins of Gurindji Kriol. In Miriam Meyerhoff & Naomi Nagy (eds.), *Social Lives in Language*, 69–94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Meakins, Felicity. 2010. Which mix – code-switching or a mixed language? – Gurindji Kriol. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 27(1). 105–140.
- Migge, Bettina. 2003. *Creole Formation as Language Contact*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mintz, Sidney W. 1971. The socio-historical background to pidginization and creolization. In Dell H. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 481–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mous, Maarten. 1994. Ma'á or Mbugu. In Peter Bakker & Maarten Mous (eds.), *Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining*, 175–200. Amsterdam: Uitgave IFOTT.
- Mous, Maarten. 2003. The linguistic properties of lexical manipulation and its relevance for Ma'á. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*, 209–235. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mühleisen, Susanne. 1993. *Attitudes Towards Language Varieties in Trinidad*. Berlin: Free University Berlin MA thesis.
- Mühleisen, Susanne. 2005. Introduction: creole languages in creole literatures: status and standardization. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 20(1) (Special Issue edited by S. Mühleisen). 1–14.
- Müller, Friedrich Max. 1875. *Lectures on the Science of Language, Vol. 1*. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1981. Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: The case for relexification. In Arnold Highfield & Albert Valdman (eds.), *Historicity and Variation in Creole Studies*, 52–78. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Nordhoff, Sebastian. 2009. *A Grammar of Upcountry Sri Lanka Malay*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam dissertation.
- Odlin, Terence. 1997. *Hiberno-English: Pidgin, creole, or neither?* (CLCS Occasional Paper 49). Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
- O'Shannessy, Carmel. 2009. Language variation and change in a north Australian Indigenous community. In Dennis R. Preston & James N. Stanford (eds.),

- Variationist Approaches to Indigenous Minority Languages*, 419–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Platt, John, Heidi Weber & Mian Lian Ho. 1983. *Singapore and Malaysia. Varieties of English Around the World. Text Series, Vol. 4*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Poplack, Shana. 1987. Contrasting patterns of code switching in two communities. In Erling Wande, Jan Anward, Bengt Nordberg, Lars Steensland & Mats Thelander (eds.), *Aspects of Multilingualism: Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Symposium on Bilingualism 1984* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis), 51–77. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Rickford, John Russell & Jerome Handler. 1994. Textual evidence on the nature of early Barbadian speech, 1675–1835. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 9. 221–255.
- Roberts, Sarah Julianne. 1998. The role of diffusion in the genesis of Hawaiian Creole. *Language* 74(1). 1–39.
- Roberts, Sarah Julianne. 2000. Nativization and the genesis of Hawaiian Creole. In John H. McWhorter (ed.), *Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles*, 257–300. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1996. Contact-induced change and the comparative method: Cases from Papua New Guinea. In Mark Durie & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The Comparative Method Reviewed: Regularity and Irregularity in Language Change*, 180–217. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2010. Developmental patterns of English: similar or different? In Andy Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*, 372–384. New York: Routledge.
- Sessarego, Sandro. to appear. On the non-creole bases for Afro-Bolivian Spanish. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*.
- Siegel, Jeff. 1998. Substrate reinforcement and dialectal differences in Melanesian Pidgin. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2. 347–373.
- Siegel, Jeff. 1999. Transfer constraints and substrate influence in Melanesian Pidgin. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 14. 1–44.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2000. Substrate influence in Hawai'i Creole English. *Language in Society* 29. 197–236.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2008. *The Emergence of Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Singler, John. 1986. Short note. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 1. 141–145.
- Singler, John. 1988. The homogeneity of the substrate as a factor in pidgin/creole genesis. *Language* 64. 27–51.
- Singler, John. 1995. The demographics of creole genesis in the Caribbean: A comparison of Martinique and Haiti. In Jacques Arends (ed.), *The Early Stages of Creolization*, 203–232. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Singler, John. 2008. The sociohistorical context of creole genesis. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John Singler (eds.), *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies*, 332–358. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Slabbert, Sarah & Carol Myers-Scotton. 1996. The structure of Tsotsitaal and Iscamtho: code switching and in-group identity in South African townships. *Linguistics* 34. 317–342.
- Smith, Ian R. 1979a. Convergence in South Asia: A creole example. *Lingua* 48. 193–222.
- Smith, Ian R. 1979b. Substrata versus universals in the formation of Sri Lanka Portuguese. In Peter Mühlhäusler (ed.), *Papers in Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, no. 2* (Pacific Linguistic Series A No. 57), 183–200. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Smith, Ian R. to appear. Diglossia in Sri Lanka Portuguese: the role of Anglophone missionaries. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*.
- Smith, Ian R. & Scott Paauw. 2006. Sri Lanka Malay: Creole or convert? In Ana Deumert & Stephanie Durrleman (eds.), *Structure and Variation in Language Contact*, 159–181. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Strong, W. M. 1911. The Maisin language. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 41. 381–396.
- Tabouret-Keller, Andrée. 1978. Bilingualisme et diglossie dans le domaine des créoles français. *Etudes Créoles* 1. 135–153.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. 1997. A typology of contact languages. In Arthur Spears & Donald Winford (eds.), *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles*, 71–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2003. Social factors and linguistic processes in the emergence of stable mixed languages. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*, 21–39. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thurston, William R. 1987. *Processes of change in the languages of Northwest New Britain* (Pacific Linguistics Series B, 99). Canberra, Australia: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University.
- Thurston, William R. 1994. Renovation and innovation in the languages of Northwestern New Britain. In Tom Dutton & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Language Contact and Change in the Austronesian World*, 573–609. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1999. Borrowing and shift-induced interference: Contrasting patterns in French-Germanic contact in Brussels and Strasbourg. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 2(1). 1–22.
- Walters, Joel. 2005. *Bilingualism: The Sociopragmatic/Psycholinguistic Interface*. Mahwah, NJ and London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. 1994. Language and education in Hawai'i: Socio-political and economic implications of Hawai'i Creole English. In Marcyliena Morgan (ed.), *Language and the Social Construction of Reality in Creole Situations*, 101–120. Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies Publications.

- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and problems* (New York: Linguistic Circle of New York). The Hague: Mouton.
- Winford, Donald. 2005. Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22(2). 373–427.
- Zenk, Henry Benjamin. 1984. *Chinook Jargon and Native Cultural Persistence in the Grand Ronde Indian Community, 1856–1907: A Special Case of Creolization*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon dissertation.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Subject index

- adjective, 36, 41, 93, 97, 100, 107, 108, 111, 119, 120, 167, 170, 177, 210, 305, 311, 375
- adolescent, 11, 231, 233, 234, 247, 249, 268, 269, 270, 375
- adolescents, 229, 244
- adposition, 18, 34, 36, 37, 46, 113, 122, 123, 124, 125, 170, 173, 176, 177, 188, 190, 197, 202, 204, 205, 207, 208, 216, 252, 253, 286, 290, 313, 375, 377, 384
- adstrate language, 41, 67, 68, 74, 83, 85, 88, 92, 93, 127, 128, 131, 159
- allochtones. *See* immigrants
- alloglottography, 275, 281, 314, 318, 320, 324
- aspect, 30, 40, 42, 46, 68, 94, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 165, 174, 197, 202, 203, 206, 209, 384, 391, 397
- attitudes, 234, 253, 259, 371, 407
- bilingualism, 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 168, 171, 187, 191, 194, 200, 213, 217, 218, 235, 239, 260, 273, 280, 291, 299, 301, 302, 303, 305, 315, 318, 321, 323, 336, 342, 343, 346, 347, 348, 363, 364, 368, 373, 376, 378, 381, 382, 383, 386, 392, 397, 406, 408
- borrowing, 2, 10, 11, 114, 159, 166, 167, 181, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 195, 205, 206, 240, 245, 333, 335, 342, 343, 344, 345, 347, 349, 350, 357, 366, 378, 381, 382, 395
- classification, 8, 11, 160, 166, 180, 273, 276, 317, 333, 335, 338, 341, 343, 344, 356, 358, 366, 395
- codeswitching, 1, 10, 159, 160, 172, 173, 174, 181, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 193, 195, 197, 198, 199, 201, 204, 205, 206, 211, 212, 213, 214, 217, 218, 235, 238, 239, 262, 264, 273, 369, 370, 371, 372, 375, 381
- comparative method, 11, 333, 334, 335, 336, 347, 349, 354, 356, 358
- comparison
lexical, 345, 350, 354, 355, 356
structural, 345, 354, 356
- complexity, 6, 15, 17, 39, 45, 79, 80, 289, 317
- computational phylogenetics, 12, 351
- consonant, 84, 85, 90, 210, 289, 319, 336, 349
- contact, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 44, 49, 50, 52, 65, 66, 67, 76, 77, 78, 85, 92, 93, 100, 123, 132, 165, 174, 177, 178, 180, 188, 189, 197, 201, 205, 209, 216, 217, 232, 264, 273, 275, 277, 285, 295, 298, 313, 321, 322, 323, 324, 333, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 341, 343, 344, 345, 348, 350, 351, 352, 353, 355, 356, 357, 358, 364, 365, 366, 368, 371, 375, 381, 382, 383, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391, 392, 399, 400, 401
- convergence, 3, 7, 88, 178, 182, 192, 217, 218, 348, 350, 369, 384, 388
- converted languages, 12, 178, 385
- copula, 37, 100, 107, 190, 247, 297
- copying, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 287, 288, 294, 311, 313, 323
- creole, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 22, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 47, 49, 53, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 160, 166, 171, 174, 180, 181, 184, 185, 186, 190, 193, 205, 217,