

1 * *Latin America: A Linguistic Curiosity from the Point of View of Colonization and the Ensuing Language Contacts*

SALIKOKO S. MUFWENE

1. Historical Background

The starting point is the fifteenth century. Southern Europe was then emerging out of seven centuries of Arab economic hegemony and even, in the case of Spain, political rule. It had become widely accepted that the world was round, the navigational knowledge and technology developed in the Far East had spread, and European merchants wanted to trade directly with the spice growers of Asia and Africa. Just like Iberia (Spain and Portugal) in the west, the Ottoman Empire was then also asserting itself as a new world power around the eastern Mediterranean, in the wake of the weakening Arab domination in the region. Not wanting any military confrontations with the Muslims, the Iberians chose to avoid them by sailing both around Africa and westward across the Atlantic. Nobody anticipated that Christopher Columbus would accidentally discover the Americas, which from the early sixteenth century came to be designated as the New World. But from then on, the Iberians sought new trading commodities across the Atlantic.

The Iberians' ambitions were facilitated by the invention of the caravel ship, equipped with "a large hull for sailing the high seas, a stern-post rudder and triangular sails for directional mobility, and artillery to intimidate those who challenged or refused to cooperate with them" (Eakin 2007, 52). They were now ready to face the rough waters of the Atlantic Ocean, able to transport more goods, including fresh water and nonperishable food, and many people over long distances. With the concurrent invention of capitalism, they were contributing to a mercantile revolution that could be compared to what had initiated modest long-distance trade a couple of millennia earlier: the use of rivers and other waterways as highways (Chaudenson, forthcoming). Similar technological progress with sea navigation had enabled the Arabs and the Chinese to become major mercantile powers centuries earlier, traveling back and forth between East Asia and East Africa. Thanks to their knowledge of monsoon wind cycles, they had learned to sail east or west during the right season and thus minimize the risks of shipwreck (Ansaldo 2009).

For the first time, the Europeans could now sail to the same markets around Africa and across the Atlantic, in order to open their own trade forts outside Europe.

The leading European maritime powers were then Portugal and Castile, which was expanding into today's Spain. The two territories had then emerged as two autonomous nations, out of the multitude of smaller political/ethnic entities that the Greeks and the Romans had identified collectively as Iberia (Ιβηρία in Greek) and Hispania (in Latin).¹ Portugal and Castile had just freed themselves from seven centuries of colonization by the Moors, the Arabs, and the Islamized Berbers, who had worked for the Almoravid Dynasty. They were looking for external resources to solve their economic problems, some of which were consequences of the expensive Reconquista campaign they had concluded.

Endeavors to settle and develop economic markets (for grain, spices, gold, and slaves in particular) in northwest Africa and the neighboring islands (Azores, Madeira, and the Canaries, in order to produce sugarcane)² brought these emergent world powers into conflict with each other, too. Because their geographical expansion also contributed to the spread of Catholicism, popes intervened to resolve the conflicts through successive bulls, the last of which is associated with the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494 (Clements 2009). According to that agreement, Portugal laid claim to all territories and seas lying east of a north-south line descending from west of Cape Verde across present-day Brazil all the way to modern Indonesia. Spain would claim control of all territories and seas extending from west of that line all the way to the Philippines.

Navigators from both maritime powers could thus prove empirically that the world was round by sailing east and west, respectively. The treaty provisions explain why Christopher Columbus, rather than Bartolomeu Dias, discovered the New World. This division also explains why Spain did not acquire exploitation colonies in Africa until the Berlin Treaty in 1885 and why Portugal had only one colony in the New World, Brazil, and wound up with mostly exploitation colonies, typically in continental Africa, and small settlement colonies on Atlantic islands off the western coast of Africa, in India (Gao and Korlai) and Malaysia (Malacca), in Indonesia (Sumatra, Jakarta, Timor), and in China (Macao).³ According to Eakin (2007, 53), the other reason may lie in how the two powers were engaged in their territorial expansions: "Spain was the cutting edge in state formation and nation building in the Renaissance" and may thus have sought to build what was later designated as "New Spain," whereas "Portugal was at the forefront of the trade revolution" (indeed, it played a more important role than Spain in the slave trade!) and was more inter-

ested in developing coastal trade colonies in Africa and Asia, from which it benefited immensely.

Within a century, the Spanish conquistadores had colonized the Caribbean and the lion's share of the Americas. They first settled Hispaniola (present-day Dominican Republic and Haiti) and then Cuba, from which they colonized the rest of the Caribbean. From Cuba Hernán Cortés launched expeditions to Mexico, and from there the Viceroyalty of New Spain was founded. It included Florida, the Mississippi Valley, the present southwestern United States, Mexico, Central America minus Panama, and the Caribbean.⁴ The Spaniards also founded concurrently the Viceroyalty of Peru, which included all of present-day South America except for the part of present-day Brazil that had been allotted to and settled by Portugal starting in 1500.

As noted previously, the Portuguese were focused on expanding from the Atlantic Ocean all the way to the Pacific. After experimenting with sugarcane cultivation on the Azores and the Madeira archipelagos, they developed, as noted, settlement colonies on islands off the western coast of Africa (Cape Verde, São Tomé, and Príncipe) and a long chain of trade colonies on the eastern coast of the Atlantic, in the Indian Ocean (on or close to the eastern coast of Africa and on the coast of southern Asia and Southeast Asia) all the way to Indonesia (Java, Sumatra, and Timor) in the Pacific, and on the coasts of China (Macao), and Japan (Nagasaki).

The seeds of "Latin America" as a new cultural region, synonymous with "Iberoamerica" or "Hispanic America," were then planted, although from the seventeenth century onward the Spaniards and the Portuguese faced the competition of England, France, and Holland. These nations had by then also emerged as important maritime and economic powers in their own right and coveted all these territories that their European forerunners had claimed. Latin America itself gradually acquired a geographic definition, at least in the United States: it comprised all parts of the New World south of Anglophone North America, the areas where Romance languages are spoken as dominant vernaculars. Within the next two centuries, the world map had to be redrawn several times to accommodate the additional power players.

Although Portugal successfully drove the Dutch and the French out of northeastern Brazil, it lost many of its African and Asian colonies, in particular the Cape of Good Hope (in present-day South Africa), Sri Lanka (then named Ceylon), and Indonesia to Holland. (The Cape of Good Hope was colonized another century later by England.) This hitherto mercantile superpower later also lost Elmina (Ghana), India, and Malaysia to England, as well as Gorée (Senegal) and Indochina to France. No Euro-

pean nation colonized Japan or China, where Portugal kept Macao up to the late twentieth century and where England founded the trade colony of Canton in the eighteenth century (and later claimed Hong Kong, which it also relinquished to China in the late twentieth century).

Spain was not spared the loss of colonies. Central and South American countries such as Belize, Guyana, French Guyane, and Surinam, once colonized by England, France, and Holland, are in the geographic space that the 1494 Treaty of Tordesillas had assigned to Spain. The Louisiana colony was taken by the French at a time when Spain neglected this part of New Spain. The Spanish Empire also lost several Caribbean islands in the same way, although some of them were seized through wars, for instance present-day Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad, and St. Kitts, as well as Aruba, Bonaire, and Curaçao (also known as the Netherlands Antilles). Later on, the United States acquired Florida from Spain, and Texas, New Mexico, and California were acquired from Mexico in the nineteenth century.

Linguistically, the Iberian colonial empire has remained an enigma, especially regarding the rarity of vernaculars that linguists have identified as creoles (thereby disfranchising them from other colonial varieties of European languages spoken predominantly by descendants of Europeans). These vernaculars, now spoken typically by descendants of African slaves and of the nineteenth-century contract laborers from India and West Africa who joined or replaced them on the plantations, have been associated primarily with sugarcane cultivation.⁵ Brazil had started this industry about a century before the Caribbean colonies, with which our heuristic creole prototypes have been associated, adopted it; but Brazil has no creoles.⁶ What are the answers to the following relevant questions? Since there is a popular or vernacular Brazilian Portuguese (VBP) that is distinct from (nonstandard) European/Peninsular Portuguese, does this (apparent) enigma mean that we may not have to dwell so much on the distinction between creoles and noncreoles in discussions of the divergence of colonial varieties of European languages from their metropolitan counterparts? Or are there specific ecological reasons for why VBP should not be considered a creole (Mufwene 2001, 2005, 2008)? And why are there no distinct varieties associated with the descendants of African slaves in Brazil, except perhaps for the varieties spoken in the Quilombos (hinterland maroon settlements; see chapter 6)? Why did the New World's only Portuguese Creole (albeit with Spanish influence), Papiamentu, emerge in the Netherlands Antilles, where the official language has been Dutch and where no sugarcane industry developed?

Given the size of the Spanish Empire in the New World, why did the only creole associated with Spanish, Palenquero, emerge, of all places, in the Palenque (settlement of escaped slaves) of San Basilio, Colombia,

where there was no sugarcane industry? Why did Cuba and the Dominican Republic, which engaged in sugarcane cultivation, had large slave populations, and continued the institution of slavery up to the late nineteenth century, not produce any creole (*pace* Schwegler 2006)? Why did Puerto Rico, which also engaged in the sugarcane industry, not produce a Spanish creole? What specific ecological conditions distinguishing Iberian colonization in the New World from the English, French, and Dutch colonization can shed light on the magic of creole formation—although, as argued by Mufwene (2001, 2005, 2008), there are no restructuring processes or combinations thereof that distinguish the emergence of creole vernaculars from normal language change and speciation?

What particular ecological factors in the Portuguese colonies off the shore of the western coast of Africa and in small settlement isolates in Asia favored the emergence of creoles (Kriolu Kabuverdianu, São Tomense, Principense, Korlai Indo-Portuguese, and Macanese/Papia Cristam di Macau) that did not obtain in Brazil? Or is there a problem with the way the putative process of “creolization” is conceived of in linguistics? The same question does not quite arise about Spanish, in part because Spain had very few colonies outside the New World. Those of Africa, namely present-day Morocco, Western Sahara, and Equatorial Guinea, were acquired in the late nineteenth century, during the “Scramble for Africa,” with the Berlin Treaty (1885). Besides, these developed on the exploitation-colony model, which was not conducive to the emergence of creoles, typically associated with plantation settlement colonies.⁷ An explanation is thus needed for the emergence of Chabacano/Chavacano in the Philippines, if it too qualifies as a creole, as it does according to the stipulations of some linguists. The Spaniards did not colonize the Philippines in the same way as the Portuguese did their Atlantic islands, which the latter peopled with exogenous slaves. Nor did the Spanish colonize the archipelago on the model of Portuguese trade colonies such as Korlai and Macao. So, what in Iberoamerica generally prevented the emergence of creoles?

Latin America is a linguistic curiosity in another way, too. In reality, the geographical colonization of Brazil is still in process today, with the ongoing penetration of the Amazon rain forest primarily by Brazilians of European descent. While the earlier Portuguese colonial expansion into the interior was driven especially by the gold rush to Minas Gerais and by later farming settlements in the Southwest, as well as by the cultivation of coffee farther west and by the extraction of “drogas do sertão,” the present penetration of Amazonia has been driven by Hevea cultivation for rubber and, more recently, by lumbering and the exploitation of diamonds. The negative consequences of deforestation caught the atten-

tion first of environmentalists and later of linguists, who, since the early 1990s, have been decrying the endangerment of Native American and other “indigenous” languages around the world.⁸

However, as observed by Nettle and Romaine (2000) about this worldwide problem, proportionally fewer Native American languages have been lost in continental Latin America than in Anglophone North America. There are some demographically major languages such as Quechua, Aymara, and Nahuatl, that continue to be spoken by more than 1 million people each in this part of the Americas.⁹ As discussed by Hildo do Couto and by Denny Moore, Nheengatu, a legacy of the geographical expansion of Tupinambá (also known historically as *Língua Geral* ‘general/common language’ or *Língua Brasileira* ‘Brazilian language’), has continued to be spoken, albeit by fewer and fewer people as the most likely speakers have adopted Portuguese as their vernacular. The overall picture is rather unlike that in North America, where linguists now have only memories of major indigenous lingua francas such as Mobilian and Chinook jargons and where former major indigenous vernaculars such as Navajo and Cree are spoken only by a little over one hundred thousand people each.

In Brazil, the Portuguese colonial expansion actually contributed to the geographical spread of *Língua Geral* (Couto and Lee, chaps. 3 and 5, this volume) up to the nineteenth century. For a long time, the Spanish expansion also contributed to the spread or maintenance of Quechua as a lingua franca, a function it had acquired as a unifying language since the Inca Empire.¹⁰ And even as Spanish spread in South America, it did not prevent the emergence and spread of *Media Lengua* ‘middle language’,¹¹ unlike what happened in Anglophone North America, where Michif and Medny Aleut (a.k.a. Copper Island Creole) are now moribund legacies of the European expansion in the social periphery. However, while a general discussion of the present kind can help develop the big picture, it hides a lot of details that set almost every colony apart from the others. This is what the following chapters will help us understand, although many parts of Latin America not covered by the book deserve just as much attention as those included.

Unfortunately, all sorts of practical constraints made it difficult to cover additional areas of Latin America. We hope, nonetheless, that the approaches to language contact adopted here, from the colonial to the present period, will inspire future research and more publications. They certainly demonstrate that language contact in the European colonies can be seriously investigated from a non-European perspective; that language evolution did not proceed uniformly even in those contexts where one does not have to distinguish between creoles and noncreoles (see, e.g., Escobar 2012); and that structural change, language speciation, and lan-

guage vitality (including language endangerment and loss) can be discussed as related folds of language evolution. Finally, there is something to be gained from the depth and complementarity of some of the chapters, especially regarding Brazil; this heuristic model can be emulated in future collective publications about Latin America or any other area.

The choice of the phrase *language evolution* in the title of this book was motivated by the need to highlight the fact that many of the ecological factors that account for how particular structural features have been selected into the system of the dominant language also shed light on the dynamics of language vitality in the relevant polities, differentially of course (Mufwene 2001, 2005, 2008). At a time when linguistics has become very much concerned with the endangerment and loss of indigenous languages in former European colonies, it will not surprise the reader that a great deal of the discussion in the chapters deals with this aspect of language evolution. The more involved reader will notice, nonetheless, that the chapters cover much more than this topic. There are many observations about why neither Portuguese nor Spanish has evolved uniformly in the New World. Although, in relation to Native American languages, they have been subjected to typologically similar substrate influences under similar contact conditions (Escobar 2012), there are still regional, even intranational, specificities that set the new Portuguese and Spanish varieties apart from each other. Even variation in the demographic sizes of the indigenous populations (Escobar 2012) and the contrast between residing in the emergent urban centers (where there have been more contacts with Europeans) and in the rural environment (Lipski, chap. 2, this volume) have influenced this differential language evolution. As in Africa, indigenous people living segregated geographically and socioeconomically from Europeans in rural areas have typically been under less influence, if any, to Europeanize culturally. (See also Quijano 2007 and Quijano and Ennis 2000 for such a comparative approach to colonization.)

2. The Chapters

In Chapter 2, “The Many Facets of Spanish Dialect Diversification in Latin America,” John Lipski starts by asking why Spanish has diversified so much in Latin America, especially why the Caribbean and the continental varieties are so different from one another, having presumably evolved from the same Castilian language. The question is important because, according to him, this sociolinguistic superstratum in Spanish colonies was relatively homogeneous in the sixteenth century. Also, according to Lipski, “Both peasants and landed gentry were severely underrepresented

in the colonies, and the first waves of settlers were predominantly members of the skilled trades, small landowners, from marginal zones beset by climatic disasters, and individuals who for whatever reason had not done well economically or socially in Europe” (1994, 40, quoted by Mal-Molinero 2000, 30–31).

The colonization of the New World also started at a time when Castilian was just consolidating itself in the Iberian Peninsula (Mal-Molinero 2000, 27), prevailing over the other Ibero-Romance languages of the emergent unified Spanish kingdom as the official language. Overlooking the facts that all the colonists need not be expected to have spoken Castilian with the same level of fluency and that many of them could have spoken it with substrate influence from Catalan, Galician, Andalusian, or any other Ibero-Romance vernacular, Lipski focuses on the effect of contact with other European languages (such as Italian), with African languages, and with the Native American languages. As explained by Chaudenson (1992, 2001), the latter are the ones that constitute the actual substrata in this colonial scenario, because they are indigenous and prior to all the other languages brought by the immigrants, voluntary and involuntary.

However, because the relevant groups did not all come to the colonies at the same time—some of them did not arrive in the relevant critical mass until the late nineteenth or early twentieth century (such as the Italians in Argentina)—one must assume the evolution of Spanish in Latin America to have been gradual, consisting of successive responses to the changing composition of the colonial populations. Such a history of successive and incremental language contacts calls for a periodized account of language evolution, as suggested by Chaudenson (1992, 2002), since the relevant structures were not all in place at the same time, nor did they change overnight and in a wholesale manner. That is, different waves of non-Spanish immigrants, often speaking different languages, must have influenced the evolution of Spanish during various periods of massive language shift from the immigrants’ national vernaculars. The significance of convergent influences (although they may be assumed to have varied from speaker to speaker, according to individual language-learning skills) also depended largely on the critical mass of the ethnolinguistic groups relative to, and their degree of integration within, the extant Spanish-speaking populations, notwithstanding the extent of typological divergence from the target language. By the founder principle (Mufwene 1996, 2001), those engaged in the process latest and in negligible numbers may be expected to have exerted the least influence, as in the case of several immigrants to Anglophone North America since the nineteenth century, because they typically arrived by increments that were not unified ethnolinguistically or settled on the margins of the An-

glophone populations. While gradually shifting to English as groups, their children selected features of the native Anglophones over the nonnative elements of their parents (Mufwene 2009a).

Lipski acknowledges this factor in a different way: “in truth Latin American Spanish is the product not only of its first settlers but of the totality of the population, immigrants and natives alike” (chap. 2, this volume). Chaudenson’s notion of PERIODIZATION entails that the local ecological conditions change as the composition of the population speaking or shifting to the dominant vernacular varies in time and space. The natures and strengths of the influences exerted on the language vary throughout the colonial period and thereafter. As explained by Mufwene (2001, 2008), the local population structure, with its own particular composition of coexistent languages and varieties thereof, as well as its own patterns of interaction, influences the specifics of language evolution. It appears that the spread of Castilian over such a wide empire as Latin America contained all the ingredients for differential evolution. Thus, Lipski’s question can be reformulated as: What are the specific ecological conditions that account for the speciation of Castilian Spanish in Latin America? What are the common conditions and elements of Caribbean Spanish, on the one hand, and Central and South America, on the other, that account for such a divide enhanced by the sea that separates the islands from the continent?

A particular factor relevant to both the comparative approach (as in population studies)¹² and the periodization approach, made evident by Lipski’s own discussion and Clements’s (chap. 7), is that the demographic significance of African slaves was not consistent from one colony to another. Adding to complexity in adequate accounts of this differential language evolution is that the ethnolinguistic composition of the African population must not have been uniform either, from one colony to another or even within the same colony, especially the large ones. To the extent that African languages have exerted their share of influence on some of the emergent colonial Spanish and Portuguese varieties (see, e.g., Mello, chap. 6, this volume; and Negrão and Viotti 2012, regarding Brazilian Portuguese), the total substrate element must have varied from one colony or part thereof to another, thus fostering nonuniform evolution of the colonial vernaculars. The question is whether, as an ecological factor, African substrate influence was, overall, significant and uniform enough on the islands to set Caribbean Spanish varieties off from continental varieties. We must bear in mind that no Hispanic Caribbean island has been associated with a creole.

Equally significant is that Cuba and the Dominican Republic did not engage in the sugarcane industry until the late eighteenth century, more

than two centuries after the founding period, during which the European population was the majority and there was no institutional race segregation—which does not mean absence of discrimination (at least in relation to the Africans). Also, these territories maintained the institution of slavery up to the late nineteenth century, long after it had been abolished everywhere else; in fact, they imported the most slaves during that period, to satisfy the demand for cheap labor. Interestingly, it is only in peripheral plantation communities of Cuba that dubious “linguistic creolization,” comparable perhaps to the similar varieties that emerged in the Brazilian Quilombos (Mello, chap. 6, this volume), has been reported (Schwegler 2006). Creolists do not even agree on whether the varieties that emerged in these peripheral communities should be identified as creole, although they are different from the national Spanish and Portuguese varieties.¹³

To explain why no creole emerged in Cuba or the Dominican Republic, Chaudenson (1992, 2001) argues in the case of Cuba (and the same is true of the Dominican Republic) that these communities arose at a time when there were already a lot of Creole people of African descent who spoke the same colonial Spanish as the Creoles of European descent, and on those plantations there were plenty of them from whom the Bozal slaves could have learned the colonial vernacular adequately.¹⁴ By contrast, English, French, and Dutch creole vernaculars emerged at a time when the Bozal slave population was demographically superior to the creole slave population, and the Bozals’ linguistic models included the “seasoned slaves,” who spoke the colonial language nonnatively (Baker 1993; Chaudenson 1992, 2001). Language transmission in plantation settings thus proceeded in a way reminiscent of the exploitation colonies of Africa and Asia, where the colonial varieties of the European languages transmitted through the school system have indigenized and diverged already from the metropolitan models (Mufwene 2005). Thus, the later learners of the European language were not exposed to exactly the same varieties as the earlier learners, who had more access to either native varieties or closer approximations thereof. In the English, French, and Dutch colonies, as opposed to the Spanish colonies, segregation was based on race, rather than just on socioeconomic class; it was part of the population structure since the early stages of the development of the colonies, where the homestead, preplantation society phase did not last long. Just the opposite appears to have been the case in Iberian colonies, if racial segregation was institutionalized at all.

As will become evident, Barbara Pfeiler (chap. 8, this volume) contributes yet another dimension to this vexed question. The massive shift to Spanish, which is still in progress today in former colonies of continental

Latin America, did not start at the same time in various colonies. Not all parts of the political/administrative colonies were economically and culturally integrated at the same time. Pfeiler brings to bear the Yucatán Peninsula, where Maya continued as the dominant *lingua franca* until the twentieth century. The late shift to Spanish was accompanied by substantial substrate influence from Maya. Consequently, there emerged a distinct Yucatán dialect of Spanish that is distinct from Spanish in the rest of Mexico.

As reformulated in this introductory chapter, Lipski's question is thus not a simple and easy one to answer, because it requires a rich understanding of patterns of population growth and human interactions, as well as of significant periods in the spread of Castilian, factors that seem to have varied from one Spanish colony or part thereof to another. For instance, as explained by Lipski himself, Argentina and Uruguay stand out for the extent of Italian influence on the Spanish of Buenos Aires and Montevideo, which is not noticeable in the varieties spoken in the other parts of these countries. An important reason is that, although the Italians arrived late, in the nineteenth century, they quickly constituted critical masses in these emergent urban centers and easily impacted the evolution of Spanish locally. By the same token, one must ask why, although Italians represent the largest ethnic group after the descendants of the Spaniards, Italian has not emerged as an important European vernacular adopted by other Argentinians. Do European Argentinians have a history of language shift that is similar to that European Americans and Canadians? Apparently, the language of the dominant economy was sooner or later learned by all other European immigrants and gradually prevailed over the other European languages, and the more competitive national groups (such as the Germans in North America) were the last to assimilate culturally and give up their vernacular (Mufwene 2009a).

Or is the case of the Italian Argentinians similar to that of, for instance, Italian and Lithuanian Americans, who came late, lived in segregated communities, and lost both their national languages and their nonnative varieties of the colonial language as gradually as they became integrated in the dominant population, albeit a dominant population of European descent? In Argentina, what are the social-ecology conditions that prevented *Cocoliche*, the allegedly pidginlike variety spoken by Italian immigrants in the twentieth century, from evolving into a full-fledged vernacular and therefore a separate, Italian-Argentinian Spanish variety? How similar are these ecological conditions to those that account for the short lives of Italian, German, and Yiddish Englishes in the United States? Lipski does not address these questions, but the reader should bear them in mind in order to assess the complexity and diversity of language con-

tact in the New World from a comparative perspective, as outlined, for instance, by Diamond and Robinson (2010).

Here, Lipski is more concerned with the impact of demographics and the order of speakers' arrival on the evolution of a language under contact conditions. He asks, "How many speakers of one language or dialect are needed to leave a permanent imprint on the evolving Spanish American varieties?" For him, such demographics, to be found in the large numbers of Andalusians (and Extremadurans [Mal-Molinero 2000, 30]) in the Caribbean in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, can explain why Caribbean Spanish is different from continental Latin American Spanish, by the founder effect (Mufwene 1996, 2001). Putatively, the continental varieties bear more influence from Castilian, especially since the seventeenth century, the period during which the Caribbean no longer was the diffusion point of the Spanish colonial expansion.

Lipski also speculates on the probable time of the autonomization (Chaudenson 1992, 2001) of Latin American Spanish from Peninsular Spanish:

By comparing linguistic innovations occurring in Spain since the early sixteenth century with emerging traits of Latin American Spanish, it is possible to identify with some accuracy the period in which Latin American dialects ceased to reflect major innovations occurring in Spain; essentially, by the 1700s most innovations in Spain did not pass unconditionally to Latin America.

Contrary to much of the literature on the evolution of European languages in the New World, Lipski also argues that Native American languages may have influenced Latin American Spanish not only lexically but also syntactically: "In a racially and socially segregated environment such as existed in colonial Latin America, Spanish is used not only for essential contacts with the population of European descent, but also among members of the *same* indigenous community." This substrate influence would have been facilitated by the fact that "during the 16th century and even later, indigenous populations often outnumbered Europeans by a factor of several thousand to one" (chap. 2, this volume). We can learn more about the possibility of such influence from ethnographically informative accounts of how language shift occurred among Native Americans in the same part of the world, where the proportion of those that have survived European colonization to date is larger than in Anglophone North America (Nettle and Romaine 2000). By the founder principle, the later the time of the shift, the less influence the relevant ethnolinguistic groups exerted on the dominant language (Mufwene 2008, chap. 10).

In chapter 3, “Amerindian Language Islands in Brazil,” Hildo do Couto focuses on the impact of Portuguese colonization on indigenous languages. He prefers the notion of LANGUAGE ISLAND to that of LANGUAGE ENCLAVE, because “it suggests that the territory of the relevant population [. . .] is a kind of island within another population [. . .] analogized to an ocean. Further, it implies that there is a hinterland from which the ‘island’ is somehow detached and to which it remains related” (chap. 3, this volume). On the one hand, this conjures up the question of the ambient ecology that has enabled the islands’ populations to maintain their languages, while the spread of Portuguese has been driving the other languages to extinction. On the other hand, we should also ask whether, in the history of Brazil, Portuguese was the only language to have spread and endangered the other languages. As in the chapters by Denny Moore and by M. Kittiya Lee, we learn that Portuguese colonization helped *Língua Brasília* (a.k.a. the *Brasília*) and, later, *Língua Geral Amazônica* (a.k.a. the *Amazônica*) spread in much of Brazil. The question arises whether this indigenous lingua franca did not contribute to the endangerment and loss of other Native American languages.

A population very much engaged in trade even before the arrival of Europeans in Brazil, the Tupinambá became important power brokers, especially after the adoption of their language (identified also as *Língua Geral*) by Portuguese traders and missionaries as the lingua franca for interactions with the indigenous people and for Christianization (Lee, chap 5, this volume). The advantages that the language conferred because of its association with economic power and, indirectly, with the European civilization appear to have caused language shift, especially in Amazonia.

Quite significantly, as noted by Moore (chap. 4, this volume), the “descending” (or forced relocation) of Native Americans to missions or colonists’ settlements, where they were under pressure to communicate in *Língua Geral*, contributed to the attrition or loss of indigenous languages. Thus, as in Black Africa, European colonization endangered or disadvantaged several indigenous languages not necessarily by promoting and spreading a European language but often, if not typically, by facilitating the further demographic expansion of specific indigenous ones that had already been major or expanding languages before the Europeans arrived. The spread of *Língua Geral* is indeed comparable to that of, for instance, Wolof, Sango, Lingala, Kituba, and Swahili in Black Africa, although, perhaps because it was colonized typically on the exploitation (rather than the settlement) model, Africa has experienced more multilingualism than language shift, especially in rural areas (Mufwene 2008).

Languages, like viruses (Mufwene 2001, 2005, 2008), spread through

carriers, those who speak them and use them to interact with new individuals, who in turn learn them. In the case of Brazil, Couto explains that the mestizos seem to have played a critical role in spreading Portuguese, especially those mestizos who worked in the colonial administration, whereas, as we also learn from Lee (chap. 5, this volume), *Língua Geral* was spread by trade, through some European marooned “factors” who had learned the indigenous language, and through Tupinambá interpreters who had learned some Portuguese.¹⁵ In Amazonia, *Língua Geral*, then also called *Língua Amazônica*, eventually evolved into Nheengatu.

Couto is also interested in the ways the meanings of traditional terms were modified to suit the colonizer’s culture. Thus, *oka* ‘hut’ combined with *pukú* ‘long’ into *oka pukú* to designate ‘street’, and *tba* ‘hamlet’ combined with *usú* ‘large’ into *tabusú* to denote ‘town’. These examples show how adaptive a language can be to a new culture that its speakers are brought into contact with. Likewise, Lee (chap. 5, this volume) tells us that Native Americans renamed European products, such as scissors and knives, in their own indigenous terms (thereby extending their meanings), suggesting less tolerance for borrowings or, perhaps, that the intercultural contacts were not intimate enough to lead to borrowings. Indeed, in interpreting *Media Lengua* as Quichua influenced by extensive lexical borrowings from and structural convergence with Spanish, Shappeck (2011) also underscores the role of increasing contacts between Spanish and Quichua either as speakers of the latter moved to the city or as Spanish gradually spread to rural areas.

Couto also reports that the vitality of *Língua Geral* was not uniform throughout Brazil. The southern variety known as *Língua Geral Paulista* died in the early nineteenth century, while *Língua Geral Amazônica* (LGA) was spreading. In rural areas, it died after rural basilectal Portuguese started rooting as the dominant vernacular. (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, gives more information about how late in the twentieth century Portuguese penetrated some parts of Amazonia and the differing ways in which it was received by the indigenous populations in Upper Rio Negro and the Upper Xingu.) An important factor in this ongoing shift to Portuguese seems to be rural exodus, with the city then exerting more pressure on incoming Native Americans to adopt its vernacular: Portuguese. What applies here is the same basic principle that Moore (chap. 4, this volume) associates with the practice of “descending,” in that the people who relocate typically adopt the language of the host population, regardless of whether it is associated with economic power, although the latter factor is far from irrelevant. One is thus reminded not only of language loss in other European settlement colonies, in particular Anglophone North

America and Australia, but also of how the Celtic populations gradually Latinized in the now Romance Europe, first in the city and later in rural areas (Landa 2000).

In addition, Couto looks into the reasons why Native American languages are dying today in “population islands” such as the Indian Reservation of the Xingu River. According to him, the relevant languages are typologically and genetically different from one another and no group is interested in the other’s language, while Portuguese is turning into a useful lingua franca. Also, children of interethnic marriages, especially those involving whites, learn Portuguese as their mother tongue. The situation is much the same with other “language islands,” with competence in Portuguese seen as a sign of progress. Urbanization, proceeding at the rate of 70 percent, is also taking its toll, although some ethnic neighborhoods maintain their heritage languages as vernaculars. To be sure, some indigenous languages have emerged as lingua francas, but those who might have been native speakers of the same indigenous languages prefer other languages as their lingua francas. Multilingualism may be a transition toward monolingualism in Portuguese, an evolutionary trajectory that has taken place in other settlement colonies and also in Romance Europe. In general, out of the estimated 1,200 languages that were spoken when the Portuguese first arrived in Brazil, only 180 are still spoken today, typically in “language islands,” where European influence is still marginal. Christopher Ball’s chapter deals with this very subject matter.

Denny Moore confirms in Chapter 4, “Historical Development of Nheengatu (Língua Geral Amazônica),” that Língua Geral functioned as the lingua franca in most interactions of the Portuguese with Native Americans in Brazil until the seventeenth century. It may even have functioned as a vernacular in mixed unions. Colonial contacts during the first two centuries, not only between Europeans and Native Americans but also between different indigenous groups (such as in the Christian missions), created ethnographic conditions that were favorable to the demographic and geographical expansion of this indigenous language. Língua Geral was also spread by the Tupinambá and other indigenous populations fleeing northward from the expansion of the Portuguese.

Although the size of the ethnic Tupinambá population declined, along with the populations of other Native American groups (just as in other European settlement colonies, largely because the people lacked immunity to illnesses brought from the Old World [Crosby 1992]), Moore notes that the name was extended to other populations culturally related to the Tupinambá, especially those who had also adopted Língua Geral as their vernacular. Missionaries were among the first to learn this and other

indigenous languages, because competence in them was a more expeditious way of Christianizing the Native Americans than waiting for them to learn Portuguese or relying on *linguas* ‘interpreters’.

Moore is also informative about how geographical ecology influenced the speed of the colonial expansion. The Portuguese gained access to Brazil, a large territory, from the south. It took a whole century for them to reach Amazonia, owing largely to the challenge of penetrating the rain forest. As noted, that region is still being penetrated now, by the use of novel technology that reduces exclusive dependence on rivers as highways. The ecological difficulties also explained why the demographic importance of Portuguese colonists remained very small in Amazonia. An interesting ethnographic division of labor followed, according to which the usage of Portuguese was restricted to senior colonial administration, the original *Língua Geral* (*Brasílica*) was used for liturgy, and the *Amazônica* (the emergent northern variety of the same language) was used for “popular communication” and for “religious instruction” (Freire 2004, 118, cited by Moore).¹⁶ Portuguese was apparently so marginal to the lives of people in Amazonia that it exerted little influence, mostly lexical, on the *Amazônica*, although, according to Denny Moore (pers. comm., Jan. 10, 2013), some syntax of *Nheengatu*, as the language is called today, eventually converged with that of Portuguese (e.g., the SVO major constituent order and the structure of embedded clauses).

However, things changed in the mid-nineteenth century, when steamships started facilitating the penetration of the rain-forest interior of Brazil and urbanization increased and was no longer limited to the coast. Technological and economic changes fueled the penetration of the Amazon by the Portuguese and Brazilians, especially from the south, and therefore encouraged the spread of the Portuguese language at the expense of LGA. This demographic expansion also precipitated the decline of the latter language. Moore observes that “by the end of the century, LGA, or *Nheengatu*, was mostly spoken in western Amazonia, in the less accessible regions.” His conclusions include the following: “It is clear that the evolution of the language has been complex; each generation of learners has modified it using the patterns available to them. *Nheengatu* has been more an alternative to Portuguese than an imitation of Portuguese.” What is less evident is whether it is useful to treat LGA as a pidgin or a creole, although it is a contact phenomenon. Readers may decide for themselves.

In Chapter 5, “Language and Conquest: Tupi-Guarani Expansion in the European Colonization of Brazil and Amazonia,” M. Kittiya Lee corroborates Couto’s observation that the domination of part of coastal eastern Brazil by the *Tupinaé* had preceded the arrival of the Portuguese in 1500.

They were in turn dominated by the Tupinambá, a related population, who spread their language, which was later identified as *Língua (Geral) Brasileira* by the European colonists. This functioned as the unofficial lingua franca between the Native Americans, the Europeans, and the Africans, before Portuguese started to prevail in the seventeenth century, as also noted by Moore. Lee associates the spread and the increasing dominance of Portuguese with the growing number of Portuguese colonists involved in sugarcane cultivation and in the gold rush after gold was discovered in Minas Gerais in 1690. The use of Portuguese in regular interactions with the African slaves was also a significant factor. The other social ecological factor is the emergence of the mestizos as a distinct group (as also noted by Couto in chapter 3); they came to play a more and more important role in the administrative expansion of the colony, thus reducing the status of the Tupinambá as intermediaries between the Europeans and other indigenous populations.

In the process of this colonial expansion, the Tupinambá, preceding the Portuguese and their auxiliaries, spread farther and farther into Amazonia, although, according to Denny Moore (pers. comm., Jan. 10, 2013), most of them were exterminated by the late sixteenth century. According to Lee, LGA prevailed because of the prestige of the coastal Tupinambá, as the river transportation system brought the indigenous people more and more into contact with them and the Europeans. According to Denny Moore, the increased contact was primarily the result of the active policy of “descending” indigenous groups noted above. “The captured people had to speak LGA to talk to those controlling them and to each other, since they were from various groups” and spoke different languages (pers. comm., Jan. 10, 2013). Note that it must also have been easier for the other Native Americans to learn LGA than Portuguese, since the indigenous languages are apparently similar typologically. Or could the Native Americans have been better disposed to LGA because their cultures are more similar to one another than to the European culture? These reasons need not be mutually exclusive, in any case.

Like the missionaries, who produced catechisms in *Língua Geral*, the European traders (including some Dutch, French, and Irish) were also less invested in using Portuguese. That LGA interested the European merchants is evidenced by the sheer number of word lists that, based on Lee’s account, were produced during the sixteenth century. The brevity of the lists and their specific contents also suggest that the European traders must have usually relied on interpreters and learned mostly the words for local goods that they needed to know. In fact, they spent most of the time aboard their ships. The interpreters often consisted of “factors” and Tupinambá, the people who had been trading directly with the Por-

tuguese since the latter arrived in 1500. Confirming Couto's account of the reluctance of Native Americans to borrow words from European languages, Lee reports that the European word lists include Native American terms for European goods such as knives and scissors. The contacts were undoubtedly too limited or indirect for European lexical items to have made their way into the indigenous languages, at least during the early stages of colonization. According to Denny Moore (pers. comm., Jan. 10, 2013), things apparently changed, and "the whole colony of Brazil [i.e., the parts with Portuguese settlements] was soon bilingual."

As John Lipski points out in chapter 2, the linguistic significance of the presence of Africans in Latin America during the colonial period, variable though it must have been, cannot be overlooked from the perspective of language evolution, especially in places where the slaves constituted an important proportion of the colonial or the postindependence population. This is what Heliana Mello focuses on in chapter 6, "African Descendants' Rural Vernacular Portuguese and Its Contribution to Understanding the Development of Brazilian Portuguese." This topic is especially important because the Brazilian colonial population does not appear to have been as segregated as the colonial societies of the English and French Caribbean, for instance. This is apparently why no particularly black Portuguese variety has emerged in Brazil that can be identified as a creole, notwithstanding the absence of particular structural criteria for identifying a particular language variety as "creole" (Mufwene 1986, 2000, 2008; DeGraff 2001, 2005, 2009; contrary to McWhorter 1998).

Mello begins by addressing how the Portuguese colonists of the early sixteenth century established communication with Native Americans, since neither group knew the other's language. She takes us into a critical phenomenon that has too often been overlooked in studies of the emergence of creoles and pidgins, the role played by interpreters (already highlighted by Couto, Moore, and Lee), although this conjures up the issue of how that class of intermediaries emerged in the first place. While Lee speaks of "factors," Mello invokes the *degredados*, whose "explicit assignment" was, according to her, "learning the local languages." (chap. 6, this volume). They are the same kind of individuals identified elsewhere as *lançados*, undesirables that were expelled from Europe and not welcome to return. They were forced by the circumstances of their existence in exile to learn the language of the host population. Colonization found them useful in return; hence the term *factor* used by Lee, with the meaning 'business agent'. These are the unsung heroes of colonization (Mufwene 2005, 2008) who helped facilitate trade and later the domination of the colonies.

Another important group in Brazil, at least regarding communication with the African slaves, consisted of *negros de reino* (from Portugal), whose role Naro (1978, 1988) discussed in relation to the emergence of creoles, and *negros ladinos* (the acculturated slaves from some São Tomé). These are distinguished from *negros boçais*, known in the non-Hispanic literature as Bozals, slaves who had freshly arrived from Africa and had to be acculturated by the creole (locally born) slaves or the “seasoned” ones (acclimated already) who had preceded them; they were typically relegated to hard work in the field (hence the term *field hands* in the North American literature). Like the Palenque of San Basilio in Colombia, the Brazilian Quilombos were apparently settled primarily by Bozal slaves, although they were joined by other populations. This is one kind of contact setting where strong substratist hypotheses on the emergence of creoles can be tested. In the case of Palenquero, the evidence of such influence on grammar is rather limited (Moñino 2007). Mello concludes that in the case of the Quilombolas’ vernacular Portuguese, the influence is limited to the lexicon, including some idioms. Could Chaudenson’s (1992, 2001) hypothesis on the absence of creoles in Cuba and the Dominican Republic despite the large number of slaves until the late nineteenth century (discussed above) also apply in this case?

According to Brazilian scholars such as Hildo do Couto (pers. comm., 2005), Brazilian Portuguese (BP) is now as distinct from European/Peninsular Portuguese (EP) as American English is from British English; they have developed their own autonomous (standard) norms. In chapter 7, “Brazilian Portuguese and the Ecology of (Post-)Colonial Brazil,” J. Clancy Clements argues that BP and EP are, nonetheless, national varieties of the same language, although they continue to diverge, perhaps also like American and British Englishes. It is irrelevant whether or not they, or some of their subvarieties, are mutually intelligible. According to him, blacks and *pardos* (African-European mixed-raced people) are the primary reason BP is diverging from EP: “The large number of Africans and their descendants played an integral role in the introduction of new features into VBP [vernacular BP] and in the propagation of these features among the population at large.” However, the question is whether the features associated with the divergence are necessarily of African origins. Or are they features that were simply favored by their congruence with those of some African languages in the way explained by Corne (1999) for French creoles? Noteworthy in this regard is Clements’s own observation that, unlike the situation in the Caribbean, “the concentration of the African population was also in smaller units.” Citing Schwartz (1985, 440), he observes:

By the advent of the nineteenth century, there were two types of agricultural operations in plantation-heavy areas such as Bahia: the established plantations that depended on the use of large numbers of slaves and the newly formed subsistence farming operations in the Recôncavo area (in Bahia), in which around 70% of the slaveowners held fewer than five slaves each and only twenty-five owners possessed more than twenty slaves. There were few sugar mills in the area; only three slaveowners held more than fifty slaves. (chap. 7, this volume)

This demographic distribution of slaves is very different from that in the English and French Caribbean and in coastal Georgia and South Carolina, where the overwhelming majority of slaves were owned by a small minority of powerful plantocrats who possessed more than one hundred slaves each. There may also have been more reliance on slave labor on English, French, and Dutch Caribbean, circum-Caribbean, and North American plantations, which sometimes grew into huge estates, especially in the Caribbean, than in Brazil.

The latter colony is also a historically curious phenomenon because the slaves were not exclusively or predominantly allocated to the agricultural industry. During the eighteenth century, a large proportion of them were employed in the mines of Minas Gerais. Since no variety of VBP has emerged that is exclusively associated with descendants of slaves, unlike what obtains in places where creole vernaculars have emerged, Clements's chapter, like Lipski's, raises the question of articulating the particular ways in which the blacks and *pardos* contributed to the divergence of BP from EP. Note that the decrease of the black and *pardo* populations in the nineteenth century might not have eroded the contributions of Africans to the structures of BP, any more than the founder effect of the English/Anglo population on the emergence of American versions of English was weakened by the increasing white American populations of continental European origins in the United States (Mufwene 2009a).

The reader should also note that, on one hand, unlike Naro and Scherre's (2007) view, which privileges the EP element, there is significant local-contact-based scholarship that has sought to underscore the contributions of African languages (see, e.g., Florin and Petter 2008; Roncardi and Abraçardo 2008; Lima and Carmo 2008; Galves et al. 2009; Ne-grão and Viotti 2011). On the other hand, since Clements acknowledges that only one of the ten features he has investigated cannot be traced back to Portuguese, it may not be irrelevant to clarify here that substrate influence need not be reduced to what Allsopp (1977) identifies as "apport," that is, forms or constructions introduced from the substrate languages but not attested in the lexifier. It may amount to the role that the

substrate languages played in favoring particular options, giving selective advantage to features that were congruent with their own (Mufwene 1990, 2001, 2005, 2008, 2010; Corne 1999; Chaudenson 2001), perhaps especially those that Gilman (1986) identifies as “areal,” in the sense that they spread over geographical areas that straddle different language families. Future research will, hopefully, sort things out.

In Chapter 8, “Maya and Spanish in Yucatán: An Example of Continuity and Change,” Barbara Pfeiler takes us to the topic of language co-existence and competition in Mexico. She addresses the question of why Spanish has not replaced Maya in the Yucatán Peninsula. Citing Gabbert (2004, 21) and Farriss (1984, 112), she notes that Maya remained the primary and legal language of the colony until the nineteenth century and was spoken not only by “Indians, mestizos and pardos” but also by members of the “lower castes.” It was also used by the missionaries for the evangelization of the Native Americans. Thus, efforts to spread Spanish in the Yucatán Peninsula started rather late, allowing Maya time to carve its space in the new world order. According to Pfeiler, “The Yucatán Peninsula was not truly integrated into the rest of Mexico until local railroads were joined with the national rail network in the late 1950s. This isolation is one of the most important factors affecting the formation and use of Yucatán Spanish, a variant differing from that of central Mexico” (chap. 8, this volume).

From an ecological perspective, the spread of Spanish in Yucatán can be correlated with the expansion of the modern economy, which began with the cultivation of henequen, the building of railroads, and the changes brought about by those events. However, consistent with the emergent population structure of Mexico, Maya continued to be spoken by some Native Americans who were not involved in the industry. The factors that have subsequently affected the demographic attrition of speakers of Yucatán Maya include the increasing immigration of outsiders to Yucatán, thanks to the new economic system, and the emigration of Mayans to urban centers and away from the region to other parts of Mexico (and to the United States) since the mid-twentieth century. While the immigrants contributed to the spread of Spanish, those who left have had to adopt the language of their host populations, Spanish in Mexico and English in Anglophone North America.¹⁷ Thus, both the immigration of outsiders to and the emigration of locals from Yucatán have exerted pressure on Yucatecans to adapt to the new socioeconomic ecologies. Both in and outside the homeland, these new ecologies made it hard for parents to transmit their heritage language to their offspring.

From the point of view of structure, Maya and Spanish have borrowed words from each other. Maya has indigenized the Spanish loan words,

enabling a lot of morphological derivations that would not be possible in Spanish. Different parts of Yucatán exhibit varying degrees of borrowings from Spanish. The extent of these can be correlated with the duration and intensity of contact with Spanish. Spanish verbs are seldom used by speakers who have had little exposure to Spanish. However, the influence of Maya on Spanish has contributed to making the local/regional variety of Spanish singular in comparison to other Mexican Spanish varieties. Even function words have been borrowed into Spanish, although nouns are used with Spanish derivational and inflectional morphology. Bilinguals also use the Mayan word order in Spanish, apparently in a manner similar to the convergence that Shappeck (2011) invokes to account for structures of *Media Lengua* in Ecuador. For instance, adverbs are placed before verbs.

Although Maya has survived the competition of Spanish to date, there is every reason to wonder whether it will endure in the future. Note that, despite the large number of its speakers (close to 1 million), the colonial/imperial language is also spreading as a vernacular. Pressure is indeed increasing to the disadvantage of Maya. More and more parents are transmitting Spanish, instead of Maya, as a mother tongue to their children in order to prepare them adequately for competition in the school system and in the job market. According to Pfeiler, “To a certain extent this is to be expected since, for example, one of the basic requirements for qualified employment or higher education is fluency in Spanish; no such requirement exists for Maya” (chap. 8, this volume). I should clarify, against those who have usually invoked the prestige of the dominant language in such cases, that it is the lucrative aspect of Spanish that appears to drive the shift here. Prestige would be only a secondary reason for a population that is simply adapting to changing socioeconomic conditions. Also, everybody is not learning standard Spanish in any case. As noted above, exodus out of the region is driven by economic pressures, which are working against the maintenance of Maya.

Like Maya in the Yucatán Peninsula, Quechua played an important role in the Spanish colonization of parts of South America. Alan Durston treats this topic in chapter 9, “Standard Colonial Quechua.” He is interested in how the Spanish colonists used and reinvented Quechua as a *lingua franca*, proceeding to develop a “Standard Quechua” out of what appears to have been a cluster of languages.¹⁸ According to colonial and Christian records of the sixteenth century, Quechua was variable. The new variety, Standard Colonial Quechua (SCQ), may have been based on what was spoken in Cuzco, the capital of the Inca Empire. Its grammar was simplified and its region-specific lexical items were replaced by those more widely used. Durston observes: “It appears that more than enhancing intelligibil-

ity among indigenous audiences that spoke other varieties of Quechua, SCQ was intended[, ironically,] to be easily learned by Spanish priests.” He also emphasizes that “SCQ was not a pidgin—it retained the full range of grammatical categories present in its base variety. Arguments that SCQ reflects Spanish influence at the grammatical level, or even a failure to understand Quechua grammar, seem unfounded” (chap. 9, this volume).

Durston highlights the important role that mining in the Peruvian highlands played in the spread and modification of Quechua as a *lingua franca*, based on the southern Peruvian variety. “Conciliar Quechua” (fabricated by Spanish missionaries and first used in writing) is what forged its relative homogeneity as a *lingua franca*, the variety that was further spread in the Spanish colonies.

Then arises the question whether SCQ ever became a vernacular. According to Durston, “It appears that in some respects SCQ stood in relation to Central Quechua varieties as [Classical] Latin did to Romance languages in medieval and early modern Europe” (chap. 9, this volume). Thus a diglossic situation existed, instead of competition between vernaculars or *lingua francas*, and a language shift became less likely to occur. Recall that it was Vulgar Latin that spread as a vernacular, and as it started in the emergent Roman-style urban centers, it was in competition with the indigenous Celtic vernaculars in the relevant part of the former Roman Empire. The Romance languages that Durston refers to are the ultimate outcomes of the indigenization of Vulgar Latin. This is a process that has at times aptly been analogized to the emergence of creoles from the contact of nonstandard varieties of European colonial languages with non-European vernaculars, although one need not call the Romance languages “creoles” at all. The ethnography of this contact situation in the Inca Empire appears to be similar (though only partly and only for a while, as we see below) to, for instance, that in postcolonial Black Africa, where European colonial languages function as official languages and as elite *lingua francas* that are barely intelligible (or not at all) to the majority of the national populations and are not at all in competition with the indigenous vernaculars.

Did the Spaniards ever attempt to impose SCQ in their colonies? asks Durston. “Did they rely on it as an administrative medium? The answer [. . .] seems to be no.” Not every colonist, or even every ecclesiast, learned SCQ. “Lay officials appear to have received no training in Quechua at all. Instead, both lay and ecclesiastical justice and administration relied on interpreters or *lenguas*, preferably local Spanish ones rather than Indians.” SCQ must have been part of the transition to a Spanish-speaking empire. The Spanish administrators eventually imposed Spanish on the indigenous population partly to get rid of the interpreters. Thus, “As SCQ

ceased to be widely cultivated by the clergy, its use as a medium of mundane written communication among the indigenous elite also seems to have waned, perhaps because they were no longer exposed to SCQ pastoral imprints.” SCQ was gradually replaced by colloquial and apparently less artificial Quechua. Note, however, that the Spaniards did not fabricate SCQ out of thin air. Some variety of Quechua had apparently functioned as a lingua franca before they colonized the region. However, Durston also remarks: “The term *lingua franca* evokes a medium that enables exchange between language communities. SCQ does not fit this definition very well; in many respects it was designed as an instrument of control and restriction rather than of wide communication” (chap. 9, this volume).

This comment raises the question whether Quechua was the only language to be so used. What about Aymara, which is still spoken (albeit by a decreasing number of speakers), for instance? Was it ever used by the colonists or their auxiliaries for communication with the natives? The significance of the question is underscored by the following observation by Durston: “Varieties of Quechua certainly did function as lingua francas for communication among Indians from different areas who converged in various colonial centers as labor draftees or migrants, as Itier [2000, 2001] has suggested. However, I see little evidence that there was such a thing as a pan-Andean or even pan-Peruvian Quechua lingua franca” (chap. 9, this volume).

Durston concludes, on one hand, that “the degree to which the colonial regime effectively promoted Quechua beyond strictly pastoral contexts has been overstated.” On the other hand, it is not evident that the Spaniards, or the Portuguese for that matter, treated all Native American languages equally. Quechua may have been used in the same way Tupi-nambá, dubbed *Língua Geral*, was in Brazil. Although in both cases, as in fact in that of Yucatán Maya, the colonial language was promoted to replace the regional language as the lingua franca and ultimately as a vernacular, the early reliance on the indigenous language extended its life. Now it appears logical to ask whether the other indigenous languages were threatened just by the European languages or also by the Native American one promoted by the colonial regime. This consideration does not, of course, lessen the role of colonization as the disturber of the “balance of power” in the indigenous linguascape.

Christopher Ball adduces another range of ecological factors that shed more light on the contacts and the ensuing competition between Native American and European languages in remote areas of Brazilian Amazonia. In chapter 10, “Linguistic Subjectivity in Ecologies of Amazonian Language Change,” he focuses on “the speaking individual” as an important ecological factor affecting language evolution. He explains “subject-

tivity” as follows: “This can be basically stated as equivalent to the claim that in some cultures it might suffice for people to be speakers of only one language to count as fully developed subjects, whereas in another, speaking two, three, or more languages may be a requisite feature of human subjectivity.”

In Vaupés, the multilingualism in question does not affect women, those who undergo exogamy and virilocality, in the same way as it does men. In their new residence, women become speakers of minority, nonlocal languages, while their children grow up bilingual, with native competence in both the mother’s and the father’s languages, the father’s language being ethnographically the dominant one. Whether or not the language of a village is endangered ultimately depends on the proportion of men who stay in the village and do not migrate to the city or the Christian mission and, in some ways, on the extent to which children remain attached to their mothers’ languages. However,

historical changes that brought forced language mixing in mission schools and increased shifts of linguistic communities to Portuguese and Tukano [the regional major language] have challenged this culturally Vaupés way of becoming a plurilingual person. [. . .] The kind of mixing that was inadvertently encouraged by relocation of children to mission schools [. . .] fostered language change including the rise of Tukano as a regional lingua franca at the expense of smaller Tukanoan varieties. (Ball, chap. 10, this volume)

The new world order introduced by colonization also turned women, still abiding by exogamy and virilocality, into important agents of language shift in favor of Portuguese. This occurred as they moved to the city, married Portuguese-speaking men (or married and then moved), and raised Portuguese-speaking children who were not very interested in the indigenous languages of their mothers. The demographic increase of Portuguese speakers among the natives has meant the decrease of speakers of heritage languages, especially the minor ones. The trend has also been exacerbated by the heightened socioeconomic status of speakers of Portuguese, which has prompted more shifts to it by individual speakers.¹⁹

Curiously, the natives blame language mixing, rather than language shift, for the loss of some indigenous languages. In their view, their languages are dying by transformation rather than by shift, the ethnographic process that has preoccupied linguists the most in the past couple of decades.²⁰ The mixing supposedly happened in the Salesian missions, where school children were forced to speak Portuguese but also came into contact with other indigenous languages, which they learned in order to remain “plurilingual.” The languages of minorities in the mission schools

were influenced by those of larger groups. According to Ball, the facts remind us “that simple equations of the loss of language with the loss of culture are often misguided” (chap. 10, this volume). Thus, contrary to much of the “ecolinguistic” literature (e.g., Nettle and Romaine 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000; Mühlhäusler 2003), speakers who have lost their languages have not necessarily lost their traditional customs, such as exogamy and virilocality, nor the need to learn the language of their new place of residence, as in the present case.

The experience of language contact has been different for the Upper Xinguans, who came into contact with the mainstream Brazilian society only recently and have never before been “rigorously missionized or subjected to slave raids and economic exploitation,” Ball points out. They also subscribe to “an ideology that attributes purity of ethnicity to individual monolingualism.” Despite contacts with other ethnolinguistic groups, “plurilingualism as a communicative property of individuals is downplayed, while isolation and ethnolinguistic boundaries are emphasized.” The use of Portuguese is domain-specific and associated with particular expertise, which, while indigenizing local Portuguese, has not affected the practice of most Upper Xinguan languages. This language contact experience has been unlike that of the neighboring Yawalapiti, whose “leadership cultivates a cosmopolitan linguistic identity.” Yawalapiti is thus dying, while the Upper Xinguan languages do not appear to be endangered yet. Ball concludes fittingly that in territories such as Brazil, “we should approach the ecology of language [evolution] with a particularist eye, rather than jumping to generalizations about types, predictive models, and overly powerful metaphors of unidirectional change or loss” (chap. 10, this volume).

3. The Big Picture

The demographic and linguistic landscapes of Latin America have certainly changed over the past half millennium. If there is any doubt that Latin America has Indo-Europeanized genetically, because of the Hispanicization phenomenon (a process of race mixing that led Anglophone North Americans to coin the term *Hispanic*), no question should arise about its linguascape. Latin America has become linguistically Romance, insofar as Portuguese and Spanish are the vernaculars of the majorities of the national populations. One may also say that it has Latinized more faithfully than European Romance countries have, because most of the new colonial offspring of Spanish/Castilian and Portuguese, albeit their standard varieties, are still largely mutually intelligible with their metropolitan counterparts, unlike what one may claim of the European Ro-

mance languages relative to Vulgar Latin, from which they evolved. We must bear in mind that population movements and language contact are as responsible for the divergence of Portuguese and Spanish Romance varieties from Latin as they are for that of Latin American Portuguese and Spanish varieties from their Peninsular ancestors.

It is likewise noteworthy that, as pointed out by Lipski, the evolution of Spanish in Latin America, like that of Vulgar Latin in Iberia, has not been uniform. Aside from the fact that Castilian did not come in contact with the same (combinations of) languages, the Castilian monarchs colonized Latin America no more uniformly than the English did their New World colonies or even the now Anglophone North America in particular. Nor was Spanish, like Portuguese in Brazil and English in Anglophone North America, adopted at the same time by all the non-Spanish populations who came to speak it as a vernacular at some point. The target had mutated already, because of previous contacts with other languages, by the time another population was exposed to it, generations later, and of course no new learner would appropriate it faithfully in the first place. Although it is true that varying degrees of assimilation by and absorption into the native-speaking population have eliminated the emergence or maintenance of varieties associated with particular ethnic groups or nations of origin in Europe, critical mass and time of shift among the non-heritage speakers have been important ecological factors in introducing xenolectal elements that would enhance the divergence of an emergent variety away from its kin elsewhere. These factors apparently account for the divergence of Spanish in countries such as Argentina and Uruguay, because of the large proportion of Italian immigrants in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Lipski, chap. 2, this volume), and also in places such as the Yucatán Peninsula, where, according to Pfeiler, its later adoption by Mayan speakers in the twentieth century made allowance for significant substrate influence.

But we must also remember that generally the colonial linguistic feature pools did not replicate those of the metropolises and were not identical from one colony to another, either. Thus, the divergence of colonial varieties from the European varieties was to be expected even if Portuguese and Castilian had not come in contact with other languages in the New World colonies. The dynamics of European feature competition were not identical, as is evident from, for instance, Trudgill (2004), regarding what he calls southern hemisphere Englishes (including the varieties spoken in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Falkland Islands, among others). Generally, the feature recombination dynamics did not remain constant across colonies (Mufwene 2001, 2005, 2006, 2008), an approach more finely articulated by Aboh (2006, 2009).

There is also something to be learned about the significance of demographic, political, and economic powers in helping the colonial varieties autonomize, thus legitimating their own separate norms, in the way explained by Chaudenson (2001). Former colonies can do this more easily after becoming politically and economically independent, as Latin American countries generally have. Countries such as Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico, whose respective populations are larger and whose economies may now be considered stronger than those of their metropolises, have norms that are treated with as much respect relative to the metropolitan ones as those of American and Australian Englishes relative to British Queen's English. This is an evolution that is ethnographically both similar to and different from that of English in England's former colonies. Speakers of "native Englishes" (chiefly the British and North American varieties) are generally less accepting of the "indigenized Englishes" spoken in the former exploitation colonies of Africa and Asia than they are of each other's, which reflects their recognition of themselves as culturally (thus also politically and economically) more related than they appear to feel toward the former exploitation colonies.²¹ Such a power-based asymmetrical distinction does not appear to have arisen yet—or, perhaps, to have been articulated so strongly—between European Portuguese and Spanish, on the one hand, and their Latin American counterparts, on the other.

Several chapters in this book also highlight the role played by indigenous and European interpreters (called *linguas* in the Hispanophone world and often identified as *linguists* in Anglophone colonial history) in facilitating communication between the Europeans and the native populations during the initial stages of colonization. There is no mystery regarding how the "factors" (Lee, chap. 5, this volume) and *degredados* (Mello, chap. 6, this volume), as well as the mestizos and the *pardos* (Clements, chap. 7; and Pfeiler, chap. 8, this volume) learned the indigenous languages: by immersion within the native populations. We still have to find out more about how the Tupinambá traders and other indigenous go-betweens learned the European languages. Is it enough to invoke the fact that some of these "unsung heroes of colonization" (Mufwene 2008) were taken or kidnapped early to Europe as proofs of the explorers' discoveries (in exchange for the human gauges left behind)? Naro's (1978, 1988) *negros de reino* and *negros ladinos* apply to the African slave populations, not to Native Americans! In any case, it is evident that we do not have to invoke fictional pidginization (beyond the initial attempts by gestures) to account for the initial colonial exchanges between the populations in contact (Chaudenson 2001; Mufwene 2001, 2008, forthcoming).

History makes it evident that the European explorers, traders, and early colonists everywhere relied heavily on interpreters, even in the

Americas (see, e.g., Karttunen 1994; Gray and Fiering 2000; Fayer 2003; and Metcalf 2005, among others). As pointed out by Durston, the subsequent imposition of the metropolitan language as the official language, which eventually indigenized while spreading as the vernacular (given the ensuing advantages in the new world order), was intended to do away with the need for interpreters and to establish direct contact with the indigenous populations, to the extent that the Europeans wanted to involve them as partners in the emergent socioeconomic systems. The question is now a more vexed one; and it is also another matter whether everybody complied, including the Jesuit fathers in Brazil, who were more interested in proselytizing in the languages most familiar to the natives and often denounced the atrocities of the colonial rule.

It is also evident that some major indigenous languages were widely used and spread, especially through the interpreters and the missionaries, during the early stages of colonization. Noteworthy agents of the spread were, according to Denny Moore, “the offspring of marriages to native women [i.e., the mestizos] or children raised by native maids” (pers. comm., Jan. 10, 2013). As noted above, some of those languages have survived to date. An important question suggested especially by Couto, Durston, Lee, and Moore in their chapters is whether these major indigenous languages did not play a role in driving other indigenous languages to extinction. This means that while colonization was the ultimate disruptor of the balance of power in the precolonial linguascapes, the immediate cause of the extinction of indigenous languages was not always the spread of the European languages.

Ball’s and Pfeiler’s chapters also show that the indigenous populations did not all come into (regular) contact with the Europeans at the same time. Geographical or social isolation has protected some of them until recently; and some languages are being endangered now not only because outsiders are penetrating their traditional habitats but also because some who would otherwise be speakers are leaving home for economic opportunities in places where they cannot sustain the use of their heritage languages.²² There are also the questions why the indigenous languages have almost all vanished from the Caribbean islands and why the few that survive are moribund. Other than the atrocities committed by the Spaniards during the early stages of colonization, including mass murders and deportations (Casas 1992a, 1992b), does the current situation also reflect, on the one hand, the additional effect of the ills brought by the European colonists and, on the other, the small size of the territories and of the affected populations? Can the impacts of these ecological factors be sorted out?

There is thus a complex nonlinear and nonuniform history of language

contact and its consequences in Latin America that students of the endangerment of indigenous languages, especially advocates for their revitalization, should better understand. The comparative assessment provided by Michel DeGraff in chapter 11: “The Ecology of Language Evolution in Latin America: A Haitian Postscript toward a Postcolonial Sequel,” is very informative. No remedy can promise success unless the prescribers understand how the epidemic is spreading. I hope the reader will appreciate the wealth of information provided in the following chapters about language evolution in parts of Latin America during both the colonial and the postcolonial periods, and that this volume will function as an invitation for more comparative studies of similar phenomena in other parts of Latin America and other parts of the world.

Notes

I am grateful to Yves Moñino, Denny Moore, Michel DeGraff, and our anonymous reviewers for useful feedback on earlier drafts of this chapter. I assume full responsibility for all the remaining shortcomings.

1. According to Clements (2009), the Lusitanians had just chosen to form a separate kingdom, while the other counties were merged into the Kingdom of Castile and, by the fifteenth century, into the Kingdom of Spain. This merger cum Castilian political expansion proceeded through inter-Crown wars and marriages and through the Reconquista as the northern kingdoms helped free their weaker, southern counterparts from the Moors’ domination. Note, however, that to date Catalan is still considered a separate language from Spanish/Castilian. Like the Basques, the Catalans feel colonized and promote wider usage of their heritage language in official business. It is noteworthy that the spread of Castilian as the official colonial language, concurrently with the emergence of an integrated kingdom by the name of España, may have marked the birth of the *Spanish* language (*español*), since no Iberian language had been identified by this name before.

2. According to Schwartz (1985), these islands are where the Iberians first experimented with sugarcane cultivation, including the institution of plantation slavery. This was different from the domestic slavery in mainland Europe. Places like Brazil, with its far larger expanses of land and a geographic ecology (climate and soil) in the northeast that was more favorable, enabled the Portuguese in particular to develop sugarcane cultivation at an industrial level that became more lucrative.

3. This is a deliberately oversimplified history because our focus is the Americas. Up to the eighteenth century, the Portuguese had an important trade empire around the coast of Africa, on the coast of southern Asia and Southeast Asia, and all the way to China and Japan (Ostler 2005). After England, France, and Holland joined in the colonial venture from the seventeenth century onward, the Portuguese were unable to develop important colonies in South Africa, India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, or Indonesia because of the competition. Portugal maintained its presence only in the small settlements mentioned in the text and the exploitation colonies of Guinea Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique.

4. To be sure, New Spain also included the Philippines, the Mariana Islands, the

Caroline Islands, Taiwan, and parts of the Moluccas, but these territories are peripheral to the discussions in this book. Eakin (2007, 80) includes the Caribbean in the Viceroyalty of New Spain (his map 4), but he also says on page 83 that this constituted one of three “core” regions from which the Spanish Empire in the Americas expanded. It is not clear whether the name New Spain also started the trend for including “New” in the names of colonies, such as New England, New Netherland, and New France, all the way to New Zealand, and names of smaller settlements, such as New York, New Orleans, and New Hebrides. Such names appear to confirm Crosby’s (1986) thesis that the European settlers intended to create “new Europes,” better ones than they were leaving behind.

5. Gullah, spoken in coastal South Carolina and Georgia, appears to be exceptional in being associated with rice cultivation. Its basilect is also considered less divergent from its lexifier, nonstandard English, than those of other English creoles.

6. Convenience has traditionally included in this set not only creoles spoken in the Caribbean Sea (e.g., Haitian, Martiniquais, Jamaican, Bajan, and Papiamentu) but also those in Guyana and Surinam (e.g., Saramaccan and Sranan), which, strictly speaking, are in South America. I follow this tradition here.

7. Guinea Bissau’s creole appears to be related to Kabuverdianu in the same way that Sierra Leone’s Krio is related to Jamaican Creole, although, to be sure, these African mainland varieties are also local evolutions from varieties that had evolved earlier on the islands, corresponding thus to what Chaudenson (1979, 2001) identifies as “second-generation creoles/varieties.”

8. I use *indigenous* in quotation marks here simply to flag and disavow the frequent use of it by linguists as an absolute (rather than a relative) term that applies only to populations and languages outside Europe that are not of European descent. This non-relative usage reflects especially the colonial perspective of Europeans who dispersed outside Europe from the fifteenth century on and encountered other populations they considered inferior. It suggests incorrectly that Europe does not, or did not, have populations and languages indigenous to it. English and the Romance languages are as indigenous to Europe as Afrikaans is to South Africa or as many creoles are to the Caribbean. They are all local formations from other languages that they survived or evolved from. Immigrants to Europe can justifiably refer to native (white) Europeans as indigenous.

9. Yucatán Maya, spoken by about seven hundred thousand people (Lewis 2009, accessed Dec. 24, 2011), can be added to the list. It is also significant that as a group the Mayan languages, spoken by a total of about 6 million speakers (Lewis 2009, Statistical Summaries, accessed Dec. 24, 2011), have all survived in Mesoamerica.

10. The fortunate, if not exceptional, fate of these major languages does not contradict the other fact that several indigenous languages were decimated along with the genocides of their speakers, under the atrocious regime of early Spanish colonization, as decried by, e.g., Casas (1992a, 1992b), especially in the Caribbean, where virtually no indigenous languages remain that are not moribund.

11. According to Shappeck (2011, ii), *Media Lengua* is the outcome not of relexification of Quichua/Quechua by Spanish, as argued earlier by Muysken (1981), but rather of “adlexification [i.e., lexical borrowings], code-mixing, and structural convergence.” It would thus be not an autonomous language with its own separate norm but the result of something similar to “code-switching” phenomena, much discussed

in the linguistics literature over the past thirty years or so. Varieties similar to *Media Lengua* are now attested in rural Ecuador that may be characterized as “Hispanicized Quichua” and are concomitant with the gradual shift to Spanish (Shappeck 2011, iv).

12. Comparative linguists have typically been interested in identifying especially lexical and phonological “correspondences,” or shared forms, between languages. The correspondences enable them to produce cladograms, or taxonomic trees (Stammbaums in linguistics), which show whether the relevant languages are related genetically and, if they are, how. The kinds of genetic ties that obtain vary according to how clades representing the different languages are related, directly or indirectly, on the cladogram. In contrast, the practice of the comparative approach in population studies is more concerned with identifying ecological factors that account for why populations that *appear* to have similar histories and inhabit similar geographical habitats have evolved culturally (including evolution in their economic developments) in different ways. See, e.g., Diamond and Robinson (2010).

13. The fact that a language variety that is spoken primarily by descendants of African slaves diverges from the “mainstream” national or regional variety, spoken primarily by people of European or mixed descent, is not a sufficient condition for stipulating that it is a creole or has emerged by “creolization.” The putative process appears to be social and political, as there is no particular combination of structural features that can be claimed to be uniquely “creole” (Mufwene 1986) or any particular combination of structural processes that can be identified as “creolization” (Mufwene 2000). What, much to the embarrassment of creolistics, has implicitly justified singling out particular “contact languages” as “creoles” (as if there were any modern languages whose evolution has not involved contact) is divergence from the variety/varieties considered “normal” evolutions and the association of their emergence with exogenous/nonnative non-European slaves (around the Atlantic Ocean and in the Indian Ocean) or contract laborers (in the Pacific). See elaborate discussions in Mufwene (2001, 2005, 2008) and DeGraff (2003, 2005).

14. The reader should remember that the term *creole* arose originally (in the late sixteenth century) in reference to people of non-European descent born in Iberian colonies; it was applied to language varieties much later, in the late eighteenth century, in non-Iberian colonies. Creole people, especially those of the homestead phase (i.e., when the relevant colonies had not yet developed plantations and the European and African populations were not yet segregated, either), did not necessarily speak creole language varieties (Chaudenson 1992, 2001).

15. As explained by Lee, “factors” were Crown-appointed local agents whose responsibility was “to negotiate all affairs between the [natives] and the Europeans” and whose “tasks included identifying profitable goods, persuading local headmen to trade, negotiating prices with [native] merchants, and arranging for the delivery of the [goods] to the factory,” their trade posts (chap. 5, this volume). This was apparently not a peculiarity of Brazil, since “factories” were also opened in every location where the Portuguese and other Europeans traded on the coasts of Africa and Asia, before these continents were subjected to exploitation colonization. The factors were typically Europeans who had been stranded in the new territories after surviving shipwrecks and had learned a local language, in this case *Língua Geral*. Along with the interpreters, they eliminated the need for incipient jargons or pidgins during these early contacts of Europeans with non-Europeans, contrary to the literature in creolistics, a point I will elaborate in future work (e.g., Mufwene, forthcoming).

16. I am personally reminded here of my own experience in elementary school in the Bandundu Province of the now Democratic Republic of Congo in the 1950s. The variety of Kikongo that missionaries used for liturgy was called Kikongo-Kisantu (literally ‘sacred Kikongo’). They used it in the headquarters mission they had founded earlier in Kisantu (sacred place) on the Lower Congo River, where varieties of ethnic Kikongo are spoken. It was very different from the vernacular/vehicular Kikongo spoken locally/regionally, which is now identified in the creolistics literature as a creole and by the name (Kikongo-)Kituba (Mufwene 2009b). Kikongo-Kisantu was apparently also concocted by the missionaries themselves, based on a stereotypical canon of Bantu morphosyntax, as they thought that the contact-based Kituba was too bastardized and inadequate for the Bible and liturgy. It is not evident that Kikongo-Kisantu preserved the complex tonal patterns of ethnic Kikongo any more than Kituba did; the European colonizers were generally not particularly good with our tonal systems.

17. This process conjures up Denny Moore’s invocation of the “descending” of Brazilian Native Americans to work away from home. Relocation forced them to adopt the language of the locals, contributing to the demographic attrition of their native vernaculars.

18. Other powerful outsiders or rulers in other circumstances have manipulated local languages in similar ways. For instance, what is usually referred to as Kikongo in central Africa is a construct of convenience for a cluster of related languages spoken in the former Kingdom of Kongo. The same thing happened in southern Africa in the nineteenth century; numerous minor Bantu languages were lumped together as Setswana, Shona, Sotho, and so forth. It seems to be true of the cluster of languages treated indiscriminately by outsiders as Chinese, a confusion well exploited by the Chinese government for national integration.

19. A uniformitarian must wonder to what extent these social practices may shed light on the dynamics of the spread of Vulgar Latin in southwestern Europe. Current and recent histories must also prompt interesting questions about some historical events, regarding which, to be sure, the information (made) available to us is usually incomplete, especially regarding language evolution. We must remember that the shift to Vulgar Latin, and later to the emergent Romance languages, was not necessarily as abrupt or as wholesale as typically suggested in (Romance) historical linguistics, in which gradual changes have typically been telescoped.

20. See Mufwene (2005; 2008, chap. 10) regarding the alleged “decreolization” cum “debasilectalization” of creoles as a form of language death, albeit by transformation, through the adoption of structures of the lexifying language.

21. It would of course be naive to believe that the reasons articulated here for this ethnographic distinction are the only ones (Mufwene 2001, 2008). Linguists who have embraced this line of obviously ethnic/race-based discrimination about language evolution have as much soul-searching to do in the practice of their research as those who reject such ecological considerations out of hand. It is noteworthy that in the by now traditional distinction between “native” and “indigenized” Englishes, the status of the varieties spoken in the former English plantation settlement colonies of the Caribbean is not clear, owing largely to the issue of whether English creoles should be considered new English dialects or separate languages that may not even be Germanic (Mufwene 2009c).

22. Massive relocation to new places where one cannot continue speaking one’s

heritage language accounts for the endangerment of Gullah (mistakenly associated with “decreolization” [Mufwene 1997, 2008]). According to Hazaël-Massieux (1999), this would also account for the endangerment of French creoles in French overseas departments, as those who would be speakers migrate to the French metropole, often identified as the “Hexagone.” However, not being fully integrated in the host, Hexagonal society has often led many of these “migrants” to become more loyal to Créole and speak it more fervently as an identity marker or an in-group variety.

References

- Aboh, Enoch. 2006. The role of the syntax-semantics interface. In *L2 acquisition and creole genesis*, ed. Claire Lefebvre, Lydia White, and Christine Jourdan, 253–275. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- . 2009. Competition and selection: That’s all! In *Complex processes in new languages*, ed. Enoch Aboh and Norval Smith, 317–344. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Allsopp, Richard. 1977. Africanisms in the idioms of Caribbean English. In *Language and linguistics problems in Africa*, ed. Paul F. Kotey and Haig Der-Houssikian, 429–441. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2009. *Contact languages: Ecology and evolution in Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Philip. 1993. Assessing the African contribution to French creoles. In *Africanisms in Afro-American language varieties*, ed. Salikoko S. Mufwene, 123–155. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Casas, Bartolomé de las. 1992a. *In defense of the Indians*. Trans. and ed. Stafford Poole, C.M., from a 1552 Latin manuscript. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- . 1992b. *A short account of the destruction of the Indies*. Trans. and ed. Nigel Griffin. London: Penguin Books.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1979. *Les créoles français*. Paris: Fernand Nathan.
- . 1992. *Des îles, des hommes, des langues: Essais sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- . 2001. *Creolization of language and culture*. London: Routledge.
- . Forthcoming. A água e as línguas. In *Línguas: Contatos e/ou fronteiras*, ed. Pierre Guisan and Thomas Finbow. São Paulo: Editora Parábola.
- Clements, Clancy. 2009. *The linguistic legacy of Spanish and Portuguese: Colonial expansion and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corne, Chris. 1999. *From French to Creole: The development of new vernaculars in the French colonial world*. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Crosby, Alfred W. 1986. *Ecological imperialism: The biological expansion of Europe, 900–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1992. Ills. In *Atlantic American societies: From Columbus through abolition 1492–1888*, ed. Alan L. Karras and John Robert McNeill, 19–39. London: Routledge.
- DeGraff, Michel. 2001. On the origin of creoles: A Cartesian critique of neo-Darwinian linguistics. *Linguistic Typology* 5:213–310.
- . 2003. Against creole exceptionalism. Discussion note. *Language* 79:391–410.
- . 2005. Linguists’ most dangerous myth: The fallacy of creole exceptionalism. *Language in Society* 34:533–591.
- . 2009. Language acquisition in creolization and, thus, language change: Some

- Cartesian-uniformitarian boundary conditions. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3–4:888–971, www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/122464861/abstract.
- Diamond, Jared, and James A. Robinson, eds. 2010. *Natural experiments of history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Eakin, Marshall C. 2007. *The history of Latin America: Collision of cultures*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Escobar, Anna María. 2012. Spanish in contact with Amerindian languages. In *The handbook of Spanish linguistics*, ed. J. I. Hualde, I. Olarrea, and E. O'Rourke, 65–88. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Farriss, Nancy M. 1984. *Maya society under colonial rule*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fayer, Joan. 2003. African interpreters in the Atlantic slave trade. *Anthropological Linguistics* 45:281–295.
- Florin, José Luiz, and Margarida Petter, eds. 2008. *Africa no Brasil: A formação vo da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo: Editora Contexto.
- Freire, José Bessa. 2004. *Rio Babel—a história das línguas na Amazônia*. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ.
- Gabbert, Wolfgang. 2004. *Becoming Maya: Ethnicity and social inequality in Yucatán since 1500*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Galves, Charlotte, Helder Garmes, and Fernando Rosa Ribeiro, eds. 2009. *Africa-Brasil: Caminhos da língua portuguesa*. Campinas, Brazil: Editora da Unicamp.
- Gilman, Charles. 1986. African areal characteristics: Sprachbund, not substrate? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 1:33–50.
- Gray, Edward G., and Norman Fiering, eds. 2000. *The language encounter in the Americas, 1492–1800*. New York: Bergham Books.
- Hazaël-Massieux, Marie-Christine. 1999. *Les créoles: L'indispensable survie*. Paris: Editions Ententes.
- Itier, César. 2000. Lengua general y quechua cuzqueño en los siglos XVI y XVII. In *Desde afuera y desde adentro: Ensayos de etnografía e historia del Cuzco y Apurímac*, ed. Luis Millones, Hiroyasu Tomoeda, and Tatsuhiko Fujii, 47–59. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- . 2001. La propagation de la langue générale dans le sud du Pérou. In *Le savoir, pouvoir des élites dans l'empire espagnol d'Amérique*, 63–74. Centre de Recherche sur l'Amérique Espagnole Coloniale, Travaux et Documents, no. 3. Paris: Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III.
- Karttunen, Frances. 1994. *Between worlds: Interpreters, guides, and survivors*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Landa, Manuel de. 2000. *A thousand years of nonlinear history*. New York: Swerve Editions.
- Lewis, M. Paul, ed. 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 16th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International. Online version, www.ethnologue.com/.
- Lima, Ivana Stolze, and Laura do Carmo, eds. 2008. *Historia social da língua nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Casa de Rui Barbosa.
- Lipski, John. 1994. *Latin American Spanish*. London: Longman.
- Mal-Molinero, Clare. 2000. *The politics of language in the Spanish-speaking world*. London: Routledge.
- McWhorter, John H. 1998. Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class. *Language* 74:788–818.

- Metcalfe, Alida C. 2005. *Go-betweens and the colonization of Brazil*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Moñino, Yves. 2007. Les rôles du substrat dans les créoles et dans les langues secrètes: Le cas du palenquero, créole espagnol de Colombie. In *Grammaires créoles et grammairie comparative*, ed. K. Gadelii and A. Zribi-Hertz, 49–72. Saint-Denis, France: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1986. Les langues créoles peuvent-elles être définies sans allusion à leur histoire? *Etudes Créoles* 9:135–150.
- . 1990. Transfer and the substrate hypothesis in creolistics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12:1–23.
- . 1996. The founder principle in creole genesis. *Diachronica* 13:83–134.
- . 1997. The ecology of Gullah's survival. *American Speech* 72:69–83.
- . 2000. Creolization is a social, not a structural, process. In *Degrees of restructuring in creole languages*, ed. Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh and Edgar Schneider, 65–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2005. *Créoles, écologie sociale, évolution linguistique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- . 2006. "New-dialect formation" is as gradual as "creole-development": A response to *New-dialect formation: The inevitability of colonial Englishes*, by Peter Trudgill. *World Englishes* 25:177–186.
- . 2008. *Language evolution: Contact, competition, and change*. London: Continuum Press.
- . 2009a. The indigenization of English in North America. In *World Englishes: Problems, properties, prospects: Selected papers from the 13th IAWC Conference*, ed. Thomas Hoffmann and Lucia Siebers, 353–368. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- . 2009b. Kituba, Kileta, or Kikongo: What's in a name? In *Le nom des langues III: Le nom des langues en Afrique sub-saharienne: Pratiques dénominations, catégorisations*, ed. Carole de Féral, 211–222. Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium: Peeters, BCILL 124.
- . 2009c. Some offspring of colonial English are creole. In *Vernacular universals vs. contact-induced language change*, ed. Juhani Klemola, Markku Filppula, and Heli Paulasto, 280–303. London: Routledge.
- . forthcoming. Globalisation économique mondiale des XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles, émergence des créoles, et vitalité langagière. In *Proceedings of the colloquium of the Comité International des Etudes Créoles, Mauritius 2012*, ed. Arnaud Carpooran.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 2003. *Language of environment, environment of language: A course in ecolinguistics*. London: Battlebridge.
- Muysken, Peter. 1981. Halfway between Quichua and Spanish: The case for relexification. In *Historicity and variation in creole studies*, ed. Arnold Highfield and Albert Valdman, 52–78. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Naro, Anthony Julius. 1978. A study on the origins of pidginization. *Language* 54: 314–47.
- . 1988. A reply to "Pidgin origins reconsidered," by Morris Goodman. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 3:95–102.
- Naro, Anthony Julius, and Maria Marta Pereira Scherre. 2007. *Origens do português brasileiro*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.
- Negrão, Esmeralda, and Evani Viotti. 2011. Epistemological aspects of the study of the participation of African languages in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Portugais et*

- langues africaines: Etudes afro-brésiliennes*, ed. M. Petter and M. Vanhove. Paris: Karthala.
- . 2012. Em busca de uma história linguística. *Revista Estudos da Linguagem* 20:309–342.
- Nettle, Daniel, and Suzanne Romaine. 2000. *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ostler, Nicholas. 2005. *Empires of the word: A language history of the world*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Quijano, Aníbal. 2007. Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies* 21, nos. 2–3: 168–178.
- Quijano, Aníbal, and Michael Ennis. 2000. Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Views from South* 1:533–580.
- Roncardi, Claudia, and Jussara Abraçardo, eds. 2008. *Português brasileiro*. Vol. 2, *Contacto linguístico, heterogenidade e história*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Editora da Universidade Federal Fluminense.
- Schwartz, Stuart B. 1985. *Sugar plantations in the formation of Brazilian society: Bahia, 1550–1835*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwegler, Armin. 2006. *Bozal Spanish: Captivating new evidence from a contemporary source (Afro-Cuban “Palo Monte”)*. In *Studies in contact linguistics: Essays in honor of Glenn G. Gilbert*, ed. Linda L. Thornburg and Janet Fuller, 71–101. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shappeck, Marco. 2011. *Quichua-Spanish language contact in Salcedo, Ecuador: Revisiting Media Lengua syncretic language practices*. PhD diss., University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education—or world-wide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2004. *New-dialect formation: The inevitability of colonial Englishes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.