Morphology in Creole Genesis: Linguistics and Ideology

In Michael Kenstowicz, ed.,

Ken Hale: A Life in Language,

Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2001, pp. 53--121

Michel DeGraff
MIT Linguistics and Philosophy
Cambridge MA 02139-4307

E-mail: degraff@MIT.EDU / Tel: (617) 258-5270

Acknowledgements: This study in pursuit of "reflexive" linguistics (in the sense of Pierre Bourdieu) would not have been possible without the invaluable reflections of colleagues and friends: Jean Robert Cadely, Noam Chomsky, Paul Dejean, Yves Dejean, Dominique Fattier, Ken Hale, Morris Halle, Dimitri Hilton, Tometro Hopkins, Michael Kenstowicz, Antonia MacDonald-Smythe, Alec Marantz, Heliana Mello, Salikoko Mufwene, Wayne O'Neil, Marilene Phipps, Geneva Smitherman, and Adrienne Talamas.

Ken's "life in language" requires insight, dedication, and courage. To me, it is an endless source of inspiration.

Contents

`` ... What matters is eventual success, and that will be measured by the extent to which work on the language is integrated in a meaningful way into the life of the community of people who speak it.'' (Ken Hale)

2.1 A Prolegomenon

In a forthcoming handbook on morphology, Pieter Muysken writes:

> ... [C]reole morphology is a sorely neglected area of study (due to the wide-spread belief that creoles have no morphology to speak of) ... (Muysken, in press)

That is, Creole morphology in and of itself has often been taken to represent nothing new or substantial. This "wide-spread belief" is at the core of the age-old dogma that Creole affixes, if any exist, are either (fossilized or relexified) versions of source-language forms and/or semantically transparent grammaticalizations of lexical items. This belief is most prevalent in "classic" Creole-genesis scenarios that postulate the prior existence of a virtually affixless pidgin. This chapter, specially sections 2.2–2.5, is one small step—a prolegomenon—toward redressing the state of affairs deplored by Muysken, with focus on Haitian Creole (HC). In section 2.6 I peek at methodology and at history to try to understand why Creole morphology came to be so "sorely neglected" and why Creoles are often believed to "have no morphology to speak of." I argue that this belief is empirically and conceptually ill founded while showing that "radical" Creoles need not emerge via pidginization qua a "radical break of transmission" that in the limit eliminates all morphology. I suggest that certain methodological aspects of Creole studies are ultimately rooted in the colonial and neocolonial ideologies that characterize the genesis and development of Creole languages. In section 2.7 I find inspiration in Ken Hale's research and ethos for "integrat[ing work on the language] in a meaningful way into the life of the community of the people who speak it" (cf. Hale 2001). Lessons from history can be used toward improving the future of Creolophones and of Creole studies, as we try to liberate this future from the legacies of the (neo)colonial past.

2.2 Creole Morphology: A "Solid Datum" for Manufacturing "Consensus"?

Over the last three and a half centuries (starting at least as early as Pelleprat 1655) and continuing into the present (as recently as Lefebvre 1998, McWhorter 1998 and Seuren 1998), most descriptions of Creole morphology have become repeated variations on five main themes: (1) incipience, (2) (near) absence, (3) lapidescence, (4) transparence, (5) exclusive substrate correspondence. These themes have been handed down by representatives of nearly every intellectual circle interested in Creole languages: first the European colonists, adventurers, missionaries, and polymaths, followed by a series of amateur and bona fide ethnographers, philologists, and linguists—Creolophones and non-Creolophones, creolists and noncreolists, descriptivists and theoreticians, and so on.[1] I illustrate these themes with relevant quotations. (Throughout this chapter, italic type indicates my own emphasis, not that of the quoted author—except where indicated.)

Incipience In this view, Creoles are linguistic neonates whose morphologies lack the features that characterize "older," more "mature" languages. McWhorter (1998) claims that the alleged morphological features of prototypical Creoles (i.e., absence of tone, inflection and semantically opaque derivation) are

> clear results of a break in transmission followed by a *development period too brief* for the [prototypical Creole] traits to be undone as they have in *older* languages. (McWhorter 1998, 788)

Among the other features alleged to be the exclusive province of "older languages" are the following (overlapping) characteristics: "rich paradigms of derivational affixes [which are] alien to any language known as a creole," "idiosyncratic lexicalizations," "semantically evolved derivation," "evolved idiosyncrasy" whose interpretation requires "a certain degree of metaphorical imagination" and "metaphorical inference" (McWhorter 1998, 796–798, 812, etc.). The traits that McWhorter attributes to "older languages" are reminiscent of those argued by Seuren and Wekker (1986, 68) to belong to "older or more advanced" languages. Such traits constitute what Seuren and Wekker consider to be lexical "luxuries"—namely, "idiosyncratic exceptions," "highly specialized lexical items," and "richer expressive means." Seuren and Wekker (1986, 66, 68) explicitly contrast the "younger or less advanced" (Creole) languages with the "older or more advanced" (non-Creole) languages. McWhorter (1998, 793, 798–799, 809–812, etc.) contrasts Creole languages with "regular" languages. And Seuren (1998, 292) contrasts Creole languages with "sophisticated" languages:

> Creole grammars ... are, in a sense, simplified in that they lack the more

> sophisticated features of languages backed by a rich and extended cultural past and a large, well-organized literate society

Furthermore, Whinnom (1971, 110) considers it likely that Creole languages, because of the limited expressiveness of their post-pidgin (non)morphology, "constitute a handicap to the creole-speaker's personal intellectual development."

> [O]ne feature [of Creole languages] which appears to be seriously impaired by pidginization is the capacity for word-coinage from within the resources of the language: *in the European-"based" pidgins and creoles, derivational affixes and suffixes seem to have lost their original conceptual content and become fossilized.* Obviously there are other devices for word-formation [e.g., periphrases] ... but *what cannot be generated very successfully by the combination of concrete words is abstract terms*, in which it is notorious that pidgins and creoles are deficient. And there are probably upper limits to the number and length of such periphrases.
>
> In other words, there may be some reason to suspect that *the creole-speaker is handicapped by his language.* (Whinnom 1971, 109)

McWhorter's, Seuren's and Whinnom's views are vaguely reminiscent of 19th-century (quasi-)Schleicherian/Darwinian notions of language evolution whereby languages "naturally progress" across a simple-to-complex hierarchy of morphological types (e.g., from monosyllabic to isolating to agglutinative to inflectional). In 'modern' versions of Schleicherian linguistics, it is Creole languages that are equated to the young, primitive and structurally simplest linguistic species. In effect, Creole languages are singled out as living fossils—observable instances of Language at its evolutionary incipience.

(Near) absence This is the point critiqued by Muysken above, namely, the claim that "creoles have no morphology to speak of." Such (near) absence is an alleged consequence of incipience. Perhaps the most explicit proposal along such lines is found in Seuren and Wekker's (1986) essay on semantic transparency in Creoles; also see Jespersen (1922:233–234) on Creoles' morphological "vanishing point."[2]

> [T]here is *consensus* [among creolists] on at least one point. It is generally agreed that creole languages have little or no morphology. ... [T]he *absence (or extreme poverty) of morphology in creole languages* seems to be a *solid datum* and *a highly significant one.* (Seuren and Wekker 1986, 61)
>
> [M]orphology [is] *essentially alien* to creole languages. (Seuren and Wekker 1986, 66)

This is reminiscent of an earlier claim by D'Ans (1968, 26) in the particular context of HC: "[I]t is *logically impossible* for [Haitian] Creole to manifest [derivational] processes."

Seuren (1998, 292–293) raises (near) absence of morphology to the status of a "historical universal":

> Historical universal I: If a language has a Creole origin it is SVO, has TMA particles, has *virtually no morphology*, etc.

Lapidescence Lapidescence is related to (near) absence: Creole morphology is (nearly) absent because (most of) the affixes in the source languages have been reduced to "fossils." Therefore, Creoles are by and large morphologically unproductive. In the case of HC, the claim is that morphologically complex words in French were adopted in the incipient Creole as morphologically simplex words that have since remained permanently unanalyzed—what Hall (1953) calls *Gallicisms*.

> The three processes of derivation (prefixation, suffixation and compounding) are for the most part *rare* and are found but *scatteringly* in creole, and to a large extent only in *learnèd* words *borrowed* from standard French. ... Suffixation is *particularly* scattering, and occurs *chiefly* in Gallicisms. (Hall 1953, 34, 36)

Aspects of Hall's view have been repeatedly put forward by Valdman, who limits the HC affix set to two productive affixes (1978, 148) and concludes:[3]

> [Derivation] plays only a minor role in the creation of new words. We have noticed only two affixes that today are used for the renewal of the lexical inventory [in HC] ... (Valdman 1978, 148; my translation)

Such claims are echoed by Samarin's (1980, 221) argument that "[t]he greatest handicap that creoles have in morphosemantic adaptation is their morphological simplicity."

Transparence Alongside (near) absence of (inflectional) morphology (see note 2), transparence is viewed as a consequence of alleged incipience. For example, in McWhorter's (1998) view, one exclusive property of "older" (i.e., non-Creole) languages is semantic *ir*regularity in derivational morphology (pp. 798, 812). Given the incipience of Creoles, derivational affixes (should a Creole have any) must be the product of recent grammaticalization of erstwhile freestanding lexical items. Because of their youth, these recently grammaticalized affixes still conserve the transparent semantics of their unbound ancestors. As a result, Creole derivational affixes cannot manifest the sort of idiosyncratic lexicalizations that are commonplace in "older" languages. Such reasoning leads McWhorter (1998, 809) to argue that, as a radical Creole, HC has "derivational affixes whose semantic contribution is *consistently* transparent." (The determining role of morphological transparency in shaping the "young" Creole lexicon goes back at least to Saint-Quentin 1872 and Hjelmslev 1938; also see Seuren and Wekker 1986.)

Exclusive substrate correspondence In this view, the inventory and characteristics of HC morphological processes are bounded by substrate morphology. Lefebvre (1998, chap. 10) explicitly argues that HC affixes are by and large inherited from, and identical to, Fongbe affixes, modulo pronunciation.

> [T]he inventory of productive affixes in [HC] reduces to ten or eleven. (Lefebvre 1988, 311)
>
> [T]here is a [virtual] one-to-one correspondence between [HC] and Fongbe affixes. (Lefebvre 1988, 333)

Creole studies are usually rife with debates. But morphology may constitute one domain of rare consensus. Indeed, if there is any semblance of a consensus on Creole synchrony and diachrony among the five tenets above, it is that Creoles are, at best, morphologically simple to an exceptional degree (when Creole morphology is productive, it is consistently and optimally transparent) and/or relatively simple to account for from a diachronic perspective (Creole morphology derives most of its combinatoric substance from the substrate).

Given these tenets, pieces of HC morphology (if any) must fall in one of four classes: they are (1) (nearly) absent: "no morphology to speak of," in Muysken's (in press) words; (2) virtually "invisible," i.e., transparent: all derivational affixes combine with transparent (presumably, compositional) semantics; (3) Gallicisms qua fossilized inheritances from French; (4) Africanisms qua substrate retentions with lexifier-derived phonetics (via relexification).

In each case, Creole morphology is argued to be a structural reflex of the short history (the "incipience") of Creole languages and/or the *sui generis* sociohistorical context of Creole genesis. It is along such lines that "creole morphology [has become] a sorely neglected area of study" (Muysken, in press).[4] Yet note that such reductive views of Creole morphology lead to the following paradox: either Creole creators have the exceptional capacity to create languages with "perfect" (i.e., optimally transparent) morphology or they are incapable of going beyond the word structure of some subset of ancestral languages or etymological fossils thereof.

2.3 Haitian Creole Morphology: Facts versus Myths

Do the claims in section 2.2 reach any level of observational adequacy? In DeGraff 2000b, I offer a representative HC sample for an affix set that is more elaborate than Lefebvre's "ten or eleven" affixes and Valdman's "two affixes." The sample suggests that the orthodoxy expressed in section 2.2—that Creole morphology is absent, extraordinarily reduced, simple and/or substrate-bound—is empirically unsubstantiated. For the purposes of this chapter, I present a sample of the data and discussion from DeGraff 2000a. I show that the received theories on Creole morphology in no way describe HC.

What might HC morphology *really* look like? The short passage in (1b) is a fictitious monologue based on the plot in (1a). This monologue was written to realistically and economically illustrate a sample of HC derivational processes within a suitable discourse context. The narrative is imaginary, but it strikes me as conversationally natural and ethnographically appropriate. Furthermore, each of the derivational processes in (1b) is robustly instantiated in HC dictionaries (e.g., Valdman *et al* 1981, Freeman and Laguerre 1996 [1998]) and word lists (e.g., Freeman 1989). In particular, see the monumental etymological database in Fattier's (1998) 6-volume dialect atlas; Fattier's work is precious because it is not only based on spontaneous data from monolingual HC speakers, but it is also rich in Creole neologisms illustrating productive word formation patterns of the sort exemplified below.[5]

(1) a. PLOT:

```
We're on a deserted sidewalk, near a cockfight stadium, in
Wanament, a Haitian town near the border with the Dominican
Republic.  Ti-Yèyèt is a pretty girl from across the
border.  Ti-Sonson is her Haitian lover.  They live
together in Wanament, in plasay ('concubinage')...
Something upsetting just happened.  A terrible affront has
been committed against Ti-Yèyèt's favorite fighting cock.
The culprit is Ti-Jan, the town's best-known griper and
most infamous braggart.  Ti-Sonson exhorts his Haitian
buddies toward revenge against Ti-Jan.  Ti-Yèyèt's honor
must be restored and the offender must pay dearly for his
insults---in a Creole version of Corneille's Le Cid.
```

b. Segment of Ti-Sonson's exhorting monologue:

*Mezanmi wo! Gad***_e_** *yon bòl***_èt_**.
my-friends oh Look-at a lottery

*Ti-Jan, baby***_adò_** **_en_***kout***_ab_** *sa a,* **_de_***respekt***_e_** **_Ti-Yèyèt_**.
Ti-Jan griper foolhardy that the disrespect Ti-Yèyèt

Ti-chouchou *m lan se yon bèl dominik***_èn_** *ki* **_gen_** *yon bèl* **_kòk-batay_**.
Little-darling 1sg the RES-PRON a pretty Dominican+fem who have a beautiful fighting-cock

*Se pa ti admir***_e_** **_Ti-Yèyèt_** *admir***_e_** **_kòk-kriyadò_** *li sa a*
RES-PRON NEG little-bit admire Ti-Yèyèt admire experienced fighting-cock 3sg this/that!

*Men admira***_syon_** *menn***_en_** *tribila***_syon_**.
But admiration bring tribulation

Ti-Jan **_de_***kreta kòk la*
Ti-Jan cut-off-crest cock the

*Epi Vant***_adò_** *a* **_mache-mache_** *grenn***_en_** *koz***_man_** *sa a.*
and braggart the walk-walk shell-out gossip this/that

Fòk n al **_de_***baba djòl***_è_** *sa a — kòrèk***_teman_** *!*
must 1pl go mow-down boaster that the correctly

'Oh, my friends! What nonsense! Ti-Jan, that foolhardy griper, has disrespected Ti-Yèyèt. My sweetheart is a lovely Dominican woman with a splendid fighting-cock. Ti-Yèyèt so much admires her experienced fighting cock. But admiration brings tribulation. Ti-Jan has chopped off its crest. And that braggart has been going around and around spreading gossip. Let's go mow him down—absolutely!'

Here is a sketch of the derivational processes in (1):

(2) a. Prefixation with *de-*, as in **_de_***respekte* 'to disrespect, to insult' (cf. *respekte* 'to respect'), **_de_***kreta* 'to cut off the crest' (cf. *krèt* `n.` 'crest') and **_de_***baba* 'to mow down' (cf. *baba* `adj.` 'mute'; variant of *bèbè*).

b. Prefixation with *en-* as in **_en_***koutab* `adj.` 'foolhardy (cf. *koute* 'to listen').

c. Prefixation with *ti-*, as in **_Ti-_***Yèyèt*, **_Ti-_***Sonson* and **_ti-_***chouchou* n. 'little darling'.

d. Suffixation with *-ab*, as in *enkout***_ab_** (cf. (2b)).

e. Suffixation with *-adò*, as in *baby***_adò_** `n.` 'griper' (cf. *babye* 'to whine'), *vant***_adò_** `n.` 'braggart' (cf. *vante* 'to brag') and *kriy***_adò_** `adj.` 'old, experienced' (see

Spanish *cri**ado*** 'experienced' and *cria**dor*** 'one who trains, breeds, raises, nurtures'). Also see HC *kriyadò* 'chronic weeper'; cf. *kriye* 'to weep'.

f. Suffixation with *-ay* (variant: *-aj*), as in *plas**ay*** (variant: *plas**aj***) `n.` 'concubinage' (cf. *plase* 'to live in concubinage').

g. Suffixation with *-è*, as in *djòl**è*** `n.` 'boaster' (cf. *djòl* `n.` 'mouth').

h. Suffixation with verbal marker *-e(n)*, as in *gad**e*** 'to look', *admir**e*** 'to admire', *menn**en*** 'to bring', *mach**e*** 'to walk' (cf. *mach* `n.` 'march, step (stairs)'), *grenn**en*** 'to shell out' (cf. *grenn* `n.` 'grain').

i. Suffixation plus gender inflection with *-en/-èn*, as in the pair *Dominik**en**/Dominik**èn*** `n.` (cf. *Dominikani* `n.` 'Dominican Republic').

j. Suffixation with *-èt*, as in *bòl**èt*** `n.` 'lottery' (cf. *bòl* 'bowl, lottery number formed by two identical digits' (Freeman and Laguerre 1996 [1998]) and *boul(-bòlèt)* 'lottery number, ball'; also see Spanish *boleto/boleta* '(lottery) ticket, ballot' and *bola* 'ball'; cf. the lottery balls used in determining winning numbers).

k. Suffixation with *-man*, as in *koz**man*** `n.` 'talk, gossip' (cf. *koze* 'to talk').

l. Suffixation with *-man*, as in *kòrèk**teman*** `adv.` (cf. *kòrèk* `adj.` 'correct').

m. Suffixation with *-syon*, as in *admira**syon*** (cf *admire* 'to admire') and *tribila**syon*** 'tribulation' (cf. ?*tribile*: there is no actual word *tribile*, at least not in the dialects that I am familiar witih).

n. Compounding, as in ***kòk-batay*** 'fighting cock'.

o. Reduplication, as in *Ti-**Yèyè**t*, *Ti-**Sonson***, *ti-**chouchou*** 'little darling' (affectionate), and ***mache-mache*** 'to walk a lot' (intensifying).

p. Apocope, as in *gen* which is the short form of *gen**yen***.

Ti-Sonson's speech in (1) and the preliminary sampling of HC affixes in (2) contradict the oft-repeated claims that HC morphology is either virtually absent (e.g., Hall 1953, 34, 36; d'Ans 1968, 26, Whinnom 1971, 109f, Seuren and Wekker 1986, Seuren 1998, 292–293, and McWhorter 1998, 810), consistently transparent (e.g., McWhorter 1998, 809, 812), limited to two productive affixes (e.g., Valdman 1978, 148), reducible by and large to unproductive Gallicisms or "pseudo-French" hypercorrections (e.g., Hall 1953, 34, 36; Valdman 1978, 23; 1979, 99; 1987, 120; 1988, 75; 1989, 59), or limited to 10 or 11 affixes that are mostly inherited from the substrate (e.g., Lefebvre 1998, 311, 333). In this 58-word speech plus the word *plas**ay*** in (1a), we grosso modo have at least 16 different types and some 30-ish examples (word tokens) of derivational processes (see bold-faced strings in (1b)). So, roughly speaking, every other HC word in (1) is morphologically complex, including a fair number of lexical-innovation candidates, that is, HC words with no apparent counterparts in French.[6] HC is obviously not on a morphological par with Bantu or Algonquian, but then again neither are English, French, and Fongbe; and the latter are all non-Creole languages (i.e., languages considered to be "regular," "normal" ,"old" and "advanced" in Valdman's, Seuren and Wekker's and McWhorter's terminologies).

Let us now revisit previous conclusions on HC morphology, starting with those of Lefebvre (1998, chap. 10).[7] Out of the 16 derivational processes illustrated in (1)–(2), Lefebvre addresses only about half in her pro-relexification arguments; also see page *** and note 18 for yet two other HC suffixes missing from Lefebvre's treatment, namely *ès* as in *titès* 'childhood' (cf. *ti* 'small') and *-te* as in *bèlte* 'beauty' (cf. *bèl* 'beautiful'). (Chaudenson (1996) provides a critique of Lefebvre's general methodology.) Regarding the data in (1)–(2) and in note 18, Lefebvre has no account for the *productive* affixes *en-*, *-ab*, *-adò*, *-èt*, (nominalizing) *-man*, *-syon*, *-ès*, *-te*, reduplication, gender inflection. In fact, Lefebvre explicitly states that, other than the 11 affixes treated in her chapter on morphology, she considers all HC candidate affixes to be fossilized. That is, any candidate affix that is not one of the 11 affixes she has identified as "native" is actually part of a simplex HC word. Lefebvre (1998, 311) claims, for example, that all HC words with *yon* endings, which correspond to "derived words in French, have entered Haitian as simplexes and are therefore listed individually" (p. 311). As I will show, Lefebvre's argument is somewhat related to Valdman's discarding various affixation instances from HC grammar as "nonexistent derivatives formed by adjoining occurring French suffixes to the 'wrong' [HC] stems" (1988, 75)—what Valdman calls "pseudo-French hypercorrections" (see section 2.4 below).

In section 2.4, I address the specifics of Valdman's claims, then I simultaneously critique both his and Lefebvre's arguments on what counts as a "native" HC suffix. In section 2.5, I turn to McWhorter's (1998) claims about a structurally defined Creole prototype. The combined result of these case studies is to show that the "solid datum" alleged in section 2.2 about Creole morphology is actually nonexistent; thus, the points of "consensus" outlined in section 2.2 are empirically untenable. In section 2.6, I also show that, once examined in light of their methodology and history, these points of "consensus" seem related to a particular ideology with well established antecedents that go as far back as the very inception of Creole studies.

2.4 Haitian Creole Morphology in the Creole Life Cycle: On Decreolization and Relexification

Let us look at the details of the repeated claims that HC derivational morphology has few productive affixes (see, e.g., Valdman 1978, 148). According to superficial analyses of HC morphology, when an HC word has a potentially affixal ending (*-syon*, say, as in *adorasyon* 'adoration') with an existing French counterpart (e.g., French *adoration*), then the corresponding HC word is considered an unanalyzed simplex loan-word from French (Valdman 1978, 131, 139, 142,etc). In other words, HC *adorasyon*, unlike French *adoration* (and unlike English *adoration*), is understood to lack internal structure. Similar arguments are advanced by Hall (1953, 34, 36), D'Ans (1968, 26), and Lefebvre (1998, 311).

What about HC words ending in *syon* that have no French counterparts? Valdman counts such HC X*syon* words (e.g., *vivasyon* 'subsistence' and *desidasyon* 'decision' in (3a)) as "pseudo-French." Not only does Valdman (like Samarin (1980, 221)) consider that HC morphology (or lack thereof) is a structural "obstacle" to HC's "lexical enrichment"; he has repeatedly argued (e.g., 1978, 144, 148, 293; 1987, 111, 120; 1988, 75; 1989, 59.) that one of the structural symptoms of the monolingual HC speaker's "diglossic fantasy" and of HC's de-creolization is the use of hypercorrective "pseudo-French" forms. These forms, as produced by non-Francophone HC speakers, mimic various kinds of French derivational processes that are not productive in HC. Valdman's examples of hypercorrections via "pseudo-French" affixation include the following words (affix string in bold):[8]

(3) a. *desida**syon*** 'decision'; cf. *deside* 'to decide'
*vivas**yon*** 'subsistence'; cf. *viv* 'to live'

b. *ajout**man*** 'addition'; cf. *ajoute* 'to add'
*finis**man*** 'completion'; cf. *fini* 'to finish'
*remesis**man*** 'thanks'; cf. *remèsye* 'to thank'

c. *esklav**aj*** 'slavery'; cf. *esklav* 'slave'

d. *edika**syone*** 'to educate'; cf. *edika**syon*** 'education' and *edike* 'to educate'

e. *an jeneral**man*** 'generally;' cf. *an jeneral* 'in general'
*fin**man*** 'completely'; cf. *fen* 'end', *fini* 'to end', 'completed'
*souva**man*** 'often'; cf. *souvan* 'often'
*toujou**man*** 'always'; cf. *toujou* 'always'

Valdman claims that the forms in (3) "sound more like French than their authentically Haitian counterparts" (1987, 111); in other words, the "pseudo-French" forms in (3) are "nonexistent derivatives formed by adjoining occurring French suffixes to the 'wrong' HC stems" (1988, 75). The implication is that HC's productive morphology is "very weak" (Valdman 1978, 144); HC is thus bound to remain dependent on French for its lexical expansion.

> The French influence in Haiti, like that of Latin in francophone countries, manifests itself by its effect on the vernacular lexicon: French is the source of most HC neologisms (Valdman 1979, 99; my translation).

In effect, such a perspective erroneously confuses etymology and morphology: the diachronic/etymological source of much of HC morphology is localized in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French lexicon, but HC synchronic morphology (e.g., as part of the idiolects of monolingual HC speakers with no exposure to French) functions independently of French. Furthermore, Hall, D'Ans and Valdman's positions are straightforwardly disconfirmed by morphologically complex *Haitianisms*—HC morphological innovations with no cognates in the source languages—which cannot be "loaned" from French since, by definition, they have no counterparts in French. The same is true with respect to HC affixes that are etymologically related to, say, Spanish (e.g., in (2e)). In fact, Haitianisms are quite common, and many of them are listed in HC dictionaries, including Valdman *et al* 1981 and Valdman, Pooser and Jean-Baptiste 1996. There, they are not flagged as "pseudo-French"; instead, they are correctly acknowledged as bona fide HC words.

Let us now turn to further preliminary data. Consider for example HC X*syon* words which both Valdman (1978, 139) and Lefebvre (1998, 311) take to be simplex in HC (I come back to Lefebvre's empirical claims below). HC has scores of X*syon* words that are morphologically *and* semantically related to their respective stem X, often with a high degree of transparency, as in French (and as in English, for that matter), as shown in (4). (Here and throughout, I give only the meanings that are relevant to establishing the (degree of) semantic relationship. The reader is invited to consult HC native speakers and/or Freeman and Laguerre 1996 [1998] for additional meanings and/or phonological variants.)

(4)	*administrasyon* 'administration'	cf. *administre* 'to administer'
	admirasyon 'admiration'	cf. *admire* 'to admire'
	adorasyon 'adoration'	cf. *adore* 'to adore'
	aplikasyon 'application'	cf. *aplike* 'to apply'
	debakasyon 'disembarkation'	cf. *debake* 'to disembark'
	diskisyon 'discussion'	cf. *diskite* 'to discuss'
	dominasyon 'domination'	cf. *domine* 'to dominate'
	edikasyon 'education'	cf. *edike* 'to educate'
	esplikasyon 'explanation'	cf. *esplike* 'to explain'
	enpòtasyon 'importation'	cf. *enpòte* 'to import'
	enskripsyon 'registration'	cf. *enskri* 'to register'
	entwodiksyon 'introduction'	cf. *entwodi* 'to introduce'
	fòmasyon 'training'	cf. *fòme* 'to train'
	fòmasyon 'puberty'	cf. *fòme* 'to undergo puberty'
	imigrasyon 'immigration'	cf. *imigre* 'to immigrate'
	imitasyon 'imitation'	cf. *imite* 'to imitate'
	kalkilasyon 'calculation'	cf. *kalkile* 'to calculate'
	òganizasyon 'organization'	cf. *òganize* 'to organize'
	ogmantasyon '(pay) raise'	cf. *ogmante* 'to increase'
	operasyon 'surgery'	cf. *opere* 'to perform surgery'
	otorizasyon 'authorization'	cf. *otorize* 'to authorize'
	patisipasyon 'participation'	cf. *patisipe* 'to participate'
	pinisyon 'punishment'	cf. *pini* 'to punish'
	plantasyon 'plantation'	cf. *plante* 'to plant'
	pwopozisyon 'proposition'	cf. *pwopoze* 'to propose'
	reyalizasyon 'achievement'	cf. *reyalize* 'to achieve'

The examples in (4) suggest that *-syon* affixation in HC is both productive and by and large regular: witness the transparency of the morpho-phonological and semantic relationship between the members of the X/X*syon* pairs in (4). This is in opposition to Valdman's (1978, 131, 139, 142) and Lefebvre's (1998, 311) claims that *-syon* is not productive in HC. Their argument goes like this: since the *-syon*-ending forms they examine tend to have close French analogues, it can, and should, be argued that they have all been inherited directly from French as unanalyzed simplex words. As already mentioned, this argument constitutes an erroneous conflation of etymology and morphology: the synchronic morphological processes in the minds/brains of HC speakers cannot be explained away by invoking HC-French etymological links. Morphologically transparent cases of *-syon* suffixation are rather frequent in HC; for example, they number about 3 pages in Freeman's (1989) 87-page inverse word list. Therefore, the null hypothesis is that the data in (4) reflect a productive relation between X-*syon* and X in the minds/brains of HC speakers. This relation extends to the formation of words such as those in (5), which may count as Haitianisms (see note 6):[9]

(5)	*dekoupasyon* 'dividing wall, screen'	cf. *dekoupe* 'to cut up, to carve'
	eklerasyon 'enlightenment';	cf. *eklere* 'to enlighten'
	levasyon 'education', upbringing	cf. *leve* 'to educate, to rear'
	pansyon 'anxiety'	cf. *panse* 'to think'
	pèdisyon 'false pregnancy, menorrhagia'	cf. *pèdi* 'to lose'
	vivasyon 'conviviality'	cf. *viv* 'to live'

Many of these (dialectal) Haitianisms are documented in Freeman 1989, Freeman and Laguerre 1996 [1998], and Fattier 1998, 242, 250–251, 320. *Vivasyon* in (5) is kindly reported by Yves Dejean (personal communication) among other data that attest to the formation of morphologically complex neologisms in (monolingual) HC with *-syon* and other suffixes (but see note 6). According to Y. Dejean, *vivasyon* is a very common HC word in Fort-Royal, used among Haitians who have no French input whatsoever.[10] For the residents of Fort-Royal, *vivasyon* means 'conviviality', which is a distinct meaning from the one reported by Valdman as the "pseudo-French" rendition of 'subsistence'. Both 'conviviality' and 'subsistence' are semantically related to their stem *viv* 'to live': both meanings are concerned with "support" for life, either physical or emotional, in some extended sense of "support." Thus, both Y. Dejean's *vivasyon* 'conviviality' and Valdman's *vivasyon* 'subsistence' are manifestations of productive derivation with the "authentically Haitian" suffix *-syon*. (Y. Dejean also reports the use of HC *vitès* as a synonym of *vivasyon* in the South, outside of Fort-Royal. Another meaning of *vitès* is 'speed', from *vit* 'fast' (cf. *delika/delikatès* 'delicate/delicateness' *gwòs/gwòsès* 'pregnant/pregnancy', *laj/lajès* 'generous/generosity', *ti/titès* 'small/childhood', etc). As Y. Dejean reminds me, *titès* is a bona fide Haitianism that attests to the productivity of yet another HC suffix, contra Valdman and Lefebvre; also see note 18.)

The data in (5) directly contradict Lefebvre's (1998, 311) claim that "*-yon* is *only* found in Haitian words that correspond *exactly* to French words." In fact, Haitianisms with *-syon* are also found in Freeman's (1989) inverse word list and in Freeman and Laguerre (1996 [1998]) HC-English dictionary. Lefebvre (1998, 311) labels both *admirasyon* and *adopsyon* as ungrammatical. She assigns them "*" because they are not found in Valdman *et al*'s (1981) dictionary; the latter is thus erroneously taken as an exhaustive listing of the mental lexicons of HC speakers. Yet both words are not only common in HC, in fact they are listed both in Freeman's (1989) inverse word list and Freeman and Laguerre's (1996 [1998]) dictionary. (Strangely enough, Lefebvre (1998, 311) writes that "[a]n examination of the list of Haitian nouns ending in *-yon* in Freeman's (1988) inverse dictionary supports [her] claims."[11])

In any case, the presence of neologisms formed with *-syon* is clear evidence that *-syon* is productive in the mental lexicons of HC speakers. Fattier (1998, 250–251,etc) provides further support for the morphological productivity of HC, including Haitianisms with *-syon*, contra Valdman and Lefebvre. Fattier's data essentially come from monolingual HC speakers who have had little or no contact with French. Therefore, the abundant and diverse attestation of morphologically complex Haitianisms in her data lay to rest the oft-repeated claim that HC is dependent on French when it comes to "lexical enrichment."

Let us return to the list of alleged "pseudo-French" hypercorrections in (3). As for *edikasyone* in (3d), this neologism (or perhaps hapax legomenon) enlists two "authentically Haitian" suffixes: the nominal suffix *-syon*, as in (4) and (5), and the verbal marker *-e*(*n*), as in (2h). *Edikasyone* is constructed exactly like other "authentically Haitian" complex words:

(6)	*esta**syone*** 'to park';	cf. *estasyon* 'station'
	*kek**syone*** 'to question';	cf. *keksyon* 'question'
	*kolek**syone*** 'to collect';	cf. *koleksyon* 'collection'
	*komi**syone*** 'to commission';	cf. *komisyon* 'commission'
	*pan**syone*** 'to think, to ponder'	cf. *pansyon* 'thought, anxiety'

Interestingly, Fattier (1998, 242) mentions *pansyone* as a dialectal case of a doubly suffixed (recursive) neological formation: the verb *pansyone* is a Haitianism that is derived from the noun *pansyon*, which in turn is a Haitianism derived from the verb *panse* 'to think'.[12] Thus, the verb *panse* in (6) recursively gives rise to the neological verb *pansyone* the same way the verb *edike* in (3d) gives rise to the neological verb (or hapax legomenon) *edikasyone*. Both *pansyone* and *edikasyone* are "authentically Haitian" neologisms that conform to HC word formation processes.

In DeGraff 2000b, I give data and arguments in favor of the productivity of other HC affixes, including all those claimed by Valdman to constitute "pseudo-French" affixation (see (3)). Fattier's (1998) corpus of monolingual HC contains similar data. Such data falsify the claims that HC is by and large morphologically unproductive and that many morphologically complex words "sound more like French than their authentically Haitian counterparts" (Valdman 1987, 111). I would argue that, on the contrary, the HC suffixes in (1)–(6) *are* all "authentically Haitian," notwithstanding their etymological links and other surface similarities with other languages (for the most part, French). Morphology is not reducible to etymology and/or sociolinguistics. The *socially oriented uses* of superficially French-related neologisms and hapax legomena may well implicate etymological and sociolinguistic factors of the sort discussed by Valdman, but at the level of *grammatical competence* the language-internal combinatorial properties of these derivations are "authentically Haitian".

In fact, that words "borrowed" from French into HC would also give rise to productive affixation should come as no surprise: processes of language contact do not exclude morphological (re)analysis of cognate forms (see, e.g., Weinreich 1953, 31ff.). In English, too, we find words adopted from French (perhaps as simplex, unanalyzed wholes) that have given rise to productive morphological processes that are divorced from the morphosyntax of the French etymological cognates. This is, for example, the case with the English *-ee* suffix (in, e.g., *payee*), originally from the French (feminine) past participle (e.g., *payé(e)*). French *-é(e)* was most likely borrowed as a "fossilized" form into English. Note that English, unlike French, does not mark gender agreement on its participles. French *-é(e)* may have enterered English as *-ee* in sixteenth-century English legal documents, as in *appelee* (see, e.g., Barker 1998, 699). Here we may be dealing with the influence on English *-ee* of the (purely orthographic) marking of feminine gender on the past participle of French verbs in *-er*: masculine *appelé* and feminine *appelée* are both pronounced /apəle/. Yet notwithstanding its *etymology* (and sociohistorical derivation) from French words borrowed into sixteenth-century legal texts as fossilized (i.e., simplex and unanalyzed) units, English *-ee* has since become autonomously productive in English *morphology* and gives rise to neologisms such as English *vendee* ('purchaser'; cf. French *vendu* 'sold'), *nominee*, *electee*, *biographee*, *plannee*, *tutee*, *expellee*, *abusee*, *asylee* (see Barker 1998, 699).

A similar situation is expected to obtain in other cases of language contact, as in the genesis of HC. The data above tell us that French complex words, even if inherited as simplexes from very specific lexical domains, can in principle give way to morphological (re)analysis. Such (postborrowing) morphological (re)analysis is obviously subject to complex language-internal and language-external conditions, but such analysis is always likely to take place given the right structural and ecological conditions. The data in (1)–(2) even include one HC suffix with Spanish etymology, namely *-adò* (cf. the Spanish agentive suffix *-dor*). Yet one would not want to claim that *babyadò* 'griper' and *vantadò* 'braggart' manifest "pseudo-Spanish hypercorrections" or that all Haitians have "relative proficiency" in Spanish; compare Valdman's (1988, 73) claim about every Haitian's "relative proficiency" in French. Notwithstanding its Spanish etymology, in the minds/brains of HC speakers *-adò* is an "authentically Haitian" productive suffix. The suffix *-adò* has its diachronic origins in cockfighting arenas near the Haitian-Dominican border (see, e.g., Faine 1936, 45–46), but it has now become fully integrated into the HC lexicon and its scope includes concepts that are not at all related to cockfighting: for example, *pet**adò*** ‘farter’ (cf. *pete* ‘to fart’) and *mant**adò*** ‘liar’ (cf. *manti* ‘to lie’). Furthermore, synchronically HC *-adò* structurally distinct from Spanish *-dor*. The latter attaches to a verbal root with an intervening theme vowel, as in for example *luch**a**dor* ‘fighter’ and *ment**i**dor* ‘lier’. The corresponding verbs, *luch**a**r* ‘to fight’ and *ment**i**r* ‘to lie’, have distinct theme vowels, ***a*** and ***i***. As HC *babyadò* from *babye* and *mantadò* from *manti* show, HC *-adò* does not manifest theme-vowel distinctions: Spanish’s most common theme vowel has been reanalyzed as an integral part of the agentive suffix, leading to the creation of HC *-adò* with its own combinatorial properties: *-adò* attaches to appropriate verbal stems, independently of their verbal markers. (I thank Karlos Arregi for pointing out to me the HC-Spanish *-adò*/*-dor* differences.) In the relevant respects, the etymology of HC *-adò* resembles that of English *-ee*: borrowing followed by re-analysis, then productive affixation, all in a relatively short diachronic span.

Are the other affixes in (1)–(2) as productive as *-syon* and *-adò*? Advocates of morphologically reduced Creole prototypes may argue that the above sample is only an illusion and that the (alleged?) morphological processes in (2) are not all productive. As noted, I argue elsewhere (DeGraff 2000b) that HC word formation processes of the sort sketched in (1)–(2) are, to various degrees, truly productive. My claims receive much empirical support from the data in Fattier 1998. Here I will simply note that many of the complex words in (2) are HC neologisms (Haitianisms), formally and/or semantically, with no apparent cognate in the source languages (e.g., *dekreta* and *debaba*, *enkoutab*, *babyadò* and *vantadò*; also see *safte* ‘greed’ in note 18). Thus, we really are in the presence of creative word formation patterns that can be reduced neither to relexification, as Lefebvre claims, nor to simplex unproductive fossilizations (e.g., Hall’s “Gallicisms”), nor to Valdman’s “pseudo-French hypercorrections” or borrowings.

In summary, this first case study tells us that what Valdman calls “pseudo-French” words in HC are actually morphologically complex words built according to word formation processes that are productive in (monolingual) HC. In some cases, such “pseudo-French” words, like *ajoutman* ‘addition’ (cf. French *ajoutement* in Rey 1995, 41), may have entered the HC lexicon at its very inception, via the regional varieties of French spoken in colonial Saint-Domingue (as Haiti was known, until it gained independence in 1804). Such synchronic and diachronic considerations cast further doubt on Valdman’s diagnostics for “pseudo-French” decreolization. In fact, HC manifests a robust set of productive affixes that allow lexical expansion from HC’s internal morphological resources. The data surveyed here also cast doubt on Lefebvre’s arguments regarding a virtual one-to-one isomorphism between HC and Fongbe affixes (also see notes 7 and 18).

2.5 On Prototypes and Stereotypes: Haitian Creole as a “Regular” Language

The “simple Creole morphology” orthodoxy illustrated in section 2.4 also manifests itself in proposals for Creole prototypes. Such a prototype is delineated most saliently in McWhorter 1998. Like the analyses in section 2.4 in which Creole morphology is deemed underproductive, McWhorter’s prototype is straightforwardly disconfirmed by samples of HC data.

In McWhorter 1998, a relatively well defined type of “simple morphology” is said to be a criterion for Creoleness, and is viewed as the direct result of Creole genesis and of Creoles’ status as young languages. It is worth quoting McWhorter’s article at length, as his are currently the most explicit, articulate, and categorical statements regarding the typological profile of Creole morphology in diachrony and synchrony. Yet, it must also be noted that the basic tenets of McWhorter’s prototypes are not original: as documented in section 2.6, these tenets find antecedents in previous claims going back to Saint-Quentin 1872, Jespersen 1922, Hjelmslev 1938, 1939, and Seuren and Wekker 1986.[13]

Throughout the history of Creole studies, the characterization of prototypical Creole morphology has opposed Creoles to an alleged class of “regular” or ”normal” languages. McWhorter characterizes “simple Creole morphology” as follows (as elsewhere in this chapter, emphasis is added for expository purposes):

> [R]ich paradigms of derivational affixes [, as exemplified by Mon-Khmer languages, are] *alien* to any language known as a creole (McWhorter 1998, 796)
>
> [C]reoles are the *only* natively spoken languages in the world that combine all three of the following traits:
>
> **1.** little or no inflectional affixation
> **2.** little or no use of tone to lexically contrast monosyllables or encode syntax
> **3.** semantically regular derivational affixation
>
> (McWhorter 1998, 798)

Among McWhorter’s (1998) claims regarding the cognitive roots and diachronic path of Creole morphogenesis are these:

> [T]he rapid non-native adoption of a language as a lingua franca entails stripping down a system to its essentials, for *optimal learnability and processibility.* The natural result is *the virtual or complete elimination of*

affixes, sometimes replaced by more immediately transparent analytic constructions. (p. 793)

Inflection, lexically contrasting tone and semantically irregular derivation "*only* develop internally as the result of gradual development over long periods of time [over millennia] (p. 792f, also see pp. 798, 812)

"[D]iachronically, inflectional morphology typically results from *gradual processes of reanalysis such as the grammaticalization of erstwhile lexical items*" (p. 793)

"Derivational apparatus ... tends to be *eschewed* by creole creators or incorporated in *fossilized* form. Meanwhile, the way derivation typically emerges in language is via *gradual grammaticalization*" (p. 798; also see. 793)

"The semantic irregularity of derivation arises from the inevitable process of semantic drift and metaphorical inference ... " (p. 798)

"*Over millennia*, [prototypical Creole] traits will certainly gradually disappear, rendering [Creole] languages indistinguishable from others synchronically" (p. 812)

It is HC that McWhorter regards as one of the "most creole of creoles" and one of "the 'pure' [prototypical] cases", claiming that HC "fulfill[s] all three [prototype] qualifications"—in fact, that it "display[s] *all three* prototype traits in their *purest* form" (p. 809, 812):

1. "*no* use of tone to contrast monosyllables or encode syntax;"
2. "*no* inflectional affixes;" and
3. "derivational affixes whose semantic contribution is *consistently transparent*"

(McWhorter 1998, 809)

McWhorter is correct in stating that HC does not make use of tone, although it is not theoretically clear why loss of lexical tone should be a defining characteristic of creolization: Does lexical tone in, say, Chinese languages "combine low perceptual saliency with low import to basic communication" (McWhorter 1998, 792)? What is the independent measure of "perceptual saliency"? What is "basic communication"? Can "basic communication" in Chinese (interlanguage) bypass the use of tonal distinctions? The latter are at the core of the Chinese lexicon the same way that a (toneless) HC phonemic inventory is at the core of lexical distinctions as in, say, *manman* /mãmã/ 'mother' and *chwal* /ʃwal/ 'horse'. In China, like in Haiti, 'mother' and 'horse' are concepts that may need to be carefully distinguished, even in "basic communication." In Chinese, such lexical contrasts enlist tonal distinctions, which, in McWhorter (1998:794) words, require "subtlety of perception unlikely to develop amidst the rapid, utilitarian acquisition typical of settings which give birth to a contact language." In this vein, it must be noted that there exist HC phonemic distinctions which, like Chinese tone, apparently require "subtlety of perception" to the extent that such distinctions have gone undetected, not only by naive nonnative speakers "amidst rapid, utilitarian acquisition," but even by expert linguists deliberately collecting data in the slow and controlled settings typical of informant sessions (for an overview, see Dejean 1977, 316–326; 1980, 89–94; 1999). This seems rather unexpected if Creoles must develop phonemic inventories that combine high "perceptual saliency" with high "import to basic communication."

When we look at inflection, things get murkier for the prototype proposal. "Loss" of overt inflectional distinctions is not exclusive to creolization, but seems generally symptomatic of language acquisition under "duress" as in various cases of language contact. This was noted long ago by, for example, Meillet (1919, 201) and Weinreich (1953, sec. 2.3); see note 2. In DeGraff 1999a,b,d, 2000a,b, I compare the status of inflection and of some of its syntactic correlates in creolization, language change and language acquisition, and I conclude that

> Creoles are no more and no less than the result of extraordinary external factors coupled with ordinary internal factors; that is, creoles, alongside language change, are the result of particular types of language contact whose effects on attained grammars are mediated by the contact situation's unstabilizing influence on the triggering experience (DeGraff 1999b, 477)

In fact, this conclusion is inescapable within a Cartesian, Universal Grammar (UG)-based approach to language contact, as "creolization and language change ultimately reduce to universal mental processes taking place in individual speakers acting as language acquirers and language users" (DeGraff 1999b, 524). In this vein, UG implements what Meillet (1906 [1958, 17]) refers to as "the general conditions of development from a purely linguistic point of view;" that is, UG provides patterns in creolization, language change, and language acquisition, with a cognitive and grammatical "tether" of just the right length (cf. Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog 1968, 139, 176). It it thus not surprising that we find that the "erosion" of inflectional morphology and/or the regularization of morphological distinctions recur in the history of *any* language (whether "old" or "new"); this is standard fare in historical linguistics. Of course, "simplification" in one domain entails "complexification" in others (see below) while processes such as grammaticalization (e.g., of free morphemes into bound morphemes) may offset the results of morphological erosion—cf. Givón's popular phrase "yesterday's syntax is today's morphology," which goes back to traditional insights from (e.g.) Bopp, Humboldt and Meillet.

What about the functional teleology of inflectional loss? As with tone, it is not clear that "virtual or complete elimination of [inflectional] affixes" is necessarily correlated with *maximum* "processibility," pace McWhorter (1998, 793); also see Hjelmslev's (1938, 1939) "Creole optimum." One can reasonably make the following argument: if inflection is the morphological encoding of morphosyntactic features and relations, then having inflection *overtly* manifested at PF does contribute to, say, the preservation of overt contrasts and the recoverability of underlying semantics, which is surely a boon for the online decoding of abstract morphosyntactic and semantic features and relations. In fact, given the competing need for perceptual (vs. production) processibility, one could as easily wonder why—or to what extent—inflectional morphology is, as a rule, diachronically subject to erosion despite its apparent parser-friendly “redundancy” (see, e.g., Labov 1994, 586–599; DeGraff 1999b, 523, 534 n. 47). Then again, the increased “form-function opacity” due to case syncretism, as, e.g., in the history of English and Romance, is somewhat compensated by increased rigidity in word order which serves to encode (some of) the function of moribund case affixes. (Joan Bresnan’s recent formalist/functionalist work within Optimality Theory comes to mind as one explicit implementation of similar questions regarding competing factors in morphosyntactic change (see, e.g., Bresnan, to appear). In Bresnan’s words, “Markedness of course has many conflicting dimensions” (cf. Mufwene 1991 on markedness conflicts in specific language-contact cases: “[G]iven the diversity of factors determining markedness, such conflicts are to be expected;” p. 138).)

On the terminological/conceptual side, the very notion of inflection is theory-internal and the boundaries between pieces of inflection and pieces of derivation vary from framework to framework; indeed, there are frameworks in which such boundaries dissolve altogether (see Stump 1998, 18f for an overview). When the inflection-versus-derivation distinction is relevant (or, rather, the distinction between the inflectional/syntactic and derivational/lexical *functions* of morphology), its applicability should depend on the precise lexicosemantics and morphosyntactic facts of the language(s) at hand (see, e.g., Stump 1998). No (theoretically usable) definition is given in McWhorter 1998. Thus, the label *inflection* is used here pretheoretically (cf. the analyses of further relevant facts in DeGraff 2000b). This said, HC does have a certain amount of productive and systematic morphological marking for natural gender. In some cases, this morphology is contextually determined. In (7), I give a small sample from DeGraff 2000b.

(7) a.

Ameriken/Amerikèn	‘American+masc/fem’
Ayisyen/Ayisyèn	‘Haitian+masc/fem’
Fransè/Fransèz	‘French+masc/fem’
Kapwa/Kapwaz	‘(person+masc/fem) from Cape Haitian’
wangatè/wangatèz	‘man/woman who believes and/or makes magical fetishes’

b.

Manman	*m*	*se*	*yon*	*Ayisyèn/*Ayisyen*
mother	1sg	RES-PRON	a	Haitian+fem/*Haitian+masc

‘My mother is a Haitian’

c.

Manman m se Ayisyèn/Ayisyen
mother 1sg RES-PRON Haitian+fem/Haitian+masc
'My mother is Haitian'

d.
*... fanm Ayisyèn/*Ayisyen*
woman Haitian+fem/*Haitian+masc
'... Haitian women ... '

The last pair in (7a), *wangatè/wangatèz*, is one of these Haitianisms that testify to the productivity of HC gender marking: the stem *wanga* is etymologically Bantu, from Kikongo (P. Baker 1993, 145f; Fattier 1998, 599) and the inflected suffix *-è/èz* is etymologically French. Other cases of neological formations with gender marking are documented in DeGraff 2000b. In (7b), gender inflection on the nominal head of the non-bare predicate (masculine /ajisjẽ/ vs. feminine /ajisjɛn/) is determined via obligatory agreement with a governing subject. In (7c), gender inflection appears optional when the predicate is bare. In (7d), gender agreement is obligatory. Thus far, the facts are preliminary and ill-understood, but it appears that the obligatory/optional marking of gender is related to both the semantic class of the predicate head and the structure of the predicate projection. That is, the contrast between (7b) and (7c) and the apparent "optionality" in (7c) seem lexically and syntactically driven. It goes without saying that only an explicit theory of morphology can spell out the conditions under which the pieces of HC gender inflection relate to the lexicon and/or the syntax.

Verbal truncation (or apocope) is another manifestation of inflectional morphology in HC. Like in other French-lexifier Creoles (see, e.g., Syea 1992), HC has a class of verbs that are truncated in certain environments (see Hall 1953, 30 for a sample).

(8) a.
Konbyen dan Tonton Bouki gen(**yen**) ?*
how-many tooth Uncle Bouki has
'How many teeth does Uncle Bouki have?'

b.
*Tonton Bouki gen(***yen**) 32 dan l*
Uncle Bouki has 32 tooth 3sg
'Uncle Bouki has (all of) his 32 teeth'

In (8a), the object *konbyen dan* 'how many teeth' is *wh*-moved, which makes the verb the last overt element in the VP. In this case, the long form, *gen**yen***, surfaces *obligatorily* in my idiolect. In (8b), where the verb is followed by its object, *32 dan l* '(all of) his 32 teeth', truncation is strongly preferred, at least in the dialects I am familiar with where *gen* usually surfaces when the object remains in situ. (In my idiolect, *genyen* in (8b) would be interpreted as the HC form for ‘to win’ which need not undergo apocope.) There are additional facts that complicate the picture. Note for example that pronominal objects, unlike full NP objects, do not force truncation. Emphasis is yet another factor that disfavors truncation even when a full NP follows a verb. In addition, there is much dialectal variation which I cannot go into here. This said, in pursuing a theoretical treatment of apocope as in (8), one can reasonably hypothesize that *genyen* ‘to have’ decomposes morphologically as *gen-**yen***, with *-yen* being an inflectional morpheme (a verbal marker or a *v* head?) whose realization is regulated by subtle morphosyntactic and/or morphophonological factors.

Yet another (overt) inflectional contrast exists in HC, namely, between the transitive and intransitive forms of certain predicates such as *fè/fè**t*** ‘make/made’ and *kowonp/kowonp**i*** ‘corrupt/corrupted’.

(9) a.
*Mwen fè/*fè**t** kabann lan rapid-rapid maten an.*
1sg make bed the fast-fast morning the
‘I made the bed very quickly this morning.’

b.
*Kabann lan fè**t**/*fè rapid-rapid maten an.*
bed the made fast-fast morning the
‘The bed was made very quickly this morning.’

The “displaced” position of *kabann lan* in (9b) mirrors that of *John* in the English passive *John was seen*; likewise the morphological contrast between *fè* /fɛ/ in (9a) and *fè**t*** /fɛt/ mirrors that between the English active *see* and passive *see**n***. The contrast between HC *fè* and *fè**t*** in (9) is another potential counterexample to the alleged absence of inflectional morphology in HC. With *fè* in (9a), the theme is in object position; with *fè**t*** in (9b), the theme is in subject position. Assuming that the alternation in (9) is derived in the syntax (contra, e.g., Ritter 1991) and assuming M. Baker’s (1988) Mirror Principle, the grammatical-function change in (9) is “signaled” by morphology “in” the syntax. The overt morphological alternation in *fè*/fèt as in (9) is relatively rare. Nonetheless, given the systematicity of HC clauses that are syntactically similar to the pair in (9), inflectional morphology would mark all such grammatical-function changes, whether or not the morphological exponent of this inflection is overt (see M. Baker 1988, 284; also see DeGraff 1994, 1997, 1999b,d, 2000a,b, for further remarks of HC verbal morphology, and Damoiseau 1988, 1991 and Ritter 1991 for more extensive discussion, alternative analyses and further references).

The use of reduplication to mark intensification (e.g., *mache-mache* ‘to walk a lot’ and *bèl-bèl* ‘very beautiful’; see (2o)) may also count as an example of inflectional morphology: in such cases, ‘aspect’ is marked, not by a free-standing pre-verbal morpheme, but by reduplication of the predicate. (Thanks to Benjamin Bruening for pointing out the relevance of HC reduplication vis-à-vis the status of Creole inflectional morphology.)

That the above instances of inflectional marking in HC target specific word classes while showing apparent ‘gaps’ (e.g., vis-à-vis gender, apocope, grammatical-function change, and intensifiability) is not surprising: even in its most robustly overt instantiations, inflection need not apply uniformly to stems of a given category; witness, e.g., Russian “indeclinable nouns”—borrowings that do not inflect for morphological case (Halle 1994, 39).

Now, what about transparency? In principle, any Creole prototype with “derivational affixes whose semantic contribution is consistently transparent” constitutes an *un*natural (i.e., artificial) language that contradicts the *universal* Saussurean arbitrariness of the lexical sign (see note 26 on Creoles as “artificial languages”). Given Saussure’s notion of the “arbitraire du signe”—the arbitrary and holistic relationship between “signifié” and “signifiant”—*any* natural language should be expected to manifest opaque lexicalizations. There is a priori no reason why Creole creators and Creole speakers should be unable to create and store as independent units derivationally complex words with idiosyncratic (i.e., nontransparent and noncompositional) semantics. Such opaque lexicalizations apply, not only at the level of syntax (e.g., phrasal idioms), but also at the level of the word (e.g., “idiosyncratic lexicalizations,” which we may call “word-level idioms”). Saussure’s “arbitraire du signe” and recent results in (psycho)linguistics (see below) suggest that speakers of any language should be able to store morphologically and syntactically complex forms in their mental lexicons. The relevant properties of word-level and phrasal idioms are stored in the mental lexicon, alongside simplex lexemes; see, e.g., Aronoff 1976, Jackendoff 1995, Marantz 1997, Pinker 1999 and references therein. Saussure’s “arbitraire du signe” applies both to formally simplex units and to formally complex combinations. The latter are composed by merging the former at either the word or the phrasal level.

The processes underlying the (opaque) lexicalization of morphologically complex items (see, e.g., Aronoff 1976, 10ff.) are not fundamentally separate from those underlying the storage of syntactically complex idioms (see, e.g., Jackendoff 1995 and Marantz 1997; also see note 19). As Saussure argued, both word-level lexicalizations and phrase-level lexicalizations (aka “idiom formation”) instantiate the “arbitraire du signe.” That is, both kinds entail the lexical association of formally complex signs with arbitrary (i.e., nonpredictable and noncompositional) semantics. As far as I can tell, Saussure’s “arbitraire du signe” can be expected to hold of *all* human speakers—human long-term memory does not appear to be short on neurons for the storing of “idiosyncratic” information. The ability to store formal and semantic idiosyncrasies at both the word and the phrase level is (by definition) at the very root of our language faculty, especially the lexicon.

Let us, furthermore, assume that the creation of idioms is part and parcel of human cognition via, say, associative memory and the universal human capacity for metaphorical reasoning, as manifested for example in children’s “fast mapping” and lexical innovations; see Clark 1993 and references therein. If so, idiom formation can, in principle, apply to the results of morphological derivation—hence the universal capacity for what McWhorter (1998, 797) calls "endless idiosyncratic lexicalizations." The latter are not the exclusive province of "old" languages since semantic opacity can develop even in absence of semantic drift and inference "over millennia" (contra McWhorter 1998, 798, 812). As Stump (1998, 17) writes, "[t]he semantic 'drift' typical of derivation need not be understood in diachronic terms."

Take *going post**al*** (i.e., the sudden manifestation of homicidal rage toward one's co-workers), *Monica-**gate*** (cf. the political turmoil surrounding Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky's sexual relationship) and *red-eye* (in the sense of 'overnight flight'). These are "catastrophic" neologisms that seemed to have developed "overnight" (no puns intended). These neologisms require a fair amount of encyclopedic and cultural inference for interpretation, although each belongs to different regions on the continuum of metaphorical drift and semantic opacity. However, the point is that their respective opacity seems to bear little relation to the actual length of their diachronic life-span. The semantic unpredictability of *some* complex words does arise via diachronic grammaticalization and gradual metaphorical drift, but this is not the exclusive source of noncompositionality in the lexicon.

Similar 'instantaneously' neological and semantically idiosyncratic derivations both exist in HC (DeGraff 2000b) and arise through acquisition (Clark 1993). In fact, Creole languages are well known for the multifunctionality of their lexicon. Such multifunctionality arises for example via zero-derivation, which is the semantically "vague" derivational process par excellence (Clark and Clark 1979). As Stump (1998, 17) notes:

> The semantic idiosyncrasy of many derived lexemes follows not from the fact that their meanings are lexically listed, but from the fact that their meanings are inevitably shaped by pragmatic inferences at the very outset of their existence (and are therefore in *immediate need* of lexical listing).

As expected, semantically opaque zero-derivation is also productive in HC, with the concomitant nontransparent lexicalization occurring rather rapidly:

(10)

*CIA ta vle **Noriega** Aristide*
CIA would want Noriega Aristide
'The CIA would want to [$_V$ *Noriega*] Aristide' (i.e., bring Aristide to jail in the U.S.)

Recall that, in Saussure's view, all languages are expected to manifest "idiosyncratic lexicalizations" at both the word and the phrase level. Creole speakers are like speakers of any other regular languages in terms of cognitive capacities: they dispose of both associative memory for lexical storage and combinatorial rules for morphological and syntactic parsing. There is (thus far) no theoretical principle that requires Creoles (qua "regular" languages) to manifest "consistent transparency" in their inherited and innovated morphology in any fashion that would *qualitatively* distinguish them from non-Creole languages. A brief inspection through the examples in (1)–(6) readily suggests that HC suffixation is not consistently transparent to a degree that would radically distinguish it from non-Creole suffixation. HC *-syon*, for example, seems as (non)transparent as English (or French) *-tion*. For semantically nontransparent *-syon* affixation, see for example *dekoupasyon* 'dividing wall, screen' (cf. *dekoupe* 'to cut up, to carve'), *pansyon* 'anxiety' (cf. *panse* 'to think'), *pèdisyon* 'false pregnancy, menorrhagia' (cf. *pèdi* 'to lose') and *vivasyon* 'conviviality, subsistence' (cf. *viv* 'to live'). Such semantically opaque derivations are straightforward instantiations of lexical Saussurean arbitrariness which is naturally expected in Creoles as in any other "regular language."

Similarly, cases of semantic opacity are found with most other affixes in HC. Take for example HC *de-*. McWhorter (1998, 797) cites the following four cases from Brousseau, Filipovich, and Lefebvre 1989, 9 (also see Lefebvre 1998, 305f).

(11) a. *pasyante* 'to be patient' vs. *de-pasyante* 'to be impatient'
  b. *respekte* 'to respect' vs. *de-respekte* 'to insult'
  c. *grese* 'to put on weight' vs. *de-grese* 'to lose weight'
  d. *mare* 'to tie' vs. *de-mare* 'to untie'

McWhorter's claim that the entire HC lexicon is consistently transparent is based on just these four pairs of second-hand examples.

Let us first ask whether *de-* is consistently and transparently "inversive" (Brousseau, Filipovish and Lefebvre 1989; Lefebvre 1988; McWhorter 1998). Actually, McWhorter's claim that X and *de*-X are "precise opposites" does not hold of the exceedingly small data set taken from Brousseau, Filipovich and Lefebvre 1989. The latter authors' claims about HC *de*, which form the core of McWhorter's argument, are themselves questionable, as work by Damoiseau (1991) and by Chaudenson (1996) shows.

First, Damoiseau (1991, 33) has convincingly shown that *derespekte* and *respekte* fall in distinct aspectual and thematic classes. Damoiseau carefully notes that *respekte* is a psychological predicate while *derespekte* denotes an action—an instance of what he (1991, 32) calls a "static" vs. "dynamic" contrast. Furthermore, from a θ-role perspective, the θ-role of the subject of *respekte* in a two-argument clause can be described as 'experiencer' while the θ-role of the subject of *derespekte* in the same configuration can be described as 'agent'. Finally, from a tense/aspect perspective, *respekte* without any Tense-Mood-Aspect marking holds of a present situation while *derespekte* in the same environment holds of a nonpresent, completed state of affairs—a situation often referred in the Africanist and creolist literature as the *factative* effect. In order to achieve a present (imperfective) interpretation, *derespekte* requires the aspect marker *ap*, as shown in the following example from Damoiseau 1991, 33:

(12) a.
Ou respekte m
2sg respect 1sg
'You have respect for me'

b.
Apa w ap derespekte m
Here 2sg PROG disrespect m
'Now you're 'dissing' me!' (i.e., you're showing me disrespect—you're insulting me)

Again, these examples show that HC *respekte* and *derespekte* belong to distinct aspectual and thematic classes. Assuming that these aspectual and thematic classes do not "oppose" each other, then it seems that *respekte* and *derespekte* can hardly qualify as "precise opposites," once their semantics are made "precise" enough. Also note that *derespekte* (unlike *demare* 'to untie' in (11d)) is not the kind of action the results of which can be undone; that is, *derespekte*, in its "dynamic" sense, is irreversible (see Horn 1989 for much relevant discussion of the reversibility of the stem to which English *de-* attaches).

There are also empirical problems with respect to *degrese* in (11c) as inversive. As Chaudenson (1996, 27ff.) points out, *degrese* is actually ambiguous between an inversive intransitive reading ('to lose weight' as in (11c)) and a privative transitive reading ('to remove fat'): for example, *degrese vyann* 'to remove the fat from meat'. It is worth noting that these two senses are sometimes expressed by different prefixes in English: *un-* and *de-*. English *un-* in (e.g.) *to uncover* and *to untie* is inversive (cf. *cover* and *tie*) whereas *de-* in *to decaffeinate* ('to remove caffeine from') is privative (cf. ?*caffeinate* which may not even occur, although it is an interpretable potential word).[14] With HC privative *degrese*, the privative reading is hardly inversive at all: there was no previous *grese* action the result of which is inverted/undone by *degrese*, and once the fat is removed from meat to be cooked, it cannot be put back (at least not in the reversible sense).

Neither is *de-* consistently and transparently inversive in (1); see (2a). Take *dekreta* 'to remove the crest'. It is constructed from the nominal base *krèt* 'crest' and there is no **kreta*; *de-* in *dekreta* 'to remove the crest from' is privative/ablative. As for *debaba* 'to mow down', its semantics exhibits the sort of "evolved idiosyncrasy" typical of (word- and phrase-level) idioms: relating the semantics of *debaba* to that of its stem does require "a certain metaphorical imagination," pace McWhorter (1998, 797) (cf. *baba* 'barbaric, idiotic'; *baba* is also a dialectal variant of *bèbè* 'mute'; Yves Dejean, personal communication). In any case, the prefix *de-* in *debaba* does not have any inversive meaning. With the right amount of "metaphorical imagination," *de-* in *debaba* may perhaps be taken as a (quasi-)causative marker, but the overall meaning of *debaba* is unrecoverable from the semantic composition of its component morphemes. Further examples of "endless idiosyncratic lexicalizations" abound in, for instance, Valdman *et al* 1981, Valdman, Poser and Jean-Baptiste 1996; Freeman 1989; Freeman and Laguerre 1996 [1998].

It is notable that HC *de-* even has an intensifying function in some cases, as in *derefize* 'to refuse emphatically' in (13) (cf. *refize* 'to refuse')—this is the quasi inverse of inversive. The list in (13) also includes near-synonymous pairs with subtle semantics and syntactic differences; here too *de-* is not transparently inversive (see DeGraff 2000b for details):

(13)

debat v.	'to struggle, to try'	cf. *bat*	'to beat; to struggle; etc.'
dechire v.	'to tear apart, to tear up'	cf. *chire* v.	'to tear (apart), to tear (up)'
defile v.	'to parade'	cf. *file* v.	'to dash away, to flee'
defripe v.	'to beat, to thrash'	cf. *fripe* v.	'to mess up'
degaye v.	'to mess up'	cf. *gaye* v.	'to disperse, to scatter'
degrennen v.	'to separate 1 by 1, to shell (out)'	cf. *grennen* v.	'to shell (out); to scatter'
dekale v.	'to chip off, to peel off'	cf. *kale* v.	'to peel, to skin, to scrape'
dekoupe v.	'to cut up'	cf. *koupe* v.	'to cut'
delage v.	'to loosen, to untie'	cf. *lage* v.	'to release, to give up'
delibere v.	'to free (a prisoner)'	cf. *libere* v.	'to free'
demegri v.	'to lose weight (emphatic)'	cf. *megri* v.	'to lose weight'
depale v.	'to ramble'	cf. *pale* v.	'to speak'
depase v.	'to exceed, to overtake'	cf. *pase* v.	'to pass'
depati v.	'to stop associating with'	cf. *pati* v.	'to depart'
deperi v.	'to waste away'	cf. *peri* v.	'to perish'
derefize v.	'to refuse (emphatically)'	cf. *refize* v.	'to refuse'
detire v.	'to stretch'	cf. *tire* v.	'to pull'
devide v.	'to empty out'	cf. *vide* v.	'to empty'
devire v	'to go on a detour'	cf. *vire* v.	'to go on a drive, stroll'

Borrowing some turns of phrase from McWhorter (1998, 803f), it can be said that once the HC data are "viewed more liberally" beyond the "highly selective presentation of data" in McWhorter 1998, 797 (and in Brousseau Filipovich and Lefebvre 1989, 9; Lefebvre 1998, 305), various claims on Creole morphology "take on a different perspective."[15] Indeed, contrary to McWhorter's (1998, 797) claim, it is certainly *not* the case that "the [HC] inversive prefix *de-* ... *with few exceptions* transforms a word into its *precise* opposite". A scan of the 24 pages of entries starting with *de* in Freeman and Laguerre's (1996 [1998]) dictionary suggests that cases of inversive *de-* where X and *de*-X are "precise opposites" are not the majority among the reported *de*-X types. That is, *de-* has inversive semantics in only a subset of *de*-X words. In most instances, the "core meaning of the inversive prefix *de-* ... is obscured," as for the Romanian *de-* prefix that McWhorter (1998, 809) takes to illustrate semantically opaque derivation in non-Creole languages. Given such facts, HC *de-*

behaves very much like its Romanian counterpart, contrary to the structural divide that McWhorter posits between Creole ("consistently transparent") morphology and non-Creole ("semantically evolved") morphology.

A similar case against "consistent transparency" of Creole morphology can be made with the other derivational processes in (1)–(2). Take reduplication in (2o). It can be semantically transparent, as in its affective use (with proper names: e.g., *Mimich* for *Michèl*) and its intensifying use (e.g., *mache-mache* 'to walk a lot' or *bèl-bèl* 'very beautiful'). (As already noted, this may be yet another example of inflectional—in this case, aspect-marking—morphology, pace McWhorter 1998, 792, 809.) Reduplication can also be semantically opaque (i.e., with unpredictable, non-compositional semantics), as in (e.g.) *youn-youn* '(a) few' from the numeral *youn* 'one' (see Faine 1936, 103; Fattier 1998, vol. 2, 843).

Next, consider the agentive nominalizer *-adò*, illustrated in (2e). It is semantically transparent in *babyadò* 'griper' (cf. *babye* 'to gripe') and *vantadò* 'braggart' (cf. *vante* 'to brag') but semantically opaque in *kòk-woutchadò*, which overlaps in semantics with *kòk-kriyadò*. *Woutchadò*, for which there is no existing HC stem, presumably derives etymologically from Spanish *luchador* 'fighter'. In a similar vein, *kòk-kriyadò* 'experienced cock' is also opaque, *kriyadò* having been borrowed from Spanish *criado* with the meaning 'experienced' or from *cria**dor*** 'one who trains, breeds, raises, nurtures'.[16] As noted in (2e), the semantically opaque *kriyadò* in *kòk-kriyadò* exists alongside a semantically transparent neologism *kriyadò* 'chronic weeper' (cf. *kriye* 'to weep'). Yet another example among many others where HC manifests "endless idiosyncratic lexicalizations" is *enkoutab* 'foolhardy' in (2b), from *koute* 'to listen'.

Thus, it does seem that HC productive affixes are by and large no more and no less transparent than affixes in other languages. When the database in McWhorter 1998 is expanded, it becomes clear that HC exhibits endless cases of semantically *non*-transparent morphology alongside inflectional morphology, thus disconfirming the notion that HC is a "pure case" of the latest Creole prototype.

Do McWhorter's criteria make accurate predictions regarding non-Creole languages? That is, do they prevent non-Creole languages from falling under the classificatory umbrella of the Creole prototype? In fact, there are non-Creole languages that seem closer than HC to the Creole prototype outlined by McWhorter, at least according to the descriptions of Cambodian/Khmer, Chrau and Palaung in Huffman 1970, Ehrman 1972, Jenner and Pou 1982, Milne 1921, and Thomas 1971. In these descriptions, Cambodian/Khmer, Chrau, and Palaung show: no (productive) tone; no (productive) inflection; and mostly moribund derivation.[17] In addition, Chrau manifests other morphosyntactic characteristics that are somewhat reminiscent of familiar 'Creole' traits: "zero copula" (Thomas 1971, 75); "verbal adjectives" (Thomas 1971, 110, 148); no overt nominal inflection (Thomas 1971, chap. 8); no overt verbal inflection; tense-mood-aspect and negation morphemes as preverbal unbound markers (Thomas 1971, chap. 9).

That Mon-Khmer manifests "prototypical Creole" properties is not surprising: Creole languages are natural languages acquired by children like any other natural languages. There are surely some tendencies that Creoles as a class may exhibit given their history of formation in abrupt conditions of language contact. However, language contact is not exclusive to Creole genesis, and there is no reason why Creoles qua *regular* natural languages should collectively and exclusively bear a common set of structural features that reflect their history (see note 13). After all, many contingent factors are involved in Creole genesis, including the diverse linguistic ecologies in each contact situation. Beyond broad tendencies toward various degrees of inflectional erosion cum semantic transparency (as noted in, e.g., Meillet 1919 and Weinreich 1953; also see Mufwene 1991, DeGraff 1994, 1997, 1999a,b,d, 2000a,b, and note 2 above), no set of exclusively Creole prototypical features has been empirically confirmed. Again, this is not surprising once we assume that languages express properties of their speakers' minds/brains: if it could be claimed that Creole languages across time and space constitute a class that can be defined purely structurally so that this class excludes non-Creole languages, then it could be claimed that Creole speakers across time and space also constitute a class of human beings that can be defined purely on biological/cognitive grounds, on the basis of mental properties that all and only Creole speakers have (i.e., properties not shared by other human beings). Given what we seem to know about the general uniformity of the species with respect to brain structure, this would be a strange scientific conclusion indeed. This conclusion is also problematic methodologically given Lyell's (1830–1833) Uniformitarian Principle that laws of nature should be assumed to work the same in the present as in the past (also see Labov 1994, 21–24); this is a point I return to in section 2.6 below and take up in DeGraff 2000b,c.

What about McWhorter's general diachronic claims that HC (like other prototypical Creoles) developed via an affixless pidgin (i.e., via "radical break in transmission" that in the limit "eschews" all affixal morphology in the contact languages) and that prototypical Creole affixes develop internally via "gradual grammaticalization" (McWhorter 1998, 788, 792f, 798, 808, 812)? Such claims are, again, robustly contradicted by the available HC data, including the data in McWhorter 1998, 798. In fact, given the linguistic evidence in this chapter, it seems doubtful that the prior existence of a pidgin with drastically reduced morphology is central to the formation of "radical" Creoles such as HC (pace, e.g., Schuchardt 1914; Jespersen 1922; Bloomfield 1933; Hjelmslev 1938; Hall 1953; Valdman 1978; Samarin 1980; Bickerton 1984; Seuren and Wekker 1986; McWhorter 1998; Seuren 1998, 292–293; Baker 1999).

Let us reexamine the *de-* prefix mentioned in (11), in particular *degrese* 'to lose weight, to remove fat/grease'. Chaudenson (1996, 27ff.) points out that seventeenth-century French *dégraisser* is also ambiguous, like its HC descendent. This casts doubt on McWhorter's scenario that HC, as a prototypical Creole, originated from a purely affixless (thus *de*-less) pidgin. In McWhorter's scenario, neither the form nor the (ambiguous) semantics of the

French prefix *de-* in *dégraisser* could have been passed down to HC *de-* in *degrese*. At best, HC *degrese* would have been inherited as a simplex form. But this is contradicted by the fact that HC *de-* in *degrese* is a productive affix whose form and (ambiguous) semantics in the particular case of *degrese* closely matches that of its (seventeenth-century) French counterpart (recall from section 2.4 that affix borrowing does not exclude productivity of the nativized form).

More generally, HC *de-* is etymologically related to the French affix *de-*. There is no sense in which HC *de-* could be argued to have evolved via grammaticalization "over millennia," contra McWhorter (1998, 793, 798, 812). There is no documented unbound cognate for *de-* in (the diachrony of) the HC lexicon. In addition, given the form and semantics of French *de-*, there is no need to postulate such a HC unbound *de*—most of the HC lexicon is etymologically related to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French (see, e.g., Fattier 1998), and there is no principle that would make derivational affixes immune to this etymological relation. In fact, virtually all HC affixes find their etymological root in morphemes that are affixes in other languages—mostly French, although HC also has affixes with non-French cognates: e.g., *-adò* from Spanish *-dor* illustrated in (2e)); see discussion on p. ***; (also see DeGraff 2000b for more extensive details).

Pro-prototype creolists could respond that the bulk of HC productive affixes entered the language via late borrowings owing to heavy lexifier contact postcreolization. But such an argument strikes me as a-historical given that, in Saint-Domingue/Haiti, contact with French was much greater in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than after Haiti gained its independence in 1804 (see, e.g., *** for one recent reference). As a matter of fact, during the years following the initial European-African contact, the Africans and their descendants became increasingly numerous and increasingly distant from the French speakers. After Haiti gained its independence, the French presence was virtually eliminated in Haiti, except among the tiny bilingual élite whose speech is in general inaccessible to the vast monolingual majority. Therefore, claiming that HC productive morphology is a result of "late, post-creolization borrowing" (cf. Valdman's decreolization) implies that such "borrowing" of morphology could take place only after the relevant sociolinguistic and historical factors made it more difficult for such "borrowing" to occur—"borrowing" is presumably easier when the "lenders" are more numerous and more accessible. On the empirical side, Fattier (1998) documents a substantial set of seventeenth–eighteenth century French "survivances" in HC; some of these "survivances" robustly illustrate the use of morphologically complex words at the earliest stages of HC (also see Chaudenson 1996, 27ff.).

Furthermore, the "affixless pidgin" scenario is anti-Uniformitarian. For such a prototypical "affixless pidgin" to emerge, the pidgin creator would have to filter out or reanalyse *all* morphologically complex words from the primarily linguistic data. For example, *pini* 'to punish' would enter the incipient Creole, but *pinisyon* 'punishment' could not enter the language as a complex formation built from the stem *pini*. In the "prototypical"

Creole-genesis situation, all complex words are adopted by the substrate speakers as simplex words and remain simplex for a long period of time. *Pinisyon*, if it existed in the pidgin and early Creole, would have no internal structure and would bear no relationship to *pini* (see section 2.4 for somewhat similar arguments toward different theoretical ends). But the latter assumption makes the early "prototypical" Creole speaker unlike any other speaker. That is, such a speaker is totally unable to do pattern-matching and detect morphological and semantic relationships in the primary linguistic data; e.g., he/she cannot relate *pini* to *pinisyon* notwithstanding the systematicity and overall transparency of *-syon* affixation, as in (4) and its French counterpart. Neither can this early (affixless) Creole speaker generate and decompose transparently derived ordinal numbers such as HC *dez**yèm***, *twaz**yèm***, *katr**iyèm***, *senk**yèm***, … *sant**yèm***, etc. '2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, …100th, etc'. (Both the forms and the combinatorics of HC ordinal numbers are diachronically related to French *deux**ième***, *trois**ième***, *quatr**ième***, *cinq**uième***, … *cent**ième***, etc., contra the empirical and theoretical claims in Lefebvre 1998, 310–311.)

This "prototypical" scenario is not only weakened by the available diachronic and synchronic evidence (see, e.g., morphologically complex "survivances" and neologisms in Fattier 1998), but it is disconfirmed by what we know about the development of morphology; witness, say, the evidence for "fast mapping" in the acquisition of derivation (see, e.g., Clark 1993) and the status of derivational morphology in language contact and change (see, e.g., Weinreich 1953). Such observations, coupled with the Saussurean quality and the storage-cum-parsing capacities of the human mind (Pinker 1999), makes the consistently transparent Creole prototype with affixless-pidgin ancestry intrinsically anti-Uniformitarian: the prototypical Creole lexicon defies basic properties of human cognition.

In order to save McWhorter's diachronic scenario from total failure, it could perhaps be assumed that the Creole prototype makes "inherently gradient," not categorical, predictions about Creole morphology (see, e.g., McWhorter 1998, 811–812). In any case, given HC's well established sociohistorical profile as a bona fide Creole, McWhorter's scenario leads us to expect that at least a fair number of HC affixes would betray their origins in a (gradiently) affixless pidgin. Such affixes would still show signs of having developed internally from "erstwhile lexical items," assuming as McWhorter does that there was a (gradiently) affixless pidgin in HC's ancestry . However, by and large HC inflectional and derivational affixes show *no* evidence of erstwhile unbound ancestors that have been reanalyzed as affixes via "gradual grammaticalization."

Not only does HC as a radical Creole challenge McWhorter's claims about how "young" languages develop their morphology (via grammaticalization), but HC morphology as sketched above undermines McWhorter's (1998) fundamental opposition between "young" and "old" languages. Given McWhorter's very criteria, HC will not count as a "young" language. HC affixes are by and large etymologically related to French affixes (not surprisingly, since most of the HC lexicon is etymologically related to French; see Fattier

1998), and in turn, French affixes often have cognates in Latin. Thus, unlike hypothesized "young" languages whose affixes have recently evolved via grammaticalization, HC has affixes with a long etymological ancestry (no less than millennia).

This brings to mind Saussure's sociohistorically-related observation that, within the documentable past, every language has an ancestor. Keeping Creoles in mind, I would like to add that, within the documentable past, every language has *at least* one ancestor (also see note 27 regarding the ancient "ancestors" of Caribbean cultures). From a language-internal perspective that takes into account the neological aspects of HC morphology, one can also recall Meillet's (1929, 74) observation that every language is repeatedly created anew via acquisition (see DeGraff 1999a, 14, for discussion). Thus, from either an E-language or I-language perspective, one could argue that each language is as "old" or as "new" as every other; most (I-)languages (including "prototypical Creoles" such as HC) are instances of language (re-)creation with contingent primary linguistic data provided by speakers of some parent language(s). In Creole genesis cases, these data, alongside UG, may underdetermine the attained grammar to an extent greater than in the non-Creole cases, but the difference is one of degree not of quality.

Sign languages like the one currently developing in Nicaragua may be one example of "pure" language creation without any previous ancestry in a stable communal (E-)language. Interestingly, such "young" sign languages manifest the sort of morphological distinctions—e.g., "rich" agreement morphology—that is absent in many "old" languages such as English and Chinese (see Kegl, Senghas and Coppola 1999). This may be a modality-specific effect (see e.g. Kegl, Senghas and Coppola 1999, 213–214, 223). Be that as it may, the recent emergence in Nicaragua of (sign) languages with extensive morphological paradigms provides yet other examples of "young" languages that robustly disconfirm the predictions of the Creole prototype; also see note 2.

To sum up regarding the Creole prototype proposed in McWhorter 1998 and its antecedents in traditional Creole-genesis scenarios that allege a prior pidgin with little or no morphology (see, e.g., Jespersen 1922, 233–234): Its basic generalizations and predictions are disconfirmed by the available diachronic and synchronic evidence from HC, a "most creole of creole." Furthermore, it is theoretically problematic: there is no a priori reason why prototypical pre-Creole pidgins—qua (conventionalized) interlanguages—should be virtually affixless as envisaged by the traditional catastrophic scenarios. As for "optimal learnability and processibility" and "consistently transparent" semantics, these are only some of the factors driving the acquisition/creation of I-languages, and they are therefore not expected to be the sole determinant in the development of Creole morphology and lexical semantics. Given Saussurean arbitrariness, Creole languages (e.g. HC, Sranan (Wekker 1996, 95) and Saramaccan (Norval Smith, personal communication)) like any other natural languages, are expected to, and do, manifest semantically opaque derivations qua word-level morphologically complex idioms. This is as expected: in any natural language, derived words, like simplex words, can function as Saussurean signs (see, e.g., Aronoff 1976, Jackendoff 1995, Marantz 1997, Stump 1998, Pinker 1999; also see note 19). These observations cast further doubt on the morphological distinction that McWhorter posits between "young" and "old" languages (also see Seuren and Wekker 1986 and Seuren 1998, 292–293). The notions "old" vs. "new" as applied to language types may just be yet another intuitively attractive taxonomy with various sociohistorically and/or sociological motivations, but with no basis in linguistic theory—somewhat on a par with the distinction between "dialect" and "language". In other words, UG does not seem to encode specific information about individual language ancestry.

2.6 Creole Morphology and the Morphology of an Ideology

Thus far in this chapter, the "simple morphology" orthodoxy in Creole studies has failed both empirically and theoretically, and it has done so conclusively once we go beyond "highly selective presentation of data" and once we incorporate "data [that] are viewed more liberally" (cf. McWhorter's (1998, 803–804) own methodological exhortations in note 15). As I have shown here and in DeGraff 2000b,c, the "simple Creole morphology" orthodoxy illustrated in sections 2.2–2.5 is more a myth than a scientific conclusion based on observable facts. In the case studies at hand, the perennial Creole prototypes—with "little or no morphology," with "substrate-bound morphology," and/or with "semantically transparent morphology"—could not be further from the true nature of HC qua prototypical Creole, once a truly representative empirical sample is brought to bear on the implementation of the relevant proposals. Particularly striking is the quality of data that have been enlisted to support these proposals—data that are either flawed or too limited (or both). Yet these proposals are widely believed. It is as if their empirical claims were self-evident.

Furthermore, the evidence disconfirming the analyses by Hall, D'Ans, Whinnom, Valdman, Samarin, Seuren and Wekker, McWhorter, Lefebvre, and others, not only is readily available from published sources and from native speakers, but sometimes is found in these authors' own work as well as in some of the references they cite to support the empirically untenable orthodoxy.

In the most notable cases, the only "solid datum" leading to "consensus" is the virtual absence of data: for example, Whinnom (1971), Seuren and Wekker (1986) and Seuren (1998, 292–293)—the defenders of the no-morphology model of the Creole lexicon—present not one piece of supporting evidence (i.e., not one example of periphrastic constructions in lieu of morphologically complex words) and not one supporting reference.

For instance, Whinnom (1971, 109-110) claims that, because bound morphemes are lacking in Creoles, the Creole speaker may be "handicapped by his language": Creole morphology is "deficient" and prevents Creole speakers from forming "abstract terms;" see section 2.2.

On the empirical side, the HC lexicon does include morphologically simplex "abstract" words such as *chagren* 'sorrow', *kòlè* 'anger', *lanmou* 'love', *lapenn* 'grief' or morphologically complex "abstract" words such as *titès* 'childhood' (cf. *ti* 'small'; see p. ***) and *bèlte* 'beauty' (cf. *bèl* 'beautiful'). All these existing HC words are abstract terms, I presume, and directly contradict Whinnom's claim.[18]

On the theoretical side, even if one were to assume total absence of bound morphemes (purely for the sake of argumentation), it is not clear why Creoles could not express abstract concepts via morphologically simplex terms and periphrases built from such terms; Whinnom does not investigate the availability of such means. In any case, bound morphemes (or the relevant properties thereof), like unbound morphemes, are listed in the mental lexicon. Periphrases may thus be considered the syntactic analogues of morphologically complex words. As with affixed words, it is pieces (and/or processes) from the mental lexicon that enter into the composition of periphrases. The difference is that periphrases are put together with "syntactic glue" whereas complex words are put together with "morphological glue."[19] Therefore, another problem for Whinnom's position is that size limits (due, e.g., to short-term memory and online processing capacities) would apply equally to morphologically complex words, periphrases, sentences, and other output of the combinatorial rules of language. Yet no one would claim that abstract propositions (e.g., related to beliefs) cannot be expressed via sentences because of size limits. Finally, if morphology has any more expressive power than syntax, then English speakers would look greatly "handicapped" when compared with Algonquian or Bantu speakers. Wouldn't the latter "result" be considered undesirable or intolerable?[20]

I have now established that one common feature of various "simple Creole morphology" claims is that they are falsified by data that were readily available to their authors. On the larger empirical/methodological front, I must ask, how do creolists claim that inflection or (semantically opaque) derivation is absent or posit the inventory and nature of derivational processes without consulting, or while contradicting, the appropriate sources on Creole lexicons? The proponents of the "simple Creole morphology" orthodoxy seem to manifest a strong belief that Creoles *must* at all costs conform to particular synchronic and/or diachronic assumptions about Creole morphology: these assumptions are recurrently raised to the level of generalizations independently of straightforwardly available counterevidence.

In what follows, I do not wish to ascribe unconscious motives to certain creolists. It would be simplistic to assume that these creolists (across time and space) are all driven by similar motivations. I am also convinced that most of us creolists try our very best to come up with what we believe are valid scientific hypotheses about the diachrony and synchrony of Creole languages. But, as I cannot look inside researchers' minds, the best I can do here is inspect the textual evidence and relate specific claims to one another and to prevalent attitudes of their times. It is this textual evidence and the corresponding empirical claims and (in)adequacy thereof that establish the particular patterns I would like to elucidate. These patterns have permeated Creolistics since its very genesis as a recognizable field of inquiry.[21]

I thus examine the historiographical roots and the historical development of the conventionalized wisdom about Creole morphology (see DeGraff 2000c for further details). As early as in Pelleprat 1655 and through the writings of Saint-Quentin 1872, Baissac 1880, Adam 1883, Jespersen 1922, Bloomfield 1933, Hockett 1958, Whinnom 1971, Valdman 1978, McWhorter 1998, and so on, the one preconceived notion that has permeated Creole studies is the assumption that Creoles are "inferior dialects" or non-"normal"/non-"regular" languages that are intrinsically marked by one or both of the following related genetic factors: (1) their catastrophic genesis as emergency (thus "simple" and "optimal') solutions to communicative problems in plurilingual communities; (2) their genesis as failures on the part of "inferior" beings to acquire "superior" languages.

Assumption (2) is clearly racist, and both assumptions are non-Uniformitarian, therefore methodologically problematic. According to the Uniformitarian Principle (Lyell 1830–1833), laws of nature should be assumed to work the same in the present as in the past—for example, in the domain of geology, Lyell's title speaks for itself: *Principles of Geology; Being an Attempt to Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface, by Reference to Causes Now in Operation.* The implication is clear: measurable evidence from the present (e.g., from observable phenomena in conjunction with current scientific results) should constrain our theories about past events, lest we lose the possibility of explaining the past in ways that are falsifiable within known and testable principles. In the case of Creole genesis, I find it reasonable to assume that there are no radically different mental processes and/or substances that distinguish the "Creole mind" from the "non-Creole mind". We should then assume that the creators of Creole languages are biologically similar to other humans and that Creole genesis at the level of the individual speaker reduces to cognitive processes that are common to the entire species. Therefore, measurable evidence within our best theories of acquisition, language-contact, comparative morphosyntax, and so on, must impose limits on (the postulated mental bases of) Creole-genesis scenarios.

In this vein, Alleyne (1994) makes some particularly perceptive observations that touch on non-Uniformitarian assumptions in Creole studies; these observations are worth quoting at length.

> One of the most important, if not the most important, factor in the existence and preservation of the stigmatization of creole languages is the uncertainty of the tradition to which these languages might be attached. This is the central problem of genesis, and it plays a fundamental role in the development of the generally negative social psychological attitudes and interpretations that have

> emerged in opposition to any notion of standardization. In this regard it is very interesting to observe how hypotheses about genesis impinge on and affect social psychological attitudes. Those hypotheses ... continue to link creole languages definitionally to pidgins and thereby ... account for them fundamentally through the process of simplification. *The simplification assigned to creoles is not the form sometimes inferred in the process of change from Anglo-Saxon to English or from Latin to French, but some kind of drastic, extreme, extraordinary, or unnatural simplification.* Thus the teleological model on which Indo-European language families are based ignores linguistic convergence as a natural development or the possibility that fundamental change may occur through language contact situations typical of creole languages.
>
> ... *[T]hese ideological assumptions about natural language change have come to support and fuel those social psychological attitudes that are based on the perception that [Creole] languages are corrupt, deviant derivatives within the Western linguistic tradition and, concomitantly, on the notion of their inadequacy.*
>
> (Alleyne 1994, 8f)

In the sort of catastrophic scenarios criticized by Alleyne, the sociohistorical context of Creole genesis gives rise to a class of languages that can be *structurally* distinguished from the class of "regular" languages. In other words, not only do Creoles form a (non-"normal") sociolinguistic class of their own (see, e.g., Valdman 1978, 345f, 1992, 81); they also form a (non-"regular") *typological* class of their own, independent of the typology of their respective source languages.

McWhorter 1998 (sketched in section 2.5) is the most recent prominent representative of a family of scenarios in which Creole languages arise, in Alleyne's phrase, via "drastic, extreme, extraordinary, or unnatural simplification." The sort of simplification postulated in McWhorter's analysis would count as "unnatural" insofar as it presupposes "a radical break in transmission" that would have "eschewed" or "fossilized" all affixal morphology in the contact languages (McWhorter 1998, 788, 792f, 798, 804, 808); such simplification is claimed to exist exclusively in the history of Creole languages and serves as a litmus test to distinguish Creoles from "regular" languages.

From a Cartesian (i.e., internalist/mentalistic) perspective, the (non-"regular"/non-"normal") Creole prototypes imply that Creole speakers dispersed across history and geography also form a biological/cognitive class of their own. This biological/cognitive class shares certain (non-Saussurean) morphological and lexical characteristics. The latter differ from proposal to proposal; contrast, for example, D'Ans 1968, Whinnom 1971, Valdman 1978, Samarin 1980, Seuren and Wekker 1986, Seuren 1998, and McWhorter 1998 as quoted in this chapter. In each case though, the characteristics delineated for Creoles make Creole speakers' linguistic profiles look "simple"/"simplified" in a way similar to the prototypes envisaged in the writings of early creolists from the (post)colonial period, during which the intellectual inferiority of Creole speakers was taken for granted.

I now sketch how particular strands of the "simple Creole morphology" orthodoxy have been woven into the history of Creole studies, from its onset as part of Europe's imperialist enterprise in Africa and in the Americas.

Let me first succinctly evoke the very beginning of Creole studies through the writings of the Jesuit missionary Father Pelleprat (1606?–1667), one of the earliest commentators on Caribbean society and Caribbean Creole speech. For Father Pelleprat, the Africans' "mode of speaking" is defined as failure on the part of the slaves to acquire the French grammar of the colonists.

> We wait until they learn French before we start evangelizing them. It is French that they try to learn as soon as they can, in order to communicate with their masters, on whom they depend for all their needs. We adapt ourselves to their mode of speaking. They generally use the infinitive form of the verb [instead of the inflected forms] ... adding a word to indicate the future or the past. ... With this way of speaking, we make them understand all that we teach them. This is the method we use at the beginning of our teaching ... *Death won't care to wait until they learn French.* (Pelleprat 1655 [1965, 30–31]; my translation)

Thus, Pelleprat in 1655 may have been among the first to consider (Caribbean) Creole languages as simplified speech varieties resulting from the "failure" to acquire the corresponding European lexifier, announcing the view to be defended in a long series of publications across more than three centuries (see Holm 1988, 22ff., for a review). In this "creolization as failure" scenario, "*de*-creolization" is an "improvement" for Creole communities (see, e.g., Jespersen 1922, 228, 235; Bloomfield, 1933, 474).

In the seventeenth century, Pelleprat's attitude was representative of larger trends in intellectual thought surrounding the twin genesis of (Caribbean) Creole languages and Creole studies. Let us now consider some representatives of eighteenth-century scholarship in colonial Saint-Domingue. Michel Étienne Descourtilz (1775–1835), a Frenchman who traveled through colonial Saint-Domingue from 1799 to 1803, notes that, in reporting "Creole" speech samples between two slaves, he "did his best to correct their [...] conversations" (1809, vol. 3, 135). Here the one "correcting" Saint-Domingue Creole—or early HC—speech does not even speak it fluently. The same was true for another European traveler to the Caribbean: Justin Girod-Chantrans (1750–1841). After spending one year in Saint-Domingue (1782–1783), he published one of the earliest known texts in Saint-Domingue Creole (Dejean 1977, 13). In his (1785 [1980]) travelogue, Girod-Chantrans calls early HC "weak," "dull," "unclear," "insipid" (p. 158), an "imbecile jargon"—contrast this with Saint-Quentin's (1872) description of Cayenne Creole as "clear," "consistent" and "logical," even though both Girod-Chantrans and Saint-Quentin ultimately adopt a similar outlook that Creoles are imperfect languages. Girod-Chantrans, like many of his contemporaries in Europe, found French-lexifier Creoles to be "nothing but French back in infancy" (p. 157).[22] Expressions of ridicule like Girod-Chantrans's were all too common—see Y. Dejean 1977 for an overview of early reports on HC.

Given the logic of the "Founders" of Creole studies and, more generally, of Europe's *mission civilisatrice*, it was logically and pragmatically impossible for early Creolists to consider Creoles as "normal" or "regular" languages, in Valdman's and McWhorter's parlance. European observers and their local counterparts could not but interpret Creole structures as validation of their belief that non-Europeans were inferior, taking "divergences [between European and Creole languages] as proof of the Blacks' incapacity to learn languages properly" (Holm 1988, 22). In the case of French colonies, these divergences were taken to attest to the cognitive inferiority of the Africans and their Creole descendants and the cognitive superiority of the European colonizers. Throughout, European languages (and other biological and cultural phenomena viewed as European) were held as the standard against which to measure their non-European counterparts. Anything other than this Eurocentric classificatory stance would have defied the (necessary) ideological order of the colonial moment. Holm (1988, 2, 22) also mentions that European scholars' traditional fascination with Classical languages such as Latin and with flexional morphology as a linguistic canon of excellence also played against Creole (and African) languages. This is related to Bloomfield's (1933, 8) observation that eighteenth-century language scholars "forc[ed] their descriptions into the scheme of Latin grammar."

In any case, at the onset of Creole studies, it was perhaps Europe's material interest in Africa and the Caribbean that would ultimately induce European intellectuals to "disguise reality in the service of external power" (in the words of Chomsky 1979, 5). Early creolists may have participated in what Chomsky (1975, 130, citing Bracken 1973) calls "the expression of the racist ideology that came naturally enough to philosophers who were involved in their professional lives in the creation of the colonial system." As Meijer and Muysken (1977, 21) sum up the matter: "Most of the nineteenth-century views on creoles were shaped by the same racism that characterized slavery."

In the nineteenth-century, the "simple morphology" disguise is elevated to a criterion of Creoleness, as in Pierre Larousse's (1869) entry for *Creole* in the *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX siècle*

> The Creole language, in our colonies, in Louisiana and Haiti, is a *corrupted French* in which several Spanish and gallicized words are mixed. This language, often unintelligible when spoken by an old African, is extremely sweet when spoken by white Creole women.
>
> (Larousse 1869; my translation)

A somewhat similar definition is found in Vinson's (1882) entry for *Creole* in the *Dictionnaire des sciences anthropologiques*:

> Creole languages result from the adaptation of a language, especially some Indo-European language, to the (so to speak) phonetic and grammatical genius of *a race that is linguistically inferior.* The resulting dialect is composite, truly mixed in its vocabulary, but its grammar remains essentially Indo-European, albeit *extremely simplified* (Vinson 1882, 345, cited in Baggioni 1988, 87; my translation)

Let us now look at some of the first detailed descriptions of French-lexicon Creoles and recall the details of Saint-Quentin's (1872) Rousseauistic hypothesis regarding the cognitive basis for his Creole prototype (some of these details—for example, Creole languages as "infantile jargon"—are found in much of the creolistics literature of the time; the "universality" of such concepts is noted explicitly by Adam (1883, 3)):[23]

> [Creole morphosyntax] is, therefore, *a spontaneous product of the human mind, freed from any kind of intellectual culture.* ... But when one studies its structure, one is so very surprised, so very charmed by its *rigor and simplicity* that one wonders if the creative genius of the most knowledgeable linguists would have been able to give birth to anything that so completely reaches its goal, *that imposes so little strain on memory and that calls for so little effort from those with limited intelligence.* An in-depth analysis has convinced me of something that seems paradoxical. Namely: *if one wanted to create ab ovo an all-purpose language that would allow, after only a few days of study, a clear and consistent exchange of simple ideas, one would not be able to adopt more logical and more productive structures than those found in Creole syntax.* (Saint-Quentin 1872 [1989, 40–41]; my translation)

Aspects of Saint-Quentin's "simple Creole morphology" argument (italicized in the quotation) reappear throughout Creole studies in various theoretical and/or sociolinguistic guises, as in Adam's (1883, 4f) Rousseau-istic concept of Creoles as *langues naturelles* (as opposed to *langues cultivées*); Jespersen's (1922, 228) idea that the creators of Creole languages, from both the superstrate and the substrate languages, spoke "as if their minds were as innocent of grammar as those of very small babies ... [thus, Creoles'] inevitable naïveté and ... childlike simplicity ... ;" Hjelmslev's (1938, 1939) "optimum;" Whinnom's (1971, 109f) morphological "handicap;" D'Ans's (1968, 26), Valdman's (1978, 375f) and Samarin's (1980, 221) derivational deficiency vis-à-vis "lexical enrichment" and "morphosemantic adaptation;" Seuren and Wekker's (1986) Creole "semantic transparency;" Bickerton's (1988, 276) radical Creole showing "the loss [of] all bound morphology;" and McWhorter's (1998) toneless, inflection-less and semantically transparent Creole morphology.

The sustained attraction of the “simple Creole morphology” orthodoxy can be sampled through the writings of a famous quartet of linguists with infamous sound bites on Creole languages: Antoine Meillet (1866–1936), Leonard Bloomfield (1887–1949), Suzanne Sylvain (1898–1975),[24] and Charles Hockett (1916–2000).

Meillet 1924:

> [W]e also need to take into account the sort of changes occurring in languages that are *imperfectly* used by speakers who do not try to speak them *normally*. Thus, the black slaves in the colonies did not try to make *normal use* of their masters' French or Spanish: their 'Creole' modes of speaking—Spanish Creole or French Creole—thus constitute *varieties of Spanish or French that are deprived of almost all their grammar, weakened in their pronunciation, reduced to a small lexicon*. (Meillet 1924 [1951, 68]; my translation)

Bloomfield 1933:[25]

> Speakers of a *lower* language may make so little progress in learning the dominant speech, that the masters, in communicating with them resort to “*baby-talk*.” This “baby-talk” is the masters' *imitation* of the subjects' *incorrect* speech. There is reason to believe that it is by no means an exact imitation, and that some of its features are based not upon the subjects' mistakes but upon grammatical relations that exist within the upper language itself. The subjects, in turn, deprived of the correct model, can do no better now than to acquire the *simplified* “baby-talk” version of the *upper* language. The result may be a conventionalized *jargon* [Bloomfield's emphasis]. During the colonization of the last few centuries, Europeans have repeatedly *given* jargonized versions of their language to slaves and tributary peoples
>
> When the jargon has become the only language of the subject group, it is called a *creolized language* [Bloomfield's emphasis]. The creolized language has the status of an *inferior* dialect of the masters' speech. It is subject to constant leveling-out and *improvement* in the direction of the latter. ... With an improvement of social conditions, this levelling is accelerated
>
> (Bloomfield 1933, 472, 474)

Sylvain 1936:

> At the time of [HC] genesis, there was, on one side, the powerful and feared master speaking with a small and invariant set of French words, and, on the

> other side, there were slaves speaking a great diversity of African dialects. It is thus expected that most of the [HC] lexicon is drawn from French. The genesis of [HC] morphosyntax has a different status: on one side, there was the simplified French used by the colonists; and, on the other side, there was *the multitude of African languages all with nearly the same grammatical structure—a structure that, like the colonist's simplified French, was very simple.* As for these African languages, M. Migeod writes: "The complete dissimilarity of vocabulary but *uniformity of syntax is often most striking and the reason may perhaps fairly safely be ascribed to the early crystallization of the mental powers of the black race.*" Therefore, the African, in order to communicate, was able to adopt the basic patterns of French morphosyntax, but he was also able to retain his old speech habits according to his emotional and cogitative modes. (Sylvain 1936, 36–37; my translation).

Hockett 1958 (in a section entitled "Pidgins, Artificial Languages, and Creoles"):[26]

> Haitian Creole is *highly aberrant*, and yet is properly classified as a variety of North French. ... One simple test of this [i.e., of the hypothesis that creoles are aberrant types of their lexifier languages] is the relative ease with which different people can learn a given pidgin or creole (p. 423)

To recapitulate, the "simple Creole morphology" orthodoxy has ancient antecedents in Creole studies, starting with Pelleprat 1655 and later in the dictionary and encyclopedia definitions in Larousse 1869 and Vinson 1882 and in the descriptive grammars of Saint-Quentin (1872) and Baissac (1880). Adam (1883, 7, 11, etc) and, to a lesser extent, Sylvain (1936, 36f) took the simplicity of Creole morphosyntax to derive from the non-Indo-European substrate. Schuchardt (1914 [1980, 91–92]) and especially Jespersen (1922, 233–234) talked about a morphological "vanishing point" in the diachronic path of Creole languages. Regarding (alleged) Creole transparency, Hjelmslev (1938, 1939), in advance of McWhorter (1998), posited that Creole morphology is "optimal" insofar that it establishes a one-to-one relationship between morphemes and formants. This is reminiscent of Saint-Quentin's (1872 [1989, 40f]) aforementioned claim that Creole morphosyntax is completely rigorous, simple, clear, consistent, and logical. (Also see the references in note 1.)

It thus can be safely asserted that, if there is any long-reigning orthodoxy and alleged truism in Creole studies, it indeed has to do with the oft-repeated claim that Creole morphology is *maximally simple and/or simplified and/or simple to account for* from a diachronic and/or synchronic perspective. In fact, this orthodoxy is empirically untenable, theoretically unfounded and methodologically bizarre. Yet, notwithstanding modern advances in linguistics and our current understanding of UG, this anti-egalitarian myth has continued unabated for the past three and a half centuries with sociologically and scientifically dismal consequences (for Creolophones and Creole studies), specifically in the domains of language planning, education and linguistic description (DeGraff 2000b,c).

I thus consider suspect any description of Creole languages that claims that these languages a priori lack certain linguistic structures—for example, semantically opaque derivation qua "evolved idiosyncrasy" as in McWhorter's (1998) Creole prototype. Regarding the latter, I fail to see any reason why such processes should be consistently absent in a given language grouping. A language that admits derivation only if semantically transparent entails that its speakers never lexicalize the result of morphological combination, no matter how often the word is derived. This is a strange assumption indeed: there is no known memory limitation that a priori excludes the lexical and idiomatic storage of derivationally complex words and phrases (see discussion in section 2.5).

Descriptions of Creole languages that make such peculiar anti-universal assumptions become even more suspect when they adduce little or no evidence to support claims that are made about entire linguistic domains (e.g., morphology and lexicon). And my suspicion turns into complete mistrust when Creole languages are systematically contrasted with "regular"/"normal" languages. For instance, in a peculiar terminological twist, one hallmark of "regular" (i.e., non-Creole) languages is the presence of semantically *ir*regular morphology (McWhorter 1998). Creole languages have also been claimed to constitute sociolinguistically and structurally non-"normal" languages whose fate, when co-existing with their lexifiers, is extinction via decreolization qua merger into the next available European "normal" language (Valdman 1978, 345ff., 1992): "Creole languages differ from other languages along many dimensions and these differences entail certain limits with respect to their development" (1978, 345). Seuren and Wekker (1986, 66) put Creole languages in the class of "younger or less advanced" and "beginning" languages, which is contrasted with a class of "more advanced" languages. For Seuren (1998, 292), "Creole grammars … lack the more sophisticated features of languages backed by a rich and extended cultural past and a large, well-organized literate society." Such views are reminiscent of the popular 19th-century Schleicherian/Darwinian distinctions between primitive and civilized languages (see, e.g., Adam 1883, 4–5). As I have argued, various diagnoses for the morphological "limits" of Creoles are empirically unfounded and seem ideologically driven.[27]

2.7 Toward a New Perspective on Creole Studies

Going beyond linguistics per se, there is a twin paradox in Creole studies that I have not yet addressed: namely that the negative attitudes and the writings of educated Creolophones (say, in Haiti) often reflect the attitudes and writings of creolists who (either explicitly or implicitly) devalue their objects of study. HC, spoken by all Haitians and the only language of the vast majority, is central to Haitian life. HC is at the core of the everyday and productive lives of at least the six million Haitians for whom it is the only language they efficiently speak and understand. Yet HC and other Creoles remain among the most stigmatized and undervalued languages of the world, even among self-styled progressive intellectuals, including linguists. And educated Creolophones too are often among those who stigmatize and devalue Creole languages (for overviews and critiques, see, e.g., Bebel-Gisler and Hurbon 1975; Y. Dejean 1975, 1993; Prudent 1980; Devonish 1986). Perhaps owing in part to the context of Haiti's violent past as a French colony based on slavery and its even more violent metamorphosis from Europe's cash cow to a defiant free Black republic, the cognitive and cultural parity of Haitians and Europeans was (and, for many in Haiti and elsewhere, remains) an "unthinkable"; see DeGraff 2000b.

The following comments by Haitian historian Hénock Trouillot are typical of the attitudes toward HC among the dominant classes:

> [HC] facilitates mediocrity in many ways
>
> [HC] closes itself in structures that are narrow and limited, with the heavy disadvantage that it is a language that has not been systematized, a language with a syntax and orthography that are not yet part of a grammar with broad recognition in the intellectual world.
>
> [HC] has no fixed orthography and no fixed syntax. Worse yet, it is (nearly) unreadable for many francophone readers.
>
> (H. Trouillot 1980, 12, 15, 22; my translation)

A related sentence of insignificance is passed by Jean Métellus, a well known Haitian scholar, who speaks with the voice of apparent authority as a neurologist, novelist, poet, and linguist.

> [W]ith [HC] one can do many things, but one can do neither physics, nor chemistry, nor mathematics, nor medicine, nor biology. ... I think that with [HC] one can only do poetry. ... But this is not a language that can be used for basic science or that can be used in the advancement of knowledge (Métellus 1997–1998, 18; my translation)

The point should be clear: there still exist influential scholars and writers for whom HC does not qualify as a "regular"/"normal" language, even though the vast majority of Haitians are monolingual Creolophones and HC is the native tongue of virtually all Haitians (see Y. Dejean 1993; also see note 28 for somewhat similar attitudes outside the HC context). This disdain for Creole languages has its counterpart in the creolists' views critiqued above. Even French-born creolist and language-teaching expert Albert Valdman is among those who consider HC to belong to a class of non-“normal” languages; his views are clearly stated in his much-quoted 1978 book (pp. 345ff.) and in many articles written thereafter (see quotations above). Valdman (in an article that otherwise seems to promote HC) even casts doubt on the *intrinsic* necessity to elevate HC—qua the “mother tongue” of the vast *monolingual* majority of Haitians—to language of instruction and official language:

> Notwithstanding the fact that [HC] is the only language shared by all Haitians, there is no inherent principle of language planning that compels its use as the primary school vehicle or as the official language. Nor, contra the celebrated UNESCO article of faith … , has it been convincingly demonstrated that in a multilingual country, in all situations, literacy is most effectively imparted in a child’s mother tongue. (Valdman 1984, 84)

Here Valdman seems opposed to UNESCO’s basic principle of universal education, a pedagogically sound principle according to which “education is best carried on through the mother tongue of the pupil,” and in support of which “every effort should be made to provide education in the mother tongue” (see, e.g., UNESCO 1953, 6, 47). Green and Hale (1998, 198) paraphrase this truism as “the unimpeachable rationale … to facilitate a child’s overall education by carrying it out in his or her own language.”

Thus, there still exist deeply negative attitudes about Creole languages, on the part of both Creolophones and creolists. These two sets of historically rooted attitudes interact in subtle and pernicious ways that often cast long shadows on descriptions of Creole languages and on Creolophones’ (self-)images and socioeconomic prospects. These attitudes systematically devalue Creole languages and their speakers in favor of European languages and their speakers. In the case of Haiti (and other Creolophone communities), such attitudes have had devastating effects on social reform and education. For instance, Creole languages are still underused and/or misused in the schools and their very use by (monolingual) Creole speakers is often misperceived as an indelible marker of lower class and inferior intellect. Such factors have contributed to blocking the upward mobility and political empowerment of (monolingual) Creole speakers—keeping them, in effect, in a situation of “linguistic apartheid” (as decried by P. Dejan/Dejean 1988, 1989, 1993; also see Bebel-Gisler and Hurbon 1975 and Y. Dejean 1975). What can be done? I would like to argue that (apparent?) neocolonial intellectual imperialism in Creole studies, coupled with the typical ambivalence toward Creoles among many educated Creolophones, must be vigorously critiqued in order to further scientific and social progress in and about Creole communities. Modern linguistic theory provides needed arguments to critique antiegalitarian stances among both creolists and Creolophones. And there is much to learn from Ken Hale’s “life in language,” especially from his life as linguist *engagé*.

The title of this section, “Toward a New Perspective on Creole Studies”, is inspired by Hale 1972a: “A New Perspective on American Indian Linguistics.” Hale’s “new perspective" is pretty straightforward: linguistic research must become "research on, for and with" the speaker (Cameron, Frazer and Harvey 1992, 22). In other words, our work as linguists must also involve our political commitment to social and economic justice in the communities we work in. This political commitment, whenever possible, must involve the training, hence "empowerment," of the native-speaker informant as *bona fide* native-speaker linguist. This position has informed Hale's fieldwork for some forty years, and it is in this sense that he has collaborated, and continues to collaborate, with speakers of indigenous languages: many among Hale's teachers/collaborators/students/consultants are Native and Central Americans and Australian Aborigines. Hale imposes no pre-requisite as condition for linguistic training (see, e.g., Hale 1972a, 95–96; 1972b, 391ff.; 1973, 205). Through this collaboration, the indigenous speakers work toward becoming full-fledged partners in linguistics research and applied linguistics. In turn, they have contributed to theoretical developments as they elaborate accurate descriptions of their native languages (see, e.g., Hale 1965, 1972a,b). In some cases, these indigenous speakers are or become activists who work toward rescuing their native or ancestral languages from a (quasi-)moribund state (see, e.g., Hale 1972b, Hale 1992, 1993, Green and Hale 1998, Fermino 2000). This is where theoretical linguistics meets "language rescue," and where field linguistics meets political activism, with native speakers becoming linguists *engagé(e)s* fighting for the respect and survival of their own language and culture.

How is this relevant to Creole studies and Creolophone communities? To use HC as an example: I would like to believe that much of the current ambivalence toward HC among Haitians is not only rooted in history, but also conditioned by a high degree of ignorance about what constitutes knowledge of language and about how Haiti's history has paradoxically, if inevitably, contributed to the debasement of its national culture. Indeed, there are specific historical events that lie at the root of widespread ambivalence toward Creole culture: historical events such as slavery, colonization, postcolonial class struggles, and "surrealist appropriations" in academic discourse (as defined by anthropologist Drexel Woodson (1992)) have conspired to deprive HC and other authentically Haitian phenomena (e.g., Vodou) of much symbolic capital. The Haitian revolution is one of history's events that, to Haitian historian Michel-Rolph Trouillot, may still constitute an "unthinkable", given the then-prevalent racism of Western thought and the contemporary remnants thereof.

> [Afro-Caribbean cultural practices] were not meant to exist. ... [They] emerged on the edges of the plantation system, gnawing at the logic of an imposed order and its daily manifestations of dominance (M.-R. Trouillot 1998, 28).

The linguist *engagé(e)* will thus use both history and linguistics to demystify current attitudes about HC. History will teach the creolist and the Creolophone about the origins of their respective prejudices (if any). As for Cartesian UG-based approaches to language, they are intrinsically egalitarian: all languages are "regular"/"normal," contra the anti-egalitarian approach illustrated by Pelleprat 1655, Saint-Quentin 1872, Baissac 1880, Jespersen 1922, Bloomfield 1933, D'Ans 1968, Whinnom 1971, Valdman 1978, Seuren and Wekker 1986, Samarin 1980, McWhorter 1998, Seuren 1998, and others. In Cartesian thought, the concept of (inferior) "coloured minds" is a "logical embarrassment" (Bracken 1974, 158, cited in Chomsky 1975, 130). The UG-based approach to linguistics will teach Creolophones, and remind creolists, that the biological cognitive basis of language is a precious genetic heirloom universally inherited by every healthy member of the human species, each of whom is endowed with an equally precious language faculty. It is this heirloom that defines the humanity and the individuality of every human being, including Creole speakers. As Sapir (1933 [1963, 7]) succinctly put it: "[L]anguage is an essentially perfect means of expression and communication among every known people." More explicitly:

> [A]ll attempts to connect particular types of linguistic morphology with certain correlated stages of cultural development are vain. Rightly understood, such correlations are rubbish. Both simple and complex types of language of an indefinite number of varieties may be found spoken at any desired level of cultural advance. When it comes to linguistic form, Plato walks with the Macedonian swineherd, Confucius with the head-hunting savage of Assam (Sapir 1921, 219)

Sapir's view and the available evidence on cross-linguistic morphology (in, e.g., English, Chinese, Wampanoag, Kivunjo and Nicaraguan Sign Language) contradict the persistently-popular view championed by (e.g.) Seuren (1998, 292) that "the more sophisticated features of languages [are] backed by a rich and extended cultural past and a large, well-organized literate society" (see note 27).

My perhaps naive hunch is that the practice of Cartesian theoretical linguistics *by Creolophones* has much to contribute to eliminating the apparent ideological "handicap" manifested by creolists and Creolophone scholars commenting on the alleged nonviability of Creole languages. Having Creolophones read what creolists write will provide some useful checks and balances, and so will having Creolophones write what creolists read. Such collaboration is beneficial to the international linguistics community. This is illustrated by Dominique Fattier's recent collaboration with linguists at Haiti's *Faculté de Linguistique Appliquée*. This collaboration was central to the empirical reliability of Fattier's (1998) outstanding description of HC dialects. I also trust that promoting HC and other Creole languages as valid objects of scientific study in the eyes of Creole speakers themselves may go some way in providing correctives to the current role— or, rather, non-role—of Creole languages in the (mis)education of Haitians and of creolists.

Another step toward increasing the participation of Creolophones in linguistics is to get young Creole speakers interested in their own languages in ways that are educationally and scientifically constructive. This may be hard to do given the socioeconomic realities facing

Creole communities and the status of linguistics as a less than lucrative field. But given my own interaction with Haitian students, I am confident that HC speakers would relish the opportunity to participate in greater numbers in the scientific study of their language, especially when they realize that Creole languages (qua "regular"/"normal" languages) have contributed great insights to the scientific study of the mind, as practiced in respectable research centers throughout the world.

Exposure to HC linguistics can start at the earliest possible age. Indeed, searching for the rules of one's native language simply amounts to apprenticeship in scientific discovery (see e.g., Honda and O'Neil 1993). Hale (1973) discusses the cognitive, intellectual, and scientific benefits of engaging schoolchildren in linguistic research with their native languages suppling the "raw" data for scientific experiments:

> It makes extremely good sense to engage school-age children in the study of their own language—it is perhaps one of the very best ways of enabling them to become familiar with certain basic principles of scientific inquiry. It has an advantage over other sciences in that the school-age child comes prepared with an extremely large body of data (in the form of intuitions about the sentences of his language) ... [H]e comes equipped with the primary data of linguistics, the science which seeks to explain the fantastically complicated ability which human beings have which enables them to speak and to understand the indefinitely many sentences of their native languages. Since primary data are so readily available, they provide an excellent opportunity for teachers to engage their students in the process of making observations about language, observations which are similar in nature to the kinds of observations that any scientist makes in relation to the phenomena he studies. ... [S]kills which are developed and exercised in making and reporting linguistic observations are of a kind which can be of great use to students in many phases of their lives, both academic and non-academic. (Hale 1973, 205)

I would surely ensconce myself (deeper) into some academic utopian exile if I believed that linguistics could suddenly reverse widespread negative attitudes about Haiti and its people, attitudes deeply rooted in (post)colonial history and in socioeconomics and politics.[28] Ultimately, HC will gain due respect in all sectors of Haitian life and beyond only when it too can accumulate real and symbolic "capital" (see Bourdieu 1991), and become wedded to sources of true power. This can only happen if HC starts at last to function as a true official language, not only on paper, but also in practice. As P. Dejan/Dejean (1988, 59, 1989, 27) reminds us, such changes require nothing less than political reform toward the full defense of the human rights of Creole speakers. Devonish (1986) makes similar arguments:

> The function of an official language in any country, particularly in an

> underdeveloped ex-colonial country ... , ought to ... involve the mass of the population in the decision-making processes of their society, as well as in its economic development. (Devonish 1986, 32)
>
> The language variety spoken as the language of everyday communication by the ordinary members of a community is the most effective language medium for releasing creativity, initiative and productivity among the members of such community. Such a language is also the most effective means of promoting popular participation in, and control of, the various decision-making bodies within the state. A revolutionary official language policy would, therefore, have to be committed to the creation of a unity between the language variety or varieties used for everyday communication among the mass of the population, and the language variety or varieties used for official purposes. (Devonish 1986, 35)

Yet my goal in this chapter, although scientific *and* political, is much more modest than Devonish's. Attainment of socioeconomic and political power by larger numbers of HC speakers (e.g., via adequate education in the language that all Haitians speak and via increased use of HC at all levels of socioeconomic and political life) is made even more elusive by the following fact, which I'd like more linguists to do something about: among the *only* professional corps that is qualified to scientifically, thus authoritatively, document the linguistic viability of Creole languages (i.e., linguists), there exist influential figures who continue upholding mythical hierarchies among human languages, with Creoles consistently ranked at the bottom. Such hierarchies are maintained, for example, when our most respected publications carry articles that relegate Creole languages to some non-"regular," non-"normal," and/or "deficient" typology with properties that seem unexpected from any natural language—for example, (1) total absence of morphology, (2) inability to express abstract notions, and (3) affixation that is always semantically transparent. (Do Creole speakers lack the necessary neurons for morphology, for abstract thought or for lexical storage of complex words?) Such stereotypes actually reinforce the status of Creoles as languages that are unfit for education and for general use in Creolophone communities (or any human society whatsoever). If such Creole stereotypes/prototypes were to exist (contra the data), they would not meet human linguistic needs. The extreme Creole prototypes—such as McWhorter's—would not even be usable for metaphors, idioms, puns, proverbs, poetry, charades, folk tales, and so on. Indeed, how could such forms of verbal art ever exist in any language that lacks the Saussurean structural means for noncompositional lexical semantics?

2.8 Envoi

> The scientific investigation of a given language cannot be understood in

isolation. In carrying out field research, linguists are inevitably responsible to the larger human community which its results could affect. ...

... What matters is eventual success, and that will be measured by the extent to which work on the language is integrated in a meaningful way into the life of the community of people who speak it.

(Hale 2001, 76, 100)

2.9 Notes

[1] See, for example, Pelleprat 1655 [1965, 30–31, 34]; Saint-Quentin 1872 [1989, 172–173]; Baissac 1880, 23, 30; Schuchardt 1909 [1980, 69–70, 97], 1914 [1979, 74, 91f, 1980, 92]; Jespersen 1922, 233–234; Bloomfield 1933, 471-475; Sylvain 1936, 27, 31, 37–38, 48–49; Faine 1936, 93, 126; Hjelmslev 1938, 286, 1939; Hall 1953, 28; D'Ans 1968, 26; 34; Tinelli 1970, 2ff.; Férère 1974, 88ff.; Valdman 1978, 130, 149–152; Y. Dejean 1977, 390ff., 423–424, 1980, 138, 160; Seuren and Wekker 1986, passim; Bickerton 1988, 272–276; Lefebvre 1998, chap. 10; McWhorter 1998, passim; Seuren 1998, 292–293; P. Baker 1999, 17, 19.

[2]Morphological reduction of a more restricted sort—namely, absence of certain inflectional affixes (see, e.g., DeGraff 1994, 1997, 1999a,b,c 2000a,b; Déprez 1999)—must be distinguished from total absence of affixation. Inflectional "erosion" seems typical of language contact in general, and applies to *both* "old" and "young" languages (see, e.g., Meillet 1919 [1958, 201]; Weinreich 1953, sec. 2.3; Givón 1979, 20ff.) Weinreich (1953, 41ff.) writes about "grammatical systems [showing preference for] relatively free and invariant morphemes in [their] paradigm," about "the disappearance of grammatical categories," and about "highly hybridized makeshift trade languages [in which] most obligatory categories expressed by bound morphemes are well known to be abandoned." (Weinreich dutifully notes possible exceptions, for example on page 42.) Givón (1979, 20–21) reminds us that the "reduction of inflections" in Caribbean Creoles should not be surprising given that the most influential substrate languages (e.g., Kwa in the case of HC) were themselves noninflecting. In the VP domain, Sylvain (1936, 138–139), Goodman (1964, 81), Chaudenson (1979, 80ff.), Chaudenson, Mougeon and Beniak (1993), DeGraff (1997, 1999b, 2000a,b), and many others have pointed out that most of the preverbal nonaffixal markers in HC (and other French-lexifier Creoles) find cognates in the verbal periphrastic constructions manifested in earlier stages of French, with contemporary counterparts in regional French dialects (e.g., in Québécois); see Gougenheim 1971 for an inventory of such periphrastic constructions in French diachrony.

In certain writings, the empirical divide between derivation and inflection seems blurred. One case in point is McWhorter 1998. With respect to HC, McWhorter's claims vacillate at times between absence of inflectional morphology (i.e., HC has "no inflectional affixes;" e.g., pp. 792, 809), absence of "rich paradigms of derivational affixes" (p. 796), and complete absence of morphology (i.e., HC is one of the languages "eliminating [morphological paradigms] entirely;" p. 810, also see p. 799).

[3] Hall's reasoning is also echoed by, among others, Tinelli (1970, 2ff.) and Y. Dejean (1977, 423–424; 1980, 160). Y. Dejean (personal communication) now agrees that he had underestimated the inventory and productivity of HC morphological processes.

[4]Dijkhoff's (1993) treatment of Papiamentu compounding is a notable exception, perhaps among others that I am not yet aware of.

[5]I use the following abbreviations: adj 'adjective', adv. 'adverb', ANT 'anterior', FEM 'feminine', n. 'noun', NEG 'negative', PROG 'progressive marker', RES-PRON 'resumptive pronoun' (see DeGraff 1992, 1993, 1995),, v. 'verb', 1sg. . . 3pl '1st person singular . . . 3rd-person plural'.

[6]One cannot be totally certain that particular forms were/are absent from the *mental* lexicons of (French) speakers at any particular time. Then and now, dictionaries are only imperfect inventories of speakers' mental lexicons. Hence the need for caution in determining neologisms; *Haitianisms* may be a more appropriate term to distinguish such well established "neologisms" from recent (and truly *neo*-logical) lexical innovations.

[7]To some extent, I agree with Lefebvre (1998), and also with Adam (1883) and Sylvain (1936): I too am convinced that various aspects of HC grammar are *somewhat* in "correspondence" with substrate grammar; this is hardly surprising given what we know about native-language influence on the results of second-language acquisition by adults. But it is certainly inaccurate to posit as Adam and Lefebvre do that Creole morphosyntax is virtually isomorphic to that of its substrate. For example, the inventory and properties of HC morphological processes, once carefully studied, robustly contradict the claim that HC affixes are mostly in a "one-to-one correspondence" with Fongbe affixes (see main text). In other words, Lefebvre's "relexification" hypothesis cannot even account for the genesis and structure of the HC lexicon—the latter is where "relexification" may be expected to apply most straightforwardly.

Suzanne Sylvain, the Haitian-born linguist who is often hailed as an early HC "relexificationist" in contradistinction to her "superstratist" compatriot and contemporary Jules Faine, was actually very careful in showing, throughout her book, that HC grammar was substantially influenced by *both* the lexifier and the substrate.

HC also displays patterns that distinguish it both from the lexifier and from the (major) substrate (see, e.g., DeGraff 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1999b,c, 2000a,b).

[8] Valdman takes most of his examples from Orjala 1970, 154f. Orjala, like Valdman, calls such forms "Gallicisms." Unlike Valdman though, Orjala considers such examples to demonstrate *productive* word formation processes in rural (i.e., monolingual) HC. For Valdman, the examples in (3) do not count as evidence for productive suffixation; instead, they count as evidence that HC derivation is "very weak," which in turn makes HC's "lexical enrichment" dependent on "pseudo-French" affixation. The latter is claimed to be symptomatic of decreolization.

[9]*Eklerasyon* in (5) is also found in Valdman 1978, 139, with the French translation 'conscience éclairée' (i.e., 'enlightened conscience'). Valdman writes that, notwithstanding morphophonological and semantic similarities between stem and derived form, "it is difficult to extract from [*eklerasyon*] a suffix that has the same semantics elsewhere." This statement contradicts the stable paradigm of semantically transparent derivations in (4); furthermore some of the pairs in (4)–(5) and many other such examples are found in Valdman *et al* 1981 and Valdman, Pooser, and Jean-Baptiste 1996; also see note 18.

[10] Fort-Royal is a small, rural, totally monolingual Haitian community (of about 300 households) near Petit-Goâve, 70 kilometers West of the capital Port-au-Prince. Fort-Royal is also where Y. Dejean directs *Sant Twa Ti Flè* ('Three Little Flowers Center'), a small school where HC is the only language of instruction.

[11]Lefebvre gives "1988" and "Lawrence, KS" as the year and place of publication for Freeman's inverse word list. The version I consulted was published in 1989 in Port-au-Prince. It seems unlikely that *adorasyon* and *admirasyon* and the HC *-syon* neologisms were all post-1988 additions to the Port-au-Prince edition.

[12] HC *pansyon* also has the sense of 'boardinghouse, pension' (cf. French *pension*), but this is not the relevant meaning for the derived verb *pansyone*. Throughout this text, I mention only the senses that are relevant for the points being made.

[13]Whether Creole languages can be defined in terms of a purely structural prototype has been debated many times before. The antiprototype view has proposed that creolization is defined by sociohistorical factors such as massive language contact, abrupt emergence of a new variety as a contact language distinct from the languages (previously) in contact, and so on (see DeGraff 1999a,b,d for an overview). For example, for Schuchardt (1909), the structural output of language contact is partly determined by language-external factors that belong to (e.g.) sociology and history. Similarly, Meillet (1906 [1958, 17]) observes that "social change" is the ultimate, "most often mediated and indirect" root of linguistic change. In Hall's (1966, 123) words, "There are no structural criteria which, in themselves, will identify a creole as such, in the absence of historical evidence." In Hoenigswald's (1971, 473, 479) words, creoles "furnish the theory of linguistic change—so largely speculative in character—with quasi-empirical foundation" and "[p]ossibly all change processes partake of the characteristics of creolization, with the *particular* historical circumstances making the crucial, but essentially quantitative, difference" . In a related vein, Mufwene (1998) argues that "creolization is a social, not a structural, process." In so doing, he joins Hall, Givón (1979) and Muysken (1988), among others, in arguing that there may be no coherent typological and theoretical basis for a Creole prototype in purely linguistic terms. As Muysken (1988, 300) states "The very notion of a 'creole' language from the *linguistic* point of view tends to disappear if one looks closely; what we have is just a language." Elsewhere I too have argued that, within mentalist approaches to language creation and language change, "the notion of 'creolization' as a unitary and distinct linguistic phenomenon evaporates" (DeGraff 1999b, 477).

[14] Also see *to delouse* 'to remove lice from'. There is no *to louse* with the meaning of 'adding lice to'; *to louse*, in one of its senses, is actually synonymous with *to delouse*. But see *to louse up* which does mean 'to infect with lice'—apparently there is no **to delouse up* or **to unlouse*. Contrast *to delouse/*to unlouse/*to louse* with *to degrease/to ungrease/to grease*. The semantics of English *de-* (and HC *de-*) are obviously much more complicated than they appear at first sight, perhaps having intricate causative and/or aspectual properties. But the central point here is that *de-* (in HC and English—and also in Romance) cannot be said to be transparently and consistently inversive. See Horn 1989 for a range of fascinating facts concerning the semantics and pragmatics of *de-* and its congeners.

[15]McWhorter (1998, 803f) warns against "highly selective presentation of data" and encourages creolists to view "creole data ... more liberally."

[16]I am thankful to Calixto Agüero-Bautista for discussion of cockfighting practices and terminology in the Dominican Republic.

[17]It is puzzling that Ehrman 1972, Jenner and Pou 1982, Milne 1921, and Thomas 1971 are enlisted in McWhorter 1998 as support for the claim that Mon-Khmer languages have "rich paradigms of morphological affixes alien to any language known as creoles" (p. 796). These authors explicitly state that derivation in Cambodian, Chrau, and Palaung is by and large "moribund" and "seldom used in new combinations" (see, e.g., Ehrman 1972, 3, Jenner and Pou 1982, xxxiv, Milne 1921, 6 and Thomas 1971, 19f, 56, 152f, 235 (also chaps. 8–9); also see Huffman 1970, 16, 311).

[18]As it turns out, the "abstraction" suffix *-te* is commonly found in HC, as in the following sample of straightforwardly compositional adjective-to-noun derivations:

(i)	*ansyen* 'old'	*ansyennte* 'seniority'
	bon 'good'	*bonte* 'goodness'
	brav 'brave'	*bravte* 'bravery'
	fèm 'firm'	*fèmte* 'firmness'
	frekan 'insolent'	*frekanste* 'insolence'
	fyè 'proud'	*fyète* 'pride'
	klè 'bright'	*klète* 'brightness'
	lèd 'ugly'	*lèdte* 'ugliness'
	lach 'coward'	*lachte* 'cowardice'
	mal 'miserable'	*malsite* 'misery'
	malpwòp 'unclean'	*malpwòpte* 'uncleanliness'
	mechan 'mean'	*mechanste* 'meanness'
	pwòp 'clean'	*pwòpte* 'cleanliness'
	saf 'greedy'	*safte* 'greed'
	sal 'dirty'	*salte* 'dirtiness'

The semantically transparent paradigm in (i) also speaks against the analysis in Valdman 1978, 139, where *bèl* and *bèlte*, like *eklere* and *eklerasyon* (see note 9), are claimed to constitute one of those morphophonologically and semantically related pairs where "it is difficult to extract from the derived member of the pair a suffix that has the same semantics elsewhere." Furthermore, HC *-te* is productive, as attested by Haitianisms such as *malsite* and *safte*. *Safte* is included in Valdman *et al* 1981, along with some of the other examples in (i); also see the variant *safrite* in Fattier 1998, 393.

Recall that *-te* in (i) and *-ès* on p. *** as productive HC suffixes also contradict the affix set postulated in Lefebvre 1998, chap. 10. The latter excludes both *-te* and *-ès*, along with many of the derivational processes illustrated in this chapter (see note 7).

[19] In theories like Distributed Morphology (see, e.g., Halle and Marantz 1993; Halle 1994; Marantz 1997), the theoretical distinction between "morphological glue" and "syntactic glue" does not have primitive status as it is claimed that the syntax is the unique "combinatoric engine" in the grammar (Marantz, Miyashita, and O'Neil 2000). In such a framework, it is impossible to draw a conceptual boundary between the sort of meaning expressed by "morphological" combination of bound morphemes and the sort of meaning expressed by "syntactic" combination of words. There is also evidence that precludes a strict separation between the two modules; witness the well-known example *better* vs. **more good*) which suggests that blocking can apply across morphology and syntax.

[20]Also see Rickford 1980 for a solid rebuttal of related claims about the expressive adequacy of Creole discourse. Rickford analyzes Guyanese Creole narratives that cast doubt on Creoles' putative inadequacy. Yet Rickford does not refute the alleged structural bases of Whinnom's (1971, 109–110) claims, namely, the limitations on Creole morphology and the implications thereof for Creole speakers' intellectual capacities.

There is a certain irony in the fact that Whinnom's unsubstantiated statement on the inherent intellectual "handicap" of Creole languages is in the same volume where one can read

> "[P]idgin-creole studies have become a respectable field. No longer are young linguists

> advised not to waste their time on such peripheral subjects but to study 'real' languages if they wish to get on in the academic world" (DeCamp 1971, 13).

Whinnom's arguments make Creole languages look quite un-'real'.

[21]Here I also follow Chomsky's (1979, 31) advice and I try to go beyond "local exception[s]" that instantiate "ideological control" toward uncovering "the overall pattern [that] remains hidden;" also see Chomsky's (1993) exhortation to address the reality and causes of the "overall pattern." This "overall pattern" is also what Smitherman (2000, 67) addresses in her critique of a particular "tradition, qua tradition" in the context of prejudices in academia toward African American speech.

"For it is this tradition, qua tradition, rather than the work of any single scholar, that sets the stage for public decision making and social policy formulation that govern the lives and ultimately the survival of black Americans."

My sketch below is not fully representative; Goodman 1964; Dejean 1977; Prudent 1980; Holm 1988; Arends, Muysken and Smith 1995 provide more comprehensive surveys. The case studies and quotations in this chapter is meant as an illustration of my thesis regarding the negative impact of certain age-old preconceptions in Creole studies.

[22]M.L.E. Moreau de Saint-Méry (1750–1819), himself born in Martinique of European descent, sharply critiqued his Swiss contemporary Girod-Chantrans's "Creole" data, calling it "Swiss Creole."

> " [Girod-Chantrans's] jargon [*baragouin*] will pass for [Saint-Domingue] Creole only for our scientists, who in turn introduce a similar sort of "Creole" in the theater, and persuade Parisians that their "Creole" is the real one. [Girod-Chantrans's alleged Creole] letter could only have been written by himself, or by someone who wanted to make fun of his naivete. . . . " (1797 [1958:81]; my translation)

Moreau de Saint-Méry's allusion to "'creole' in the theater" strikes me as uncannily prescient given the abundance of fanciful descriptions of HC in past and present Creole studies (see Chaudenson 1996; DeGraff 1999c; and Dejean 1999 for recent critiques). Also noteworthy is the fact that most early creolists (with exceptions such as Moreau de Saint-Méry, Ducœurjoly, and Saint-Quentin) could hardly qualify as Creole speakers. The situation has hardly changed since; but see section 2.7.

[23]What Saint-Quentin (1872) calls "syntaxe" (which is the topic of his description of the French-lexifier Creole of Cayenne, Guyane) is roughly what we would today call morpho(phono)logy with basic aspects of word order.

[24] Suzanne Sylvain is perhaps the earliest bona fide Haitian-born creolist.

[25]Throughout Bloomfield 1933, 471–475, Creoles are viewed as (originating from systems that are): "aberrant," "sub-standard," "baby-talk," "simplified," "imperfect," "reproductions [of some European language]," "incorrect," "inferior dialects," "subject to improvement in the direction of [masters' speech]." This stands in sharp contrast to Bloomfield's (1925) progressive, egalitarian and eloquent manifesto "Why a linguistics society" where he promotes the study of "dialects," unwritten languages and Native American languages:

> The layman usually ... believes that languages which possess no written literature are mere “dialects” or “jargons”, of small extent and subject to no fixed rule. Quite by contrast, linguistics finds ... a similarity, repugnant to the common-sense view, between the languages of highly civilized people and those of savages, a similarity which disregards the use or non-use of writing. ... [S]tandard and literary languages are not original forms from which dialects faultily deviate ... but are only secondary creations on the basis of dialects, which latter root far more deeply in the past.

Yet Bloomfield (1933) himself applies the “layman['s] ... common-sense view” to Creoles, removing them from the scope of his own egalitarian credo. Such ambivalence and contradictory pronouncements are still common among contemporary creolists and Creolophones (for further discussion, see, e.g., Bebel-Gisler and Hurbon 1975; Y. Dejean 1975, 1993; Prudent 1980; Devonish 1986; Zéphir 1996; and DeGraff 2000c).

[26]The *Library of Congress Classification Schedule 1998* classifies Creole-related books under the “PM” category which is misleadingly synopsized as “Hyperborean, [American] Indian and Artificial Languages”! (I thank Theresa Tobin for an enlightening tour through the arcane “ontology” of the Library of Congress.)

[27]It also seems that Seuren (1998, 292) would take, say, Caribbean Creole culture—e.g., its linguistic, religious, social, artistic, and culinary practices— to bear *no* historical connection to the “rich and extended cultural past” of Africa, Europe, Asia and the (pre-Columbus) Americas. If so, Seuren must in turn deny (e.g.) the well-documented symbolic and theological complexity of Haitian Vodou, much of which finds deep-running roots in, inter alia, Christianity and, especially, ancient traditional religions from the Gulf of Guinea in Africa (see Hurbon 1987, Desmangles 1992 and references therein). In effect, Seuren may be adopting the still popular bias according to which *no* Caribbean phenomenon can be related to any “rich and extended cultural past”, notwithstanding the available evidence.

Interestingly, Seuren's devaluation of Caribbean languages and cultures is found in the same book where Seuren accuses Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) of “basic Eurocentrism”, “cultural prejudice”, “cultural arrogance,” and of having “a fundamentally chauvinist mind,” all of which, according to Seuren is related to “racial and nationalist prejudices [that] were rife in the western world of the early 19th century” (p. 111). As evidenced here and in the main text, such prejudices still exist even as we near the twenty-first century and even in the “polite society” of respectable linguistic publications.

[28] Linguistic prejudices and myths surrounding “minority languages” persist on a large scale even among the most literate and economically-advanced societies and even among the latter's political, academic and intellectual élites (see, e.g., O'Neil's (1998), Rickford's (1999) and Smitherman's (2000) critiques vis-à-vis the most recent “Ebonics debate” following up the 1996 Oakland School Board's resolution recognizing African-American English as a valid “primary language”). In the case of HC in Haiti, the stigmatized “minority language” happens to be the *first* and *only* language of the vast majority. This point often goes unappreciated, not only among casual observers, but also among scholars, educators and administrators directly concerned with Haiti (for sociolinguistic and political analyses, see, e.g., Bebel-Gisler and Hurbon 1975; Y. Dejean 1975, 1993; P. Dejan/Dejean 1988, 1989, 1993).

2.10 References

Adam, Lucien. 1883. *Les Idiomes Négro-Aryen et Maléo-Aryen. Essai d'Hybridologie Linguistique.* Paris: Maisonneuve et cie.

Alleyne, Mervin. 1994. Problems of standardization of Creole languages. In Morgan 1994, 7–18.

Arends, Jacques; Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.). 1994. *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word formation in generative grammar.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Baggioni, Daniel. 1988. L'histoire de la créolistique et ses rapports à l'histoire de l'anthropologie. De Lucien Adam (1883) à Louis Hjelmslev (1938). *Études Créoles*, 11, 1, 82–93.

Baissac, Charles. 1880 *Étude sur le Patois Créole Mauricien.* Nancy: Imprimerie Berger-Levrault et Cie.

Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing.* Chicago : University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Philip. 1993. Assessing the African Contribution to French-based Creoles. In Salikoko Mufwene, ed., *Africanisms in Afro-American Language Varieties*, 123–155. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Baker, Philip. 1999. Theories of creolization and the degree and nature of restructuring. Ms. (22 pages), University of Westminster. Paper presented at the *International Symposium on Degrees of Restructuring in Creole languages*, Regensburg, June 1998.

Barker, Chris. 1998. Episodic *-ee* in English: A thematic role constraint on new word formation. *Language* 74(4), 695–727.

Bebel-Gisler, Dany, and Laënnec Hurbon. 1975 [1987 .] *Cultures et Pouvoir dans la Caraïbe.* (Third Edition) Paris: L'Harmattan.

Bickerton, Derek. 1988. Creole languages and the bioprogram. In Newmeyer 1988, 268–284.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1925. Why a linguistics society? *Language* 1, 1–5.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language.* New York: H. Holt and Co.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Bracken, Harry. 1973. Essence, accident and race. *Hermathena*, 116, 88–95.

Bracken, Harry. 1974. *Berkeley.* London: Macmillan.

Bresnan, Joan. To appear. The Emergence of the Unmarked Pronoun. In Géraldine Legendre, Sten Vikner, and Jane Grimshaw, eds., *Optimality-Theoretic Syntax.* Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Brousseau, Anne-Marie; Sandra Filipovich; and Claire Lefebvre. 1989. Morphological processes in Haitian Creole: The question of substratum and simplification. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 4, 1–36.

Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, and Penelope Harvey. 1992. *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method.* London: Routledge

Chaudenson, Robert. 1979. *Les Créoles Français.* Paris: Fernand Nathan.

Chaudenson, Robert. 1996. Petit sottisier glané dans les recherches sur l'origine des systèmes grammaticaux créoles. In Daniel Véronique, ed., *Matériaux pour l'Étude des Classes Grammaticales dans les Langues Créoles*, 17–37. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence.

Chaudenson, Robert, Raymond Mougeon, and Édouard Beniak. 1993. *Vers une approche panlectale de la variation du français*. Aix-en-Provence: Institut d'Études Créoles et Francophones; Diffusion: Didier Érudition.

Chomsky, Noam. 1975. *Reflections on language.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Chomsky, Noam. 1979. *Language and Responsibility.* Sussex, England: Harvester Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. *Year 501: The Conquest Continues.* Boston: South End Press.

Clark, Eve. 1993. *The Lexicon in Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Eve and Herbert Clark . 1979. When nouns surface as verbs. *Language* 55, 767–811.

Damoiseau, Robert. 1988. Élements pour une classification des verbaux en créole haïtien. Études Créoles, 11, 1, 41–64.

Damoiseau, Robert. 1991. Exemples de procédures de réinterpretation d'un lexique français en créole haïtien. *Études Créoles*, 14(1), 1–43.

D'Ans, André-Marcel. 1968. *Le Créole Français d'Haïti.* The Hague: Mouton.

DeCamp, David. 1971. The study of pidgin and creole languages. In Hymes 1971, 13–39.

DeGraff, Michel. 1992. The syntax of predication in Haitian. In *NELS 22, Proceedings of the 22nd Meeting of the North-Eastern Linguistics Society*, 103–117. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

DeGraff, Michel. 1993. A riddle on negation in Haitian. *Probus* 5, 63–93.

DeGraff, Michel. 1994. The morphology-syntax interface in creolization (and diachrony). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 24(2), 115–132,

DeGraff, Michel. 1995. On certain differences between Haitian and French predicative constructions. In Jon Amastae, Grant Goodall, Mario Montalbetti, and Marianne Phinney, eds., *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics*, 237–256. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DeGraff, Michel. 1997. Verb syntax in creolization (and beyond). In Liliane Haegeman, ed., *The New Comparative Syntax*, 64–94. London: Longman.

DeGraff, Michel. 1999a. Creolization, language change and language acquisition: A prolegomenon. In DeGraff 1999e:1–46.

DeGraff, Michel. 1999b. Creolization, language change and language acquisition: An epilogue. In DeGraff 1999e:473–543.

DeGraff, Michel. 1999c. Empirical quicksand: Probing two recent articles on Haitian Creole. *Journal of Pidgin & Creole Languages*, 14(2), 1–12, 1999.

DeGraff, Michel. 1999d. Parameter-setting in acquisition and through creolization and language change. In Rob Wilson and Frank Keil, eds., *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Cognitive Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

DeGraff, Michel. 1999e. *Language Creation and Language Change: Creolization, Diachrony and Development.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

DeGraff, Michel. 2000a. À propos des pronoms objets dans le créole d'Haïti: Regards croisés de la morphologie et de la diachronie. *Langages* 138, 89–113.

DeGraff, Michel. 2000b. Morphology in language creation and language change: Haitian Creole as "prototypical" case study. Ms. MIT.

DeGraff, Michel. 2000c. *Toward a new perspective on Creole studies.* Ms. MIT.

Dejan, Pòl. 1988. *Ki Sa Gouvènman Peyi a Janm Fè ant 1943 ak 1988 pou L Regle Koze Pa Konn Li ak Pa Konn Ekri ann Ayiti.* Port-au-Prince, Haïti: Sekreteri d Eta pou Alfabetizasyon.

Dejean, Paul. 1989. *Survol des Tentatives d'Alphabétisation en Haïti par les Services Gouvernementaux, 1943–1988.* Port-au-Prince, Haïti: Groupe d'Action et de Recherche

pour l'Éducation.
Dejean, Paul. 1993. *Haïti: Alerte, On Tue!* Montréal: CIDIHCA.
Dejean, Yves. 1975. *Dilemme en Haïti: Français en Péril ou Péril Français?* New York: Éditions Connaissance d'Haïti.
Dejean, Yves. 1977. *Comment Écrire le Créole d'Haïti.* Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
Dejean, Yves. 1980. *Comment Écrire le Créole d'Haïti.* [Abridged and revised version of Dejean 1977] Outremont, Québec: Collectif Paroles.
Dejean, Yves. 1993. An overview of the language situation in Haiti. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 102, 73–83.
Dejean, Yves. 1999. L'archipel nous revient: Créolistes et données. *Études Créoles*, 22, 2, 85–114.
Déprez, Viviane. 1999. The roots of negative concord in French and French-lexicon creoles. In DeGraff 1999e:375–427.
Descourtilz, Michel Étienne. 1809. *Voyages d'un Naturaliste et ses Observations faites sur les Trois Règnes de la Nature, dans Plusieurs Ports de Mer Français, en Espagne, au Continent de l'Amérique Septentrionale ...* (3 volumes). Paris: Dufart, père.
Desmangles, Leslie. 1992. *The faces of the Gods: Vodou and Roman Catholicism in Haiti.* Chapel Hill : The University of North Carolina Press.
Devonish, Hubert. 1986. *Language and Liberation: Creole Language Politics in the Caribbean.* London: Karia Press.
Dijkhoff, Marta. 1993 *Papiamentu Word Formation: A Case Study of Complex Nouns and their Relation to Phrases and Clauses.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
Ehrman, Madeline. 1972. *Contemporary Cambodian: Grammatical Sketch.* Washington D.C.: Foreign Service Institute.
Faine, Jules. 1936. *Philologie Créole. Études Historiques et Étymologiques sur la Langue Créole d'Haïti* Port-au-Prince, Haïti: Imprimerie de l'État.
Fattier, Dominique. 1998. *Contribution à l'Étude de la Genèse d'un Créole: L'Atlas Linguistique d'Haïti, Cartes et Commentaires.* Doctoral dissertation, Université de Provence. (Distributed by Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France.)
Férère, Gérard. 1974. *Haitian Creole: Sound-System, Form-Classes, Texts.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Freeman, Bryant. 1989. *Dictionnaire Inverse de la Langue Créole Haïtienne.* Port-au-Prince: Centre de Linguistique Appliquée, Université d'État d'Haïti.
Fermino, Jessie Little Doe. 2000. *An introduction to Wampanoag grammar.* Master of Science Thesis, MIT.
Freeman, Bryant and Jowel Laguerre. 1996 [1998]. *Haitian-English Dictionary* (2nd edition: 1998). Lawrence, KS: Institute of Haitian Studies, University of Kansas.
Gilbert, Glenn (ed.). 1980. *Pidgin and Creole Languages: Selected Essays by Hugo Schuchardt.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
Girod-Chantrans, Justin. 1785 [1980]. *Voyage d'un Suisse dans Différentes Colonies d'Amérique....* Neuchâtel: Imprimerie de la Société typographique. [1980 edition: Paris: Libraire Jules Tallandier.]
Givón, Talmy. 1979. Prolegomena to any sane creology. In Ian Hancock, ed., *Readings in Creole Studies*, 3–35. Ghent, Belgium: E. Story-Scientia.
Goodman, Morris. 1964. *A Comparative Study of Creole French Dialects.* The Hague:

Mouton.

Gougenheim, Georges. 1971. *Etude sur les Périphrases Verbales de la Langue Française.* Paris: Nizet.

Green, Thomas and Ken Hale. 1998. Ulwa, the language of Karawala, eastern Nicaragua: Its position and prospects in modern Nicaragua. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language: Indigenous language use and change in the Americas* 132, 185–201.

Hale, Ken. 1965. On the use of informants in field-work. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 10(2,3), 108–118.

Hale, Ken. 1972a. A new perspective on American Indian Linguistics. In Alfonso Ortiz, eds., *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, 87–110. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Hale, Ken. 1972b. Some questions about anthropological linguistics: The role of native knowledge. In Dell Hymes, ed., *Reinventing Anthropology*, 382–397. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hale, Ken. 1973. The role of American Indian linguistics in bilingual education. In Paul Turner, ed., *Bilingualism in the Southwest*, 203–225. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hale, Ken. 1992. Language endangerment and the human value of linguistic diversity. *Language* 68(1), 35–42.

Hale, Ken. 1993. On the human value of local languages. In Chrochetière, André; Jean-Claude Boulanger; and Conrad Ouellon, eds., *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Linguists, vol. I*, 17–31. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Hale, Ken. 2001. Ulwa (Southern Sumu): The beginnings of a language research project. In Paul Newman and Martha Ratliff, eds., *Linguistic Fieldwork*, 76–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, Kenneth and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.). 1993. *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hall, Robert, Jr. 1953. *Haitian Creole: Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary. The American Anthropologist. Memoir 74.* Washington D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Hall, Robert, Jr. 1966. *Pidgin and Creole Languages.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Halle, Morris. 1994. The Russian declension. An illustration of the theory of Distributed Morphology. In Jennfer Cole and Charles Kisseberth, eds., *Perspectives in Phonology*, 29–60. Stanford CA: CLSI Publications.

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection In Hale and Keyser 1993, 111–176.

Hjelmslev, Louis. 1938. Relation de parenté des langues créoles. *Revue des Études Indo-Européennes* 1, 271–286.

Hjelmslev, Louis. 1939. Caractères grammaticaux des langues créoles. In *Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques; Compte-Rendu de la Deuxième Session*, p. 373. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.

Hockett, Charles. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics.* New York, Macmillan.

Hoenigswald, Henry. 1971. Language history and creole studies. In Hymes 1971, 473–480.

Holm, John. 1988. *Pidgins and Creoles.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Honda, Maya. and Wayne O'Neil. 1993. Triggering science-forming capacity through linguistic inquiry. In Hale and Keyser 1993, 229–255.

Horn, Laurence. 1989. Morphology, pragmatics, and the *un*-verb. In Joyce Powers and Kenneth de Jong, eds., *ESCOL '88. Proceedings of the Fifth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 210–233. Columbus OH: The Ohio State University, Department of Linguistics.

Huffman, Franklin. 1970. *Modern Spoken Cambodian.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hurbon, Laënnec. 1987. *Dieu dans le Vaudou Haïtien.* Port-au-Prince, Haïti: Éditions Henri Deschamps.

Hymes, Dell (ed.). 1971. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1995. The boundaries of the lexicon. In Martin Everaert, Erik-Jan van der Lindern, Andre Shenk, and Rob Schreuder, eds., *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*, 133–165. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jenner, Philip and Saveros Pou. 1982. *A Lexicon of Khmer Morphology.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Jespersen, Otto. 1922. *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin.* London: G. Allen and Unwin.

Kegl, Judy; Ann Senghas; and Marie Coppola. 1999. Creation through contact: Sign language emergence and sign language change in Nicaragua. In DeGraff 1999e, 179–237.

Labov, William. 1994 *Principles of Linguistic Change.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Larousse, Pierre. 1869. *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX siècle.* Paris: Larousse.

Lefebvre, Claire. 1998. *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar: The Case of Haitian Creole* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyell, Charles. 1830–1833. *Principles of Geology; Being an Attempt to Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface, by Reference to Causes Now in Operation.* London: J. Murray.

Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your lexicon. In Alexis Dimitriadis, Laura Siegel, Clarissa Surek-Clark, and Alexander Williams, eds., *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2), 201–225. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Linguistics.

Marantz, Alec; Yasushi Miyashita and Wayne O'Neil (eds.). 2000. Introduction: Mind articulation. In Alec Marantz; Yasushi Miyashita and Wayne O'Neil, eds., *Image, language, brain: Papers from the first Mind-Articulation Project symposium.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2000.

Markey, T.L. 1979 (ed.). *The ethnography of variation: Selected writings on pidgins and creoles, by Hugo Schuchardt; edited and translated by T.L. Markey.* Ann Arbor: Karoma.

McWhorter, John. 1998. Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class. *Language* 74(4), 788–818.

Meijer, Gus and Pieter Muysken. 1977. On the beginnings of pidgin and creole studies: Schuchardt and Hesseling. In Albert Valdman, ed., *Pidgin and creole linguistics*, 21–45. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Meillet, Antoine. 1906 [1958]. 'L'État actuel des études de linguistique générale. (Opening lecture for the course on comparative grammar at the Collège de France.) [Reprinted in Meillet 1958, 1–18]

Meillet, Antoine. 1919 [1958]. Le genre grammatical et l'élimination de la flexion. *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza)*, 25, 86. [Reprinted in Meillet 1958, 199–210.

Meillet, Antoine. 1924 [1951]. Introduction à la classification des langues. Introductory chapter of *Les Langues du Mondes.* [Reprinted in Meillet 1951, 53–69]

Meillet, Antoine. 1929 [1951] Le développement des langues. In *Continu et Discontinu*, 119ff. [Reprinted in Meillet 1951, 71–83]

Meillet, Antoine. 1951. *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale. Volume II.* Paris: Klincksieck.]

Meillet, Antoine. 1958. *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale. Volume I.* Paris:

Honoré Champion.]

Métellus, Jean. 1997–1998. What is an intellectual? (Interview.) *Haïtiens aujourd'hui*, 12/97–1/98, 2, 1, 11-26..

Milne, Mary. 1921. *An Elementary Palaung Grammar.* Oxford, The Clarendon Press.

Moreau de Saint-Méry, M. L. E. 1797 [1958]. *Description Topographique, Physique, Civile, Politique et Historique de la Partie Française de l'Isle Saint Domingue* (3 volumes). Philadelphia: Chez l'Auteur. [1958 edition: Paris: Société de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises.]

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1994. *Language and the Social Construction of Identity in Creole Situations.* Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies, University of California.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 1991. Pidgins, creoles, typology, and markedness. In Francis Byrne and Thom Huebner, eds., *Development and Structures of Creole Languages: Essays in Honor of Derek Bickerton*, 123–143. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 1998. Creolization is a social, not a structural, process. Paper presented at the *International Symposium on Degrees of Restructuring in Creole languages*, Regensburg, June 1998.

Muysken, Pieter. 1988. Are Creoles a special type of language? In Newmeyer 1988, 285–301.

Muysken, Pieter. In Press. Pidginization, creolization and language death. In Geert Booij and Christian Lehmann, eds., *Handbook of Morphology.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Newmeyer, Frederick. 1988. *Linguistics. The Cambridge Survey. Vol 2: Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neil, Wayne. 1998. Ebonics in the media. *Radical teacher* 54, 13–17.

Orjala, Paul. 1970. *A Dialect Survey of Haitian Creole.* Doctoral Dissertation, Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Pelleprat, Father Pierre. 1655 [1965]. *Relation des Missions des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les Iles et dans la Terre Ferme de l'Amérique Méridionale.* Paris: Chez Sébastien Cramoisy and Gabriel Cramoisy. Translated and Reprinted in 1965 as *Relato de las Misiones de los Padres de la Compañía de Jesús en las Islas y en Tierra Firme de América Meridional.* Caracas: Fuentes para la Historia Colonial de Venezuela.

Pinker, Steven. 1999 *Words and rules: The ingredients of language.* New York: Basic Books.

Prudent, Lambert-Félix. 1980. *Des Baragouins à la Langue Antillaise: Analyse Historique et Sociolinguistique du Discours sur le Créole.* Paris: Editions Caribéennes.

Rey, Alain. 1995. *Dictionnaire Historique de la Langue Française.* Paris: Le Robert.

Rickford, John. 1980. 'Me Tarzan, you Jane!' Adequacy, expressiveness, and the creole speaker. *Journal of Linguistics* 22, 281–310.

Rickford, John. 1999. The Ebonics controversy in my backyard: A sociolinguist's experiences and reflections. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3, 2, 267–275.

Ritter, Elizabeth. 1991. Déplacement de NP en haitien. Oui ou non? *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 20, 65–86.

Saint-Quentin, Alfred de. 1872 [1989]. *Introduction à l'Histoire de Cayenne*, with *Étude sur la Grammaire Créole* by Auguste de Saint-Quentin. Antibes : J. Marchand [1980 edition: Cayenne: Comité de la Culture, de l'Éducation et de l'Environnement, Région Guyane.]

Samarin, William. 1980. Standardization and instrumentalization of Creole languages. In Albert Valdman and Arnold Highfield, eds., *Theoretical orientations in Creole studies*, 213–236. New York: Academic Press.

Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Sapir, Edward. 1933 [1963]. Language. In *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 9, 155–169. New York: Macmillan [Reprinted in *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*, pp. 7–32, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press]

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1909 [1980]. Die Lingua Franca. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 33, 441–461. [Translated in Gilbert 1980, 65–88]

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1914 *Die Sprache Der Saramakkaneger in Surinam.* Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks. 14(6). Amsterdam: Johannes Müller. [Preface translated into English in Markey 1979, 73–108, Gilbert 1980, 89–126].

Seuren, Pieter and Herman Wekker. 1986. Semantic transparency as a factor in Creole genesis. In Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith, eds., *Substrata Versus Universals in Creole Genesis*, 57–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Seuren, Pieter. 1998. *Western Linguistics. An Historical Introduction.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Smitherman. Geneva. 2000. *Talkin that Talk: Language, Culture and Education in African America.* London: Routledge.

Stump, Gregory. 1998. Inflection. In Andrew Spencer and Arnold Zwicky, eds., *The Handbook of Morphology*, 13–43. Oxford: Blackwell.

Syea, Anand. 1992. The short and long form of verbs in Mauritian Creole: Functionalism versus formalism. *Theoretical Linguistics* 18(1), 61–97.

Sylvain, Suzanne. 1936. *Le Créole Haïtien: Morphologie et Syntaxe*. Belgique: Wetteren, Imprimerie de Meester.

Thomas, David. 1971. *Chrau Grammar.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Tinelli, Henri. 1970. *Generative Phonology of Haitian Creole.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Trouillot, Hénock. 1980. Les limites du créole dans notre enseignement. Port-au-Prince, Haïti: Imprimerie des Antilles.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1998. Culture on the edges: Creolization in the plantation context. *Plantation Society in the Americas*, 5(1), 8–28.

UNESCO. 1953. *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education. Monographs on Fundamental Education — VIII.* Paris: UNESCO.

Valdman, Albert. 1978. *Le Créole: Structure, Statut et Origine.* Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.

Valdman, Albert. 1979. La situation linguistique en Haïti. *Études Créoles* 2(2), 95–106.

Valdman, Albert. 1984. The linguistic situation of Haiti. In Charles Foster and Albert Valdman, eds., *Haiti — Today and Tomorrow: An Interdisciplinary Study*, 77–99. Lanham MD: University Press of America.

Valdman, Albert. 1987. Le cycle vital créole et la standardisation du créole haïtien. *Etudes Créoles* 10(2), 107–125.

Valdman, Albert. 1988. Diglossia and language conflict in Haiti. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 71, 67-80.

Valdman, Albert. 1989. Aspects sociolinguistiques de l'élaboration d'une norme écrite pour le créole haïtien. In Ralph Ludwig, ed., *Les Créoles Français entre l'Oral et l'Écrit*, 43–63. Tubingen: G. Narr.

Valdman, Albert. 1992. Aspects de l'enseignement du créole comme langue étrangère et langue seconde. *Etudes Créoles* 15(2), 81–94.

Valdman, Albert *et al.* 1981. *Haitian Creole-English-French dictionary* (2 volumes). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Creole Institute.

Valdman, Albert with Charles Pooser and Rozevel Jean-Baptiste. 1996. *A Learner's*

Dictionary of Haitian Creole. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Creole Institute.

Vinson, Julien. 1882. "Creole". In *Dictionnaire des sciences anthropologiques. Paris.*

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems.* New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov and Marvin Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In W. P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, eds., *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, 95–195. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Wekker, Herman. 1996. Creole words. In Jan Svartvik, ed., *Words: Proceedings of an international symposium, Lund, 25–26 August 1995*, 91–104. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.

Whinnom, Keith. 1971. Linguistic hybridization and the 'special case' of pidgins and creoles. In Hymes 1971, 91–115.

Woodson, Drexel. 1992. Which beginning should be hindmost? Surrealism in appropriations of facts about Haitian 'contact culture'. Paper read at special session on *Contact Culture: In Search of Hemispheric Americana*, Meeting of the *American Anthropological Association*, San Francisco.

Zéphir, Flore. 1996. *Haitian Immigrants in Black America: A Sociological and Sociolinguistic Portrait.* Westport CT: Bergin and Garvey.