John Benjamins Publishing Company

The African diaspora in Latin America

Linguistic contact and consequences

Gregory R. Guy

Some 60% of the Atlantic slave traffic was directed to Luso-Hispanic America, principally Brazil, Cuba, Hispaniola, Colombia, etc., where people of African ancestry still form substantial majorities in some areas. This paper examines the linguistic consequences of this massive contact between Africans and Europeans. In colonial times, non-native and pidgin/creole varieties clearly existed in Latin America (cf. Palenquero, Papiamentu, Cuban *habla bozal*). In contemporary Latin America, people of African ancestry tend to be the defining speakers of nonstandard varieties whose linguistic characteristics are best explained in terms of a history of contact and/or creolization. Overall, popular Latin American Spanish and Portuguese appear to have been significantly influenced by Afro-European language contact.

Keywords: Caribbean Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, African languages, creolization, coda consonant deletion, number agreement

1. Introduction

An often overlooked fact about the Atlantic slave trade was that a substantial majority of this traffic in human misery was directed to what is now referred to as Latin America – i.e., the Portuguese and Spanish colonial empires and their successor independent states. Brazil was the demographic capital of the slave trade, receiving approximately 40% of all the Africans brought to the Americas. Hispanic America took another 20%, mostly directed to the circum-Caribbean regions: Hispaniola – the modern Dominican Republic (DR), Cuba, Puerto Rico, Venezuela, coastal Colombia, and Panama (Curtin 1972). (Smaller numbers were also taken to Argentina and the Pacific coastal areas). People of African ancestry continue to form a substantial part of the contemporary population of these regions. The sociolinguistic situation in Luso-Hispanic America during the centuries of the slave trade was therefore comparable to that which obtained in other places that relied on enslaved laborers: massive multilingual contact, in the course of which millions of

adults were forced to communicate in some version of the language of the dominant group despite minimal contact with native speakers of that language.

These are the same conditions that prevailed elsewhere in Africa and the Americas during the slave trade, with massive linguistic consequences, specifically the emergence of creole languages. The other major colonial powers involved in slavery were England and France, and most of the extant creole languages in the Americas are English or French based: Haitian, Jamaican, Guyanese, etc. in the Caribbean, and Louisiana Creole and Gullah in North America. By comparison, the number of recognized creoles in the countries colonized by Spain and Portugal is very small, perhaps only two: Palenquero and Papiamentu. Such a contrast between the Anglo-French colonies on the one hand, and the Luso-Hispanic territories on the other, raises some obvious questions. What were the linguistic consequences of African slavery in Luso-Hispanic America? Why are there so few recognized creoles in the Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries of the Americas? What explains the different outcomes? If the outcome there was not the emergence of creoles, what was the effect of this language contact on a massive scale? How should the varieties spoken by the contemporary Latin American populations of African descent be characterized?

A number of approaches to answering these questions have been advanced in the literature including: (1) contact with African languages had little discernible effect on Latin American Spanish and Portuguese for various reasons; (2) it had some effects which were not equivalent to creolization; (3) creolization occurred but was subsequently overridden or eroded by subsequent events – i.e., some form of 'decreolization' occurred, or the creole speakers were swamped by later waves of migration involving different kinds of language acquisition.

Each of these approaches requires some causative explanation. Explaining the absence of creolization (positions 1 and 2) requires attention to the early conditions of contact: the demographic balance between Europeans and Africans, the sociolinguistic relations between masters and slaves, the presence of freedmen, the specific circumstances of language contact and acquisition, etc. The decreolization position (3) appeals to later, post-contact conditions: the longer duration of slavery in Luso-Hispanic America, levels of integration and intermarriage, the social status of mixed-race individuals, increases in the white population though later European immigration, etc. But all of these approaches face fundamental questions. If (1) there was no creolization, why not? If (2) something other than creolization occurred, what was it? If (3) creoles did emerge, why aren't they still around? And whatever happened, why did it happen in Latin America and not Anglo-French America?

These questions all deal with language change, and as in all diachronic matters, any historical evidence is desirable, and often decisive. But historical documentation of the spoken language of low-status speakers is rare. Consequently, the best evidence available is found in the languages spoken today by descendants of

the communities of interest. We have unlimited access to these varieties, and can look for linguistic phenomena that illuminate our historical questions. This paper surveys certain linguistic characteristics of Spanish and Portuguese spoken in the relevant areas of the Americas (Brazil and the Hispanic Caribbean), in light of the several approaches outlined above. I will argue that the linguistic processes in Luso-Hispanic America were not so different from the Anglo-French colonies, and that contact-induced changes in the Portuguese and Spanish spoken by Africans and their descendants did indeed occur, perhaps assuming the dimensions that we postulate for creolization. I propose a historical course for such varieties that addresses the apparent disparity in the distribution of creole languages in the Americas.

2.   The historical presence of creoles in Latin America

The clearest evidence for the emergence of creole languages in Latin America is found in the maroon communities that were so widespread in Brazil, Colombia, and elsewhere. One such community which managed to maintain its autonomy from colonial authorities for centuries is San Basílio in Colombia, where a creole language survives, known as Palenquero, or simply Lengua in the community itself (de Friedemann & Patiño 1983; Schwegler 2002, 2011; Morton 2005). But San Basílio was only one of many palenques established in Colombia. Most of these probably also spoke creoles, but they were all reconquered by the Spanish and their populations re-enslaved. In Brazil, historical records attest to numerous quilombos, communities of Africans who had escaped from slavery. Among these was the most successful African community in the Americas, Palmares, which constituted a virtual state in the interior of Northeastern Brazil and defied Portuguese attempts to reconquer it for almost a century.

Contemporary Afro-Brazilian communities of slave descendants have been identified throughout Brazil; some of these may have originated as quilombos, others were established by freedmen or ex-slaves, and some are the remnants of slave-based colonial enterprises that were abandoned by white owners when they became uneconomical. Lucchesi, Baxter and Ribeiro (2009) present detailed discussion of several such Afro-Brazilian communities in Bahia; they demonstrate that all these communities show substantial divergence from standard Brazilian Portuguese, indicating a history of irregular language transmission under conditions of multilingual language contact.

Given the evidence of Palenquero, it is very likely that most maroon communities spoke Portuguese- or Spanish-lexifier creoles in colonial times. Furthermore, the pidgins or creoles spoken in these communities likely reflected the usage of the enslaved populations who remained under colonial rule, among whom are the ancestors of the Latin Americans of African descent today. Historical evidence about

the speech of such populations is scant in most locations, but some data survives on *bozal* Spanish in Cuba – the variety of the African-born. This first generation of Afro-Cubans clearly spoke a contact variety, with many of the characteristics discussed in the next section. One Cuban observer from the 1840s, Esteban Pichardo, describes *bozal* speech as lacking agreement and number marking, and showing loss of final consonants. Another early 19th century observer, José de la Luz (cited by Clements 2009), mentions negative repetition as a regular feature of black speech, e.g., *no va a salir no*; this structure occurs in contemporary Caribbean Spanish (CS), and is widespread in Brazilian Portuguese (BP). But scholarly opinion is divided on whether *bozal* speech was associated with the emergence of a stable creole in second and later generations of Afro-Cubans. Scholars such as Otheguy (1973) and de Granda (1978) argue that such a creole existed and was subsequently decreolized, giving modern popular usage. Others, such as McWhorter (2000), deny the existence of any stable Afro-Hispanic creole.

Other historical evidence also indicates an early presence of creole languages in Latin America. Most of the slave trade to Brazil was conducted by the Portuguese themselves, and later by Brazilians. Portugal established colonies and trading stations in Africa which were the source of most of the people taken to Brazil as slaves. In Africa, this trade left behind several Portuguese-lexifier creoles: in Guiné-Bissau, Cabo Verde, São Tomé, Príncipe, Annobon. This implies that the Africans who passed through these slaving stations en route to the Americas must have had contact with pidgin/creole speakers before embarkation. Historical records further indicate that slaves were sometimes taken to the Americas after living, working, and presumably acquiring a creole for some time in these locations. For example, São Tomé had a major sugar industry, relying on slave labor, from the 15th to the 17th centuries. This industry went into decline as Brazilian sugar production increased, with the result that many of the São Tomense planters transferred their operations, and their slaves, to Brazil. It is therefore clear that creole influences and creole speakers were included in the sociolinguistic inputs to Brazil, the largest slave-based economy in the Americas.

Slave trading to Hispanic America, however, was a more varied operation, rarely conducted by the Spanish. Hence the linguistic experiences of individuals who passed through the trading pipeline before their arrival in Cuba, Hispaniola, Venezuela, etc. would have been varied, and would likely have included little contact with Spanish or Spanish-based creoles, although a significant number who were transported by Dutch, Portuguese, or Brazilian traders, would have had contact with Portuguese-based creoles.[1]

---

1.   The lack of Spanish slaving ports in Africa is the basis of McWhorter's (2000) explanation for the absence of Spanish-based creoles.

Another relevant historical curiosity is the case of Papiamentu, the creole spoken in the Dutch colonies Aruba, Curaçao, and Bonaire (Jacobs 2012). The lexifier language of Papiamentu is sometimes credited as Spanish, but the weight of historical and linguistic evidence favors Portuguese as the principle source. The early history of the ABC islands was complex, but the foundation of the modern population dates from the establishment of definitive Dutch control in 1634. The Dutch presence was accompanied by a significant infusion of Portuguese speakers, especially Sephardic Jews exiled from Portugal and Spain by the Inquisition. Many of these came by way of Brazil, which the Dutch occupied during the first half of the 17th century in the course of a war with Spain, then in control of Portugal and its colonies. The Dutch rulers of northeastern Brazil gave refuge to the Jews; when Portugal re-established control of the region in 1654 and expelled the Dutch, the Jewish population was doubly endangered by virtue of both their religion and their support of the Dutch intrusion. Consequently most of them left Brazil with the Dutch, and resettled in the ABC islands, which the Dutch promptly established as the center of their slave trade to the Americas. It is likely that Brazilian slaves accompanied this relocation, because the peace agreement between Portugal and the Netherlands permitted departing settlers to take their property with them and indemnified them for losses. Other Portuguese inputs to the early ABC population occurred with the arrival of other settlers and slaves from Cabo Verde and Guiné, where Portuguese-based creoles are still spoken. Hence, Papiamentu was founded on a Portuguese-lexifier creole, but subsequent contact with Portuguese was virtually nil, while contact with Spanish was substantial.

The history of Spanish and Portuguese America therefore makes it clear that creole languages were present in these areas since the earliest arrivals of Africans, including creoles transplanted from slaving stations in Africa, and others that emerged locally. The principle European language involved in the formation of these creoles was Portuguese.

3. The contemporary situation: Vernacular varieties of Spanish and Portuguese

Throughout Luso-Hispanic America there are many speakers of African descent, especially in the areas referenced above: Brazil and the Hispanic Caribbean. While the social construction of race in Latin America is not the same as in the United States (e.g., the status of mixed-race individuals), it is still the case that the social elites in these countries are mostly white, while people of African ancestry are highly over-represented among the poor and working classes. Furthermore, these countries mostly show very pronounced income disparities between rich and poor;

indeed, Latin America collectively is the worst region in the world for income inequality (Tsounta & Osueke 2014).

Accompanying this marked social (and racial) stratification are significant linguistic differences. The contrasts between standard and popular varieties of Brazilian Portuguese, of Panamanian and Puerto Rican Spanish, etc. are substantial and salient. These differences permeate the linguistic system – including phonology, morphosyntax, and lexicon. Among the most notable – and stigmatized – features, are a series of consonant reduction processes affecting syllable codas and final consonants, variable number agreement across the NP, and variable number agreement between subject and verb. The latter process is accompanied by reduction of person/number contrasts in verbal paradigms, and increased expression of overt subject pronouns. What is striking about these phenomena is that the processes are extremely similar in both Spanish and Portuguese, affecting the same linguistic features or structures, and typically showing the same constraints on occurrence. In this Section I present examples of these parallels.

4.   Phonological reductions

The inventory of permissible coda consonants is limited in both Spanish and Portuguese. In Spanish, all coronal consonants can occur syllable or word-finally:

/-s/ *estamos, las casas*
/-d/ *ciudad, usted*
/-n/ *bien, hablan, nación*
/-l/ *mal, papel*
/-r/ *mar, sentir, mujer*

In Brazilian Portuguese the inventory is smaller, consisting mainly of /-s/ (variably realized as /s, z, ʃ, ʒ/ depending on context and dialect) and /-r/:

/-s/ *estamos, as casas*
/-r/ *mar, sentir, mulher*

The other coronal consonants of Portuguese do not occur in coda position: /d/ takes an epenthetic vowel (*cidade*) or is absent (*mercê*), while historical final /n/ is realized as nasalization of the preceding vowel (*bem, falam, nação*; orthographic final -m indicates preceding vowel nasality.) Final /l/ is vocalized to /w/ in most varieties of Brazilian Portuguese, thus: *mal* [maw] *fuzil* [fuziw].

In popular varieties of Brazilian Portuguese and Caribbean Spanish all coda consonants are subject to various reductive processes, notably including deletion.[2] The coda /-s/ case is the most-studied, and functions as a sociolinguistic marker: it is popularly described in the Caribbean as 'eating the esses' (*comerse los esse'*). When /-s/ is not deleted in CS, it is often realized as a lenited or aspirated form, with a lax posterior lingual or glottal constriction [x, h]. BP mostly shows deletion, but aspiration is found, especially before nasals or /l/ (*mehmo*).

Numerous quantitative studies of popular varieties of CS and BP demonstrate high rates of /-s/ lenition and deletion. In Panama Cedergren (1973) found 59% deletion overall, rising to 68% in the lowest socioeconomic class; Alba's (1990) study of Dominican Spanish reported 71% deletion among male speakers and 51% deletion among females. In Brazil, Guy (1981) found a deletion rate of 53% of un-stressed non-inflectional -s among illiterate lower class speakers in Rio de Janeiro (RJ). All such studies report substantial differences in deletion rates and constraints between roots and suffixes (*menos* vs. *casas*). This is treated below in terms of mor-phosyntactic variation.

Coda /r/ is similarly deleted at high rates in popular dialects of CS and BP. Oushiro and Mendes (2013) report 55% -r deletion in São Paulo, and Alba reports 68% deletion among low-income speakers in the DR. Deletion of -r is socially stratified; higher status speakers delete less. Alba finds 22% deletion for middle-income speakers, vs. 9% for the highest-income. In both languages -r deletion is more common in verbal infinitives, where -r is an affix (*estar, comer, sentir*). Alba finds -r deleted in 48% of infinitives vs. 32% of other words. Oushiro & Mendes state that in their corpus -r deletion is found "principally in occurrences of the infinitive morpheme" (2013: 74). Similar results are reported by, inter alia, Cedergren (1973), Poplack (1979), de Oliveira (1983), Callou, Moraes & Leite (1996). Infinitival -r also shows different constraints, indicating weaker phonological effects; Alba finds that the inhibitory effect of a following vowel is nearly absent in verbal infinitives (see Table 1). Such results lead de Oliveira to conclude that -r absence in infinitives does not represent phonological deletion, but rather, morpholexical variation showing some parallels to the variable agreement cases discussed below.

---

2.   In this discussion I focus on circum-Caribbean varieties of Spanish, particularly Cuba, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Panama, and coastal regions of Venezuela and Colombia. Several of the features discussed are also encountered elsewhere in Hispanic America, particularly in some areas of the Pacific coast of South America, and in Argentina-Uruguay. For the most part, this distribution reflects the historical geography of slavery – the areas where Africans were present in significant numbers. But by far the largest concentrations of African slave labor in the Spanish Empire were in the Caribbean. The features in question are notably absent in territories where the Spaniards relied on indigenous labor and Africans were rare, e.g., Mexico and the Andean regions.

Table 1. Deletion of final -r in Dominican Spanish (after Alba 1990: 189, 201)

Following segment	Non-morphemic -r	Infinitival -r
stop	55%	48%
nasal	32%	50%
vowel	8%	40%

Final /-n/ is also deleted in CS, although less frequently than -s and -r; Hoffman (2010) reports a deletion rate of 10% in Salvadoran Spanish. In BP, the phonological parallel is denasalization of final nasal vowels: e.g., *ontem, vagem* pronounced as [õtʃî, vaʒi]. Guy (1981) reports a denasalization rate of 67% in RJ. In both languages, nasal reduction interacts with morphological marking, since an -n suffix in Spanish and final vowel nasalization in Portuguese are plural markers in third person verbs (*habla/fala* 3sg – *hablan/falam* 3pl). This issue is addressed below.

5.   Morphosyntactic variation

The popular varieties of CS and BP systematically diverge from their standard counterparts and historical European sources in the direction of absent or reduced inflection. Two prominent cases are variable absence of plural agreement in the nominal and the verbal systems. Other examples are: replacement of the inflected future by periphrastic or simple present forms, reduced usage of subjunctive and imperative forms, near complete abandonment of 2pl verb forms, and in much of Brazil, disuse of 2sg verb forms as well. BP has also lost the inflected infinitive (e.g., *podermos*) and mesoclisis (*dar-te-ia*). Another divergence is the reduplicated negative. Several processes are synchronically variable, and these all exhibit constraint patterns that provide important evidence bearing on the issue of language contact.

5.1   Nominal agreement

Variable nominal number agreement has been extensively investigated in CS and BP for four decades; among the earliest studies were Cedergren (1973) and Poplack (1979, 1980) for CS, and Guy (1981), Scherre (1978, 1988) for BP. The consistent result in both languages is frequent absence of plural markers in multi-word NPs. Various kinds of evidence (e.g., absent markers in irregular forms) demonstrate that this is a variable syntactic process: number agreement does not systematically extend across the NP in popular varieties, in contrast to the obligatory agreement of standard varieties. The most striking and regular constraint on this process in both languages is word position in the NP. All studies find that the first word in

the NP (or in certain complex NPs, the word immediately preceding the head) is almost categorically plural-marked, whereas subsequent words are increasingly unlikely to show a plural marker. This pattern references syntactic position, rather than word class: any word class falling in initial position bears a plural marker, as in these Portuguese examples:

initial article: *os amigo* (the-pl friend-ø)
initial adjective: *bons amigo* (good-pl friend-ø)
initial quantifier: *muitos amigo* (many-pl friend-ø)
initial demonstrative: *aqueles amigo* (those-pl friend-ø)
initial noun: *amigos rico* (friends rich-ø)

This pattern of plural marker presence in first-position vs. absence in later positions is found in both BP and CS, but the difference is smaller in Spanish. Terrell's (1979) figures for Cuban Spanish are as follows:

Table 2. Plural marking by syntactic position in Cuban Spanish (after Terrell 1979)

Position/word class	% plural marked
first – modifiers	97
first – nouns	81
non-initial – nouns	61
post-nominal – adjectives	60

By comparison, popular varieties of BP have a more precipitous decline in marking from first to subsequent positions. Naro and Scherre (2003a) report rates of 90–97% marking in first position, dropping to 43% in post-head position. In a corpus of illiterate speakers from RJ, Guy (1981) found these results:

Table 3. Plural marking by position in RJ Portuguese (from Guy 1981)

Position in NP	N	% plural-marked
first	5247	95
second	3947	28
third	552	21

Even more polarized results are found in isolated Afro-Brazilian communities, as in Baxter's (2009) study of Helvécia in Bahia. He finds 98% plural marking in first/pre-head position vs. only 9% in second position. Such data suggest that in some precursor of the contemporary popular varieties of Brazilian Portuguese, nominal plural marking was confined to phrase-initial words, with no 'agreement' in subsequent words.

Such a plural marking pattern must be regarded as highly unusual for an Indo-European language. Related languages have lost nominal plural agreement in their recorded history: e.g., English and in some respects, French. But the retained plural markers in these languages are tied to specific word classes: nouns and some demonstratives in English, articles in French. By comparison, the pattern of retaining nearly obligatory marking in a particular syntactic position while lacking it elsewhere is unique. The simultaneous appearance of this highly novel construction in BP and CS, and nowhere else in Euro-America, is a remarkable development; we will argue that it is more plausibly explained by contact with African languages than by spontaneous simultaneous innovations in Latin America.

5.2   Verbal agreement

Verbal number agreement has been much studied in Brazilian Portuguese, beginning with Naro and Lemle (1976), Naro (1981), Guy (1981). These studies reveal another unusual set of constraints. The most systematic is what Naro and Lemle labeled the 'saliency' constraint: plural marking is highest in verb forms that have the greatest difference between singular and plural, such as preterites – *falou* (sg) / *falaram* (pl) – and irregular forms like *é/são*, *vai/vão*. Unsalient contrasts, as in *fala/falam*, are much less likely to show plural marking. Hence one finds many utterances like *eles fala* but few like *eles falou*. Table 4 shows figures from Guy (1981:260).

Table 4. Verbal plural marking in RJ Portuguese, by saliency class

	Category	N	% Plural marked
1	*comem-comem, fale-falem,* etc.	894	14
2	*fala-falam, ia-iam,* etc.	3161	26
3	*faz-fazem, quer-querem,* etc.	481	30
4	*dá-dão, está-estão,* etc.	1112	63
5	*sumiu-sumiram, foi-foram,* etc.	476	66
6	*falou-falaram, fez-fizeram, é-são, etc.*	1776	76

Notable here is the great range of plural marking rates. Minimally differentiated forms have a trivial 14%, while every increment in salience of the singular-plural distinction brings an increase in plural marking, reaching 76% in maximally distinctive forms.

A second prominent constraint is the relative position of subject and verb. Subjects in canonical pre-verbal position favor verbal marking, while post-verbal subjects strongly disfavor. The conjunction of this positional effect with the saliency

constraint presents a striking challenge for explanation. Both lack significant parallels in related languages that have lost verbal number marking. Neither is functionally motivated – in fact, both are counter-functional, in that plural marking tends to be located exactly where it is most redundant, and omitted where it would be most useful for disambiguation.

In CS, verbal non-agreement is less common than in BP, but the available evidence shows constraint effects similar to Portuguese. Poplack's data (1979, 1980) on Puerto Rican Spanish shows such parallels, albeit at a much lower level of non-agreement. She discusses the issue in terms of "-n deletion", but her data strongly imply a syntactic process. Tokens of omitted -n that are *not* plural markers are extremely rare in her data: just 1% of cases. But the 3pl suffix -n is absent in 9% of words like *hablan* 'they speak'. Furthermore, her omitted -n cases show no significant phonological constraints, but are constrained by saliency and subject position. Her "irregular" verbs, comprising all verbs with plural inflections more distinctive than the -n suffix, are much more likely to bear plural marking than regular 3pl forms. Similarly, pre-verbal subjects favor agreement, while post-verbal ones disfavor. So again we encounter parallel patterns in BP and CS that are unusual, innovative, and unlike developments in related languages.

5.3   Negative repetition

One widely-recognized morphosyntactic feature of CS and BP is reduplicated or repeated negation, a distinctive pattern in which the usual preverbal negator is repeated again at the end of the clause. Bullock and Toribio (2009) provide Dominican examples:

> Para acá **no** ha llovido nada **no**.
> Los haitianos **no** hablan como nosotros **no**.

Some Portuguese examples from Cavalcante (2009) are:

> **Não** gosta de ir em festa **não**.
> Eu **não** sei do quê que ele tá trabalhando lá **não**.

In Brazil this reduplicated negation is widespread and common (22% of all negative constructions in Reimann and Yacovenco 2011, 30% in Cavalcante 2009). In Hispanic America it is found in the Caribbean and sporadically elsewhere. Parallel structures are notably evident in Spanish- and Portuguese-based creoles, such as Palenquero and São Tomense (Ferraz 1979; Schwegler 1991; Hagemeijer 2008), and in *bozal* Spanish in Cuba and elsewhere. For Palenquero and São Tomense, Schwegler and Ferraz argue for a West African substrate as the source of this

construction, as it is found throughout a number of languages from Southwest Africa to the Congo, including those spoken by many of the people taken to the Americas by the slave trade.

6.   The problem of explanation

An adequate account of the history of Spanish and Portuguese in the Americas should explain the contemporary sociolinguistic facts in Brazil and the Caribbean sketched above. Socially we must account for the observed social stratification and its strong correlation with race, and for the geographic distribution of the varieties in question. Linguistically, the questions are: Why these specific features and where did they come from? Why do they appear at these times, and why are they so similar in CS and BP?

The explanations that have been proposed for these facts fall into three clusters which attribute them to three different sources: (1) European roots; (2) spontaneous innovation; (3) language contact and associated processes of adult acquisition, transference and imposition, and perhaps creolization. Let us consider the adequacy of each in turn.

6.1   European sources for popular American varieties

Several linguistic traditions seek to explain linguistic traits of colonial or frontier communities in terms of their homeland sources (cf. Trudgill 2004). Thus American Spanish *seseo* (/θ/ > /s/) is commonly attributed to the early prominence of Andalusian speakers, and the *chiado* (-s palatalization) of Florianópolis Portuguese is reliably attributed to Azorean settlers. Regarding the features discussed above, Andalusian sources have been proposed for -s lenition in CS, but the parallel phenomena in BP mostly lack peninsular sources. Peninsular explanations for the phonology of CS and BP are also inconsistent with the dialect geography. There was no population movement from Iberia to America that explains why these phenomena are found where they are, and not elsewhere, and mainly among poor black speakers rather than affluent whites.

For the unusual morphosyntactic traits of BP and CS, peninsular sources are almost impossible to find. Negative repetition is rare in Iberia and robust absence of plural markers occurs nowhere in Spain or Portugal. The constraint effects seen above – initial word marking in nominal plurals, saliency and subject position constraints in verbal plurals – are likewise unattested in Spain. The only serious proposal of a European source for these phenomena is the work of Naro and

Scherre (1993, 2000) on peninsular Portuguese. These scholars report having ob-served non-agreeing forms in Portugal, although they concede that such forms are "statistically rare" (2000: 241) and that the Portuguese linguists they consulted all denied such forms existed. Nevertheless they looked for non-agreement in pre-17th century written texts, and found 235 cases of singular verbs with plural subjects, representing less than 1% of relevant sentences. To investigate constraint effects, they constructed a sample in which the rate of non-agreement was multiplied by a factor of approximately 40 (by including only a few agreeing forms). This yielded saliency and subject position effects similar to those in contemporary BP. On this basis they argue there was an incipient change in preclassical Portuguese that was "accelerated and exaggerated" in Brazil under "conditions of endemic pidginization and adult second language acquisition.

However, this procedure is statistically invalid; in a full data set including all agreeing forms, the effects they report would be utterly insignificant, with p values approaching 1 – not even slightly different from random. Hence it is highly unlikely they could be noticed and acquired by learners, much less "exaggerated". Decisive quantitative evidence on this point is presented by Vieira and Bazenga (2015). They find agreement rates of 99% in two European Portuguese (EP) corpora, vs. 88% and 78% in two Brazilian samples. The Brazilian data showed the saliency constraint, but for EP, neither their data nor any other published study showed a saliency effect. They conclude that in EP agreement is effectively categorical, and that the data "do not sustain the proposition that there was, in the development of Brazilian Portuguese, the expansion of European structures" (2015: 74).[3] Thus we will argue that the BP pattern more likely arises from the very processes of 'pidginization and adult second language acquisition' that Naro and Scherre allude to, rather than from non-existent peninsular models.

The fatal flaw for any account that seeks European sources for the phenomena considered here is that no single European source explains the extensive parallels between CS and BP. Throughout history, the Spanish and Portuguese empires were entirely separate and frequently hostile operations, with little cross-settlement or linguistic contact. Hence if separate settler streams from Spain and Portugal im-planted separate languages in separate territories, any idiosyncrasies shared be-tween American varieties of the languages must have a non-peninsular source. We turn, then to other explanations.

---

3.   My translation: "*Os dados… não apresentam evidências que sustentem a proposta de que teria havido, na constituição do PB, a expansão das estruturas europeias.*"

6.2   Spontaneous innovation

European languages in the Americas are not mere mixtures of European dialects; like all languages at all times, they have undergone internal change. Examples of contemporary change in New World Spanish and Portuguese include devoicing of /ʒ/ to /ʃ/ in Argentine Spanish, and diphthongization of /ē/ to /ēj/ in Paulista Portuguese. Might the phenomena we are considering have emerged as spontaneous innovations in the Americas?

Such an account runs afoul of the same problem as an explanation in terms of Peninsular sources: how to explain the parallels between CS and BP. Certainly the same change can occur independently in different languages. But it is a basic principle of dialectology and historical linguistics that shared characteristics are more often due to a single common source than to multiple independent innovation, especially when they are complex or marked. In our case, the phonological characteristics – deletion of coda /r, s/ – are not unusual, but their co-occurrence is notable, and some of their contextual conditioning is marked, especially preferential absence in inflectional suffixes. In morphosyntax, negative repetition is uncommon, and the unusual constraints on variable agreement in nominal and verbal systems must be considered marked phenomena. As we have noted, first position plural marking in the NP independent of word class has no comparable constructions in any related languages, and the saliency constraint on verbal plural marking illustrated in Table 5 is also highly unusual. Morphosyntactic changes are often constrained by factors like functional load, frequency, or discourse, but saliency is not a common constraint on spontaneous innovation.

There is, however, one type of change where saliency effects are common: those in which the 'innovation' is borrowed through contact with another variety or language, usually because the source variety has higher prestige or social power. This is the type of change that van Coetsem (1988) and Guy (1990) refer to 'recipient language agentivity' or borrowing, analogous to Labov's 'change from above'. In such cases, more salient forms are more readily borrowed than subtler ones. Labov reports such an effect in his department store study (1972: Chapter 2), where the spreading use of coda /r/ occurs more often in the salient word-final position than word-internally. Hence the emergence of saliency effects on plural marking in BP and CS may reflect gradual acquisition of plural agreement by nonstandard speakers who originally lacked it.

6.3   Language contact

Many linguistic phenomena arise in language contact; here our concern is phenomena associated with adult second language acquisition and cross-language transference. Spanish and Portuguese in the Americas experienced language contact on a massive scale – first with indigenous languages, and subsequently with the languages of millions of Africans brought as laborers. The great majority of the ancestors of the present population of Latin America did not come from Spain and Portugal, and most of these people must have learned Spanish or Portuguese, or a contact-influenced variety thereof, as adults. Since adults are notoriously poor second language learners, the varieties of Spanish/Portuguese acquired by these learners must have differed from the 'target' varieties spoken by European settlers. Such differences are of several kinds. Some reflect transfers from the speaker's L1; this is what van Coetsem calls 'source language agentivity', and Guy labels 'imposition'. Other differences reflect communicative strategies of early-stage adult L2 learners, including generalizations, focusing on roots to the exclusion of inflections, avoidance of movement phenomena, etc. If language contact and 'irregular transmission' (Lucchesi 2003; cf. also Naro & Scherre 2003b) are the source of CS/BP features, they should reflect L1 impositions and L2 acquisition strategies.

The degree to which the L2 varieties (such as *bozal* Spanish) approximated or diverged from the target varieties of Europeans was certainly affected by various social and demographic conditions, particularly access of L2 learners to L1 speakers, and the social relations between them. Access was affected by the demographic balance of L1 to L2 speakers – the proportions of Europeans and non-Europeans in the population – and by the communicative networks of each. In colonial society, the facts of social power and dominance and ideologies of race militated against extensive personal interaction between dominant Europeans and the dominated Others – Africans and Native Americans. Masters do not typically hang out and chat with field slaves to facilitate their language acquisition.

The maximally divergent outcome in these contact situations was the emergence of pidgins and creoles; this occurred when social conditions were at an extreme – when Africans greatly outnumbered Europeans and social segregation was pronounced. But as many scholars argue, slavery of any kind is unlikely to promote acquisition of a highly convergent variety. Enslaved Africans always spoke with 'foreign accents' and used L1 impositions, even if conditions did not favor emergence of a pidgin. Their descendants' usage would reflect this input, tending especially to preserve traits shared by many original African speakers. Even if not a creole, the emergent L1 variety of later generations continued to differ from the European norm to the extent that people of African descent continued to be socially and linguistically separated from the white elite. Such is the likely sociolinguistic

history of African American English, and such is what evidently gave rise to popular varieties of Spanish and Portuguese spoken mainly by people of African descent in Latin America.

6.4   African sources

Several of the phenomena observed in CS and BP have probable African sources. The vast majority of people taken by the slave trade to the Americas spoke languages of the Niger-Congo family. One systematic phonological property of these languages is the preponderance of open syllables. Proto-Bantu, and probably proto-Niger-Congo, permitted only CV or V syllable structures, and this is still true of most languages in this family. Coda consonants are nearly or entirely absent in most of the languages spoken by Africans in the Caribbean and Brazil (although some permit nasal elements in the syllable nucleus or coda: syllabic nasals, nasal vowels, occasionally coda nasal consonants). This is true of Yoruba, Igbo, Ewe, Kimbundu, Umbundu, Kikongo, etc. Hence the 'foreign accent' imposed by Africans on the varieties of Spanish or Portuguese they acquired in the Americas would surely have omitted or lenited coda consonants. Insofar as this served as the model for their children and subsequent generations, it is likely to have been a significantly greater contributor to coda lenition in Luso-Hispanic America than Andalusian Spanish or other European source. Crucially, the phonological similarity of the African source languages is the only input factor common to the founding populations of both CS and BP. Reduction of all coda consonants would be expected in a population undergoing shift from Niger-Congo languages to Spanish and Portuguese, but would be a statistically improbable coincidence were it a novel innovation arising spontaneously and simultaneously in two different languages in the Americas.

Negative repetition also has likely African sources; as we have noted it is found not only in BP and CS, but also in Luso-Hispanic creoles (e.g., São Tomé creole, Palenquero), and is attributed by specialists in these languages to a West African substrate (Ferraz 1979; Schwegler 1991). Schwegler specifically cites KiKongo where negation involves two negative particles, one preverbal and the other clause-final.

6.5   Initial position plural marking

Marking nominal plurality in phrase-initial or pre-head position is an unusual innovation from an Ibero-Romance perspective, but has striking parallels with many West African languages that were spoken by a majority of the people taken as slaves to Luso-Hispanic America. The most prominent African linguistic groups

represented in Brazil were drawn from two areas: the Nigerian coast (especially Yoruba and Igbo), and the area from the Congo basin through present-day Angola (especially the Bantu languages Kimbundu, Umbundu, and Kikongo). Portuguese and Brazilian slavers had well-developed operations and local connections in these regions, and were also heavily involved in supplying slaves from these areas to the Hispanic Caribbean. Most of these languages share the very structural property in their nominal plural marking systems that we find in CS and BP: plural markers are located in phrase-initial or pre-head position. In Bantu languages, including Kimbundu and Kikongo, plural marking is accomplished by a prefix; hence any plural NP has a morpheme indicating plurality immediately preceding the head noun (and in phrase-initial position, even when not immediately pre-head). In Yoruba, there is an NP initial plural particle, *awon*, homophonous with the 3pl pronoun. In Igbo, number is normally unspecified, other than for some animate nouns; a bare noun or NP usually can have either a singular or plural referent.

Given these structural facts, the likely source of the position constraint on NP plural marking is an imposition from the African languages spoken by significant majorities in colonial times. Adult L2 learners of Spanish and Portuguese whose L1s had NP-initial plural marking simply transposed this structure from L1 to L2. Their L1 syntax primed them to perceive and produce plural markers at the beginnings of NPs, before the head. Analogous transference effects can be noted among English speakers learning Spanish or Portuguese: they impose English structures, placing plural markers on nouns, locating adjectives pre-nominally, etc.

6.6   Adult learner strategies

Other features considered above are consistent with more general strategies of adult L2 learners. When obliged to use the L2 for real-life communicative ends early stage learners tend to utilize: (a) frequent structures more than rare ones, (b) salient forms more than unsalient (e.g., stressed vs. unstressed forms), (c) roots to the detriment of inflected forms, and (d) free morphemes over bound ones. Much of what makes BP and CS distinctive is consistent with such strategies. The saliency constraints suggest acquisition of agreement marking by untutored learners in verbal forms where it was most audibly prominent. High rates of omission of inflectional -r, -s, -n, found consistently in BP and CS but absent in Spain and Portugal, are consistent with the focus on roots. Inflectional loss is reflected in other ways: the BP verbal paradigm is often described as highly impoverished: along with variably absent plural marking in third person forms, the second person forms are almost entirely absent in most of the country, and the 1pl form is frequently replaced by a construction using a 3sg verb with *a gente* as the subject. Consequently, it

is unremarkable to encounter speakers who produce for example the imperfect paradigm with no person-number inflection at all: *eu, você, ele, a gente, vocês, eles falava*. The concomitant increase in use of overt subject pronouns, which occur at much higher rates in BP and CS than in other dialects of Spanish and Portuguese, is also consistent with favoring free over bound morphemes. Loss of low-frequency structures is also evident, such as the mesoclitics and inflected infinitives in BP.

In sum, the distinctive linguistic characteristics of BP and CS, that set them apart from their peninsular source languages, all have consistent explanations in terms of African substrates and/or adult second language acquisition. No peninsular source can account for why the same traits are found in both languages, and independent innovation in both communities of such a diverse range of phenomena is statistically impossible. What the Hispanic Caribbean and Brazil shared, however, was the presence of a substantial African population that at times greatly outnumbered both the European and indigenous populations of these territories. Given that some six million Africans were transported to Luso-Hispanic America and obliged for the rest of their lives to communicate in Spanish or Portuguese, such linguistic developments in communities where they were a majority are not the least bit surprising. It is more surprising that there exists such a long-standing and ample scholarly tradition dedicated to ignoring or minimizing such effects.

7.   The apparent dearth of creoles in contemporary Latin America

We have argued that the features of popular speech in CS and BP arose from linguistic processes accompanying the massive language contact and language shift that occurred when millions of Africans were obliged, under slavery, to acquire Spanish or Portuguese. Hence, we have rejected the first scenario discussed in the introduction – the position that no lasting linguistic impact of slavery is evident in Latin American Portuguese and Spanish. Nevertheless, these popular varieties are not commonly considered to be creoles. This is still a puzzle; given that the linguistic legacy of African slavery in the French and English territories of the Americas is a panoply of creole languages, in Haiti, Jamaica, Guyana, Trinidad, Barbados, Guadeloupe, etc., and even the United States, why aren't there many more recognized Spanish or Portuguese-lexifier creole languages throughout the Americas? What was different in Luso-Hispanic America? We are therefore left to consider the two remaining scenarios: that language contact under slavery in Latin America had effects that were not equivalent to creolization, or that creolization occurred but was subsequently overridden by subsequent events – some form of 'decreolization' occurred, or the creole speakers were swamped by later waves of migration involving different kinds of language acquisition.

As we have noted, Palenquero and Papiamentu provide clear evidence that pidginization/ creolization did occur in Latin America. The Portuguese creoles in Africa (in São Tomé, Cabo Verde, etc.) demonstrate that African captives of Portuguese traffickers had contact with pidgin/creole speakers even before being transported to the Americas. So it is not the case that there were no initial sources for creole languages in Latin America. Rather, what requires explanation is why they did not develop more widely, or if they did, why they are no longer evident among the descendants of their original speakers.

As we have noted, creole languages arose under extreme sociohistorical conditions of language contact; Singler (2006: 159) states "it is their social history that defines them." Linguistically they present extreme examples of the language contact effects discussed above, arising from forced second language acquisition by a subordinated, usually enslaved, population that had limited access to target language native speakers. Under such conditions, 'acquisition' of the dominant language is only approximate and the resulting creoles reflect an array of processes that are well-described in the literature. Among these are characteristics relevant to our discussion, including impositions from the L1s of the subordinate population and features arising from adult language acquisition such as omission of agreement phenomena and a preference for isolating morphology over inflection. Finally, the present form of creole languages has also been influenced by language contact across the centuries. In most locations the continuing presence of the dominant language had the effect of gradually minimizing differences between the target language and the creole – the process of 'decreolization'.

Crucially for the Latin American case, the relevant sociohistorical conditions were all continuously variable, not discrete or constant: duration of contact, degree of access of the subordinate population to TL speakers, etc. Consequently the linguistic outcomes were highly diverse, which is amply reflected in the theoretical and descriptive diversity of creole linguistics. Creoles emerged under the most extreme conditions, but what happened under less extreme circumstances? The varieties that arose in such situations diverged from the TL, even if they diverge less than creoles do. Creole studies recognize a spectrum of divergence in the 'creole continuum', but this is usually focused on within-language variation. In cross-language comparisons, there is less consensus about how to treat less-divergent varieties spoken by historically enslaved populations. Some scholars treat these cases as involving varying degrees of creolization (cf. Schneider 1990); others propose an intermediate category of 'semi-creoles' (see Holm 1992 and 2000, who puts the popular varieties of Brazilian Portuguese and Caribbean Spanish in this category; cf. also Baxter 1997). For other scholars such cases do not qualify as true creoles, even though they have undergone restructuring resulting from contact and acquisition.

Whatever theoretical model of contact and creolization one adopts, it is clear that in most of the relevant social, historical, and linguistic dimensions Luso-Hispanic America differed from Anglo-French America, generally in directions that would produce a variety that was less divergent from the target, i.e., less 'basilectal'. Some of the variable conditions that are most relevant to Latin America are the following.

7.1   Duration of slavery, language contact and linguistic assimilation

As the original colonial powers, Spain and Portugal were present in the Americas for much longer than the French and English: Santo Domingo was founded in 1498, Havana in 1519, Olinda in 1535, Salvador in 1549. By comparison, the French asserted claim to Haiti in 1659 (Singler 1996: 205), while the British founded Kingston in 1692 and took possession of Trinidad only in 1797. Slavery persisted longer in Brazil than anywhere else in the Americas, for 390 years. The period of intensive linguistic domination by whites over Africans and their descendants lasted much longer in Luso-Hispanic territories than in Anglo-French ones: for nearly four centuries in Brazil and Cuba, but little over a century in Jamaica and Haiti and only a few decades in Trinidad. Hence linguistic assimilation operated for much longer on BP and CS. Whether this constituted decreolization, or what Naro and Scherre (2000) call 'nativization', or simply standardization (in the sense of increasing approximation to the socially dominant variety), the effect was to reduce the divergence of popular speech.

7.2   Ratio of Africans to Europeans

Access to native speakers of the dominant European language was a clear determinant of difference between the TL and popular speech of Africans and their descendants. English and French sugar colonies in the Americas functioned with an extremely small number of whites relative to the Africans they enslaved. In Haiti, the proportion of Africans in the population rose rapidly from two-thirds in 1700, to 81.5% in 1713 (Singler 1996), to as much as 93% in the late 18th century (Richardson 1992); numbers in Jamaica were similar (Heuman 2003: 657). But in Cuba, slaves were a relatively small fraction of the population until intensive sugar cultivation began in the 19th century and slaves were imported in huge numbers. According to the Cuban census, the non-white proportion of the population peaked at 58.5% in 1841. In Brazil, the peak level of the non-white population was reached in the first half of the 19th century, when censuses were not conducted. The 1872 census recorded 38% of the population as white, but this figure had certainly been

elevated by the substantial increase in European immigration to Brazil after the suppression of the slave trade in 1850, and other historical events like high death rates among African conscripts in the Paraguayan War (1865–1870). Adjusting for this, and making allowances for the fluid interpretation of race and color in Brazil, it appears that the peak percentage of non-whites in Brazil was in the neighborhood of three-quarters of the population in the 1840s.

Before these peaks were reached, there were long periods in Brazil and the Caribbean when Africans were considerably less numerous. In the earliest years, both Spain and Portugal used indigenous peoples as their labor force, and this continued throughout colonial times in the Andes, Mexico, and parts of Central America. When the first Africans arrived in Latin America, being relatively few they would likely have been more linguistically assimilated – i.e., less divergent or 'basilectal'; this population could have provided a vehicle for the dissemination of such a variety to later African arrivals. And even when the slave system reached its maximum, the contrast with French and British territories was marked: ratios of blacks to whites of three-to-one or three-to-two in Latin America, vs. ten-to-one in the Anglo-French Caribbean.

7.3   The social conditions of slavery

African slavery was everywhere accompanied and rationalized by racist beliefs, but the practices of the slave system differed from place to place, with linguistic consequences. The social construction of race in North America, for example, is largely imagined as a binary opposition between black and white; the laws and practices of slavery and racial segregation were predicated on such a duality. Any blurring of the line between white and black was abhorred: free blacks did not legally exist in some southern states in the US, and manumission was rare.

In Latin America race was typically constructed in a more fluid imaginary. Many intermediate categories were recognized between white and black – BP has dozens of words for various combinations of physical traits and racial ancestry: *mulato, mestiço, caboclo, pardo, moreno*, etc. Manumission was not unusual and free people of color abounded in Brazil throughout its history. The mixed race children of slaveholders were sometimes acknowledged or even raised as part of their father's family. The most revered artist of colonial Brazil, the sculptor and architect Antônio Francisco Lisboa, known as Aleijadinho, had such an upbringing. Africans and their descendants held diverse occupations in Brazil: besides field hands in agriculture and personal servants, there were miners, porters, dockworkers, smiths, carpenters, etc. Social ascent was possible for people of color; the common Brazilian expression *dinheiro embranquece* ('money whitens the skin')

has a linguistic correlate: social class – as indicated by affluence and education – is a more reliable predictor of linguistic usage than the physical features of a speaker. The linguistic consequences were that many people of African ancestry had considerable contact with native speakers of Portuguese, and there existed many people who were socially intermediate, and potential linguistic intermediaries, between dominant whites and enslaved or subordinated blacks.

7.4   The source languages

A further difference between the English/French and Portuguese/Spanish slave colonies was the constellation of languages involved in the contact situation. The specific outcomes of any language contact, including creolization, are dependent on the input languages; given different inputs, diverse outputs are to be expected. The considerable variety of languages involved in contact in the colonial Americas thus militates against a simple calculus of whether popular speech in Brazil and the Hispanic Caribbean was more or less 'creolized' than in Anglo-French territories. On the European side, English and French are the two most inflectionally reduced languages of Western Europe, having mostly lost, *inter alia*, person-number inflection in the verbal paradigm, and number agreement in the NP. Hence non-agreement is not a criterion for non-convergence in contact-influenced varieties of French and English, and variable agreement in BP and CS is not a valid measure of whether these varieties are farther from European sources than their Anglo-French counterparts, where such structures are not an issue.

On the African side of the contact situation, many languages were involved. As Singler (1988) shows, features that are common and consistent across the substrates are likely to persist in a creole. In the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in the Americas, the Africans were overwhelmingly speakers of Niger-Congo languages. These were heterogeneous in many respects, but quite homogeneous in several relevant respects cited above: no coda consonants, phrase-initial number marking, etc.

In sum, the apparent profusion of Anglo-French creoles, and dearth of Luso-Hispanic ones, may be more a question of definition and degree than of discrete difference. The proportionately smaller presence of Africans in early colonial Latin America may have mitigated the emergence of stabilized creoles; the different practices and conditions of slavery in these societies may have facilitated greater access to and better acquisition of the dominant language, thus reducing distance between elite and popular speech. But at various places and times in Latin America, pidgins must have been used, and creoles must have developed. Many features of the relevant popular varieties of Spanish and Portuguese have clear sources in the history of contact and irregular transmission. Extrapolating backwards from the evidence

of ex-slave communities indicates that the usage of earlier generations of black speakers was still more divergent from the standard languages. It is clear that people of African descent have experienced considerable pressure for centuries to acquire more 'standard' features; indeed contemporary studies of change in progress indicate that such standardization of popular usage – change from above – is ongoing and accelerating. Hence however much the languages of the earliest days of the African diaspora in Latin America diverged from their European lexifiers, whether a linguistic observer would denominate them as creoles or not, their present-day forms are certainly substantially 'decreolized', or closer to the dominant varieties.

The closest English analogue to popular CS and BP is probably African American English: a variety that diverges from its dominant 'standard' in the direction of properties common among creoles (including lack of subject-verb agreement), but is not so distinctive that most scholars consider it a different language – indeed, the origins of AAE are the object of more debate than the varieties considered here. The popular varieties of BP and CS are today perhaps better characterized as associated with class than with race, but it is still the case that most poor and poorly educated speakers are black or brown, while most affluent, powerful, and well-educated speakers are white.

8. A crucial case: Afro-Bolivian Spanish

Recent work by Lipski (2008) provides a case study of an Afro-Spanish variety formed early in the colonial period and maintained in near complete isolation from other Spanish speakers until modern times. The current speakers, located in the Yungas region of Bolivia (steep valleys on the eastern slopes of the Andes), descend from African slaves taken by the Spanish to labor in silver-mining in the Andean highlands, where they suffered high mortality rates due to altitude and climate. Some were then transferred to serve as agricultural laborers on haciendas in the lower altitude, more tropical climate of the Yungas. There they lived in a state of bondage or peonage until the mid-20th century. Their overseers were mostly monolingual Aymara-speaking indigenous peoples, and the peons were typically obligated to speak Aymara with the overseers. Consequently, these Afro-Bolivians had little to no continuing contact with Spanish speakers for several hundred years until the second half of the 20th century. Hence their language was not subject to much standardization or 'decreolization' and provides a close perspective on the speech of *bozales* and other early generations of Africans in Spanish America. At present, however, Lipski notes that most of the younger generations also speak highlands variety of Bolivian Spanish "as their second dialect" (2008: 63). Hence some pressures to assimilate and standardize are no doubt currently active.

The linguistic characteristics that we have seen in BP and CS are clearly evident in this Afro-Bolivian community, often in more pronounced form. These include:

Coda consonant reduction: According to Lipski (2008), Afro-Bolivian Spanish (ABS) has extensive deletion or aspiration of final -s, and deletion of final -r, especially in verbal infinitives. These characteristics are in striking contrast to the consonantally conservative highland Bolivian Spanish that his consultants also command.

Nominal plural marking: Nouns and adjectives are mostly invariant in this variety, bearing no plural markers. In the most traditional usage, plural NPs are marked by an initial plural determiner *lu* or an initial numeral: e.g., *lu mujé* 'las mujeres', *tres hombre* 'tres hombres'. But in what Lipski (2008:93) describes as "partially modernized speech" the plural structure consists of "marking plural -s only on the *first* element of plural noun phrases". In either case, it is the first element of an NP that indicates number, precisely the phenomenon we have seen in BP and CS.

Verbal plural marking: Lipski highlights the ABS verbal system as one of its most distinctively 'restructured' characteristics. It shows no person-number inflection at all. The invariant verb form occurring with all subject persons and numbers is based on the standard Spanish 3sg. For example:

Afro-Bolivian	Spanish	
yo tiene	*yo tengo*	'I have'
nojotro tiene	*nosotros tenemos*	'we have'
ele tiene	*el tiene*	'he has'
eyu tiene	*ellos tienen*	'they have'

In the absence of any verbal number marking, traditional ABS sheds no light on the saliency effect in popular BP. In BP this effect is variable and quantitative: more marking accompanies greater salience. What would be comparable among the Afro-Bolivians would be the usage patterns found in their 'partially modernized speech', where plural-marked verbs variably occur. Lipski does not present quantitative evidence on 'partially modernized' usage, but he does make the following observation: "the most frequent verbs (usually irregular) are the first to exhibit subject-verb agreement in partially decreolized speech" (2008:110). He cites examples such as *yo sé, soy, tengo* 'I know, I am, I have' instead of *sabe, es, tiene*. All of these cases would count as highly salient in the scales used in the analysis of BP.

Afro-Bolivian Spanish has a number of other illuminating characteristics. It lacks gender agreement in the NP, which occurs occasionally in BP and CS. It has nearly categorical use of overt subject pronouns. This places it, like BP, very close to non-null subject languages like modern English, and a very long way from most dialects of Spanish outside of the Caribbean. By comparison, Highland Bolivian

Spanish is like Mexican and peninsular Spanish in using very low rates of subject pronouns. And in the verbal system, ABS has a progressive construction of *ta* + infinitive which is similar to Palenquero: *yo ta tomá mi plato* 'I am eating my food' (Lipski 2008: 122).

In all these respects, the language of Afro-Bolivians is strikingly different from the highland Bolivian dialect of Spanish that is spoken around it and is currently being acquired by the Afro-Bolivians as a second language or dialect. Afro-Bolivians have been isolated for centuries from the Spanish varieties with which they share the features considered here. There is no plausible scenario in which they could have spontaneously developed such features, or acquired them from European speakers and then exaggerated them. Rather, these linguistic characteristics must have emerged from the conditions of enslavement, language contact, and language acquisition. Lipski concludes that ABS is descended from a proto-Hispanic pidgin/creole, spoken originally in the Caribbean. The parallels with BP and CS certainly suggest common processes at work. The greater distinctiveness of ABS locates it farther from the superstrate language, and closer to the constellation of characteristics we find in generally recognized creoles. Its history of linguistic isolation implies that ABS must be more basilectal, closer to the speech of the earliest generations of Africans in the Americas, than BP and CS. This in turn implies a historical trajectory by which all of these varieties started out as creoles, or at least restructured varieties tending toward the creole end of Schneider's cline, and then acquired their present form through differing degrees of standardization.

9. Conclusions

The sizeable communities of people of African descent in modern Latin America trace their origins to the same slave trade and slave-based economy that brought Africans to North America and to English and French territories in the Caribbean. In all of these African American communities, language varieties are spoken that are substantially different from the historical and contemporary norms of white native speakers of Spanish, Portuguese, English and French. In the Anglo-French Caribbean, and in Louisiana and the Sea Islands of Georgia and South Carolina, these varieties are generally considered creoles, but in Spanish and Portuguese America, they are not. This contrast is partly due to differing scholarly traditions, but it also appeals to linguistic features, such as the existence of distinctive verbal systems in the languages considered to be creoles. The absence of some such features in some Latin American varieties of Spanish and Portuguese spoken by people of African ancestry has therefore been taken by some scholars to imply that

their other distinctive linguistic properties did not arise from African-European language contact, and that the history of slavery had little impact on the evolution of Spanish and Portuguese in the Americas. In this paper I have presented evidence contradicting such a model. I have argued that the linguistic parallelism between the popular varieties of Caribbean Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese constitutes compelling evidence of the impact of African speakers on the languages spoken by their descendants. We have seen a number of linguistic phenomena and structures that are (1) present in both CS and BP, and (2) innovative from the standpoint of the historical European norms, and (3) structurally consistent with either the African languages brought to Latin America or the common processes of (incomplete or unfavorable) adult second language acquisition, and (4) spoken first and foremost by low status people of African ancestry, and much less or not at all by the white elite. Such phenomena resist any explanation in terms of European sources, historical drift, or spontaneous innovation. Their commonalities and co-occurrence imply a common source, but their simultaneous presence in varieties of both Spanish and Portuguese disproves a common European source (or a common Amerindian source). The only linguistic input that was shared across the different locations where these phenomena are found was the presence of millions of Africans, forcibly brought to the Americas to labor in bondage, and obligated by force or necessity to acquire and communicate in the languages of their oppressors. The linguistic effects of that experience are still evident in the popular speech of their descendants. Whether those effects constituted creolization is a matter of theory and definition; what is incontrovertible is that these forms of language would not exist in Latin America were it not for the linguistic practice and presence of so many people who came to the New World speaking not Spanish or Portuguese, but Kimbundu or Yoruba or Kikongo, or one of dozens of other languages of Africa.

References

Alba, O. 1990. *Variación fonética y diversidad social en el español dominicano de Santiago*. Santiago DR: Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra.

Baxter, A. 1997. Creole-like features in the verb system of an Afro-Brazilian variety of Portuguese. In *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles* [Creole Language Library 19], A. Spears & D. Winford (eds), 265–288. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/cll.19.16bax

Baxter, A. 2009. A concordância de número. In *O Português Afro-brasileiro*, D. Lucchesi, A. Baxter & I. Ribeiro (eds), 269–294. Salvador: EDUFBA (Editora da Universidade Federal da Bahia).

Bullock, B. & Toribio, A. 2009. Reconsidering Dominican Spanish: Data from the rural Cibao. *Revista Internacional de lingüística Iberoamericana* 7(2): 49–73.

Cavalcante, R. 2009. A negação sentencial. In *O Português Afro-brasileiro*, D. Lucchesi, A. Baxter & I. Ribeiro (eds), 251–268. Salvador: EDUFBA (Editora da Universidade Federal da Bahia).

Cedergren, H. 1973. *The Interplay of Social and Linguistic Factors in Panama*. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.

Callou, D., Moraes, J. & Leite, Y. 1996. Variação e diferenciação dialetal: A pronúncia do /r/ no português do Brasil. In *Gramática do português falado*, Vol. 6, S. Koch (ed), 465–493. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.

Clements, J. 2009. *The Linguistic Legacy of Spanish and Portuguese: Colonial Expansion and Language Change*. Cambridge: CUP.   doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511576171

Curtin, P. 1972. *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

de Friedemann, N. & Patiño Roselli, C. 1983. *Lengua y sociedad en El Palenque de San Basílio*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

de Granda, G. 1978. *Estudios lingüísticos hispánicos, afrohispánicos y criollos*. Madrid: Gredos.

de Oliveira, M. 1983. *Phonological Variation and Change in Brazilian Portuguese: The Case of the Liquids*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Ferraz, L. 1979. *The Creole of São Tomé*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Guy, G. 1981. *Linguistic Variation in Brazilian Portuguese: Aspects of the Phonology, Syntax, and Language History*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Guy, G. 1990. The sociolinguistic types of language change. *Diachronica* 7(1): 47–67. doi: 10.1075/dia.7.1.04guy

Hagemeijer, T. 2008. Double-headed negation in Santome. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 7(2): 63–82.   doi: 10.5334/jpl.128

Heuman, G. 2003. The free coloreds in Jamaican slave society. In *The Slavery Reader*, G. Heuman & J. Walvin (eds), 654–667. New York NY: Routledge.

Hoffman, M. 2010. *Salvadorian Spanish in Toronto* [Lincom Studies in Romance Linguistics 63]. Munich: Lincom.

Holm, J. 1992. Popular Brazilian Portuguese: A semi-creole. In *Actas do colóquio sobre crioulos de base lexical portuguesa*, E. d'Andrade & A. Kihm (eds), 37–66. Lisboa: Colibri.

Holm, J. 2000. Semi-creolization: Problems in the development of theory. In *Degrees of Restructuring in Creole languages* [Creole Language Library 22], I. Neumann-Holzschuh & E. Schneider (eds), 19–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jacobs, B. 2012. *Origins of a Creole: The History of Papiamentu and its African Ties*. Berlin: Moulton De Gruyter.   doi: 10.1515/9781614511076

Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lipski, J. 2008. *Afro-Bolivian Spanish*. Madrid & Frankfurt: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.

Lucchesi, D. 2003. O conceito de transmissão irregular e o processo de formação do português do Brasil. In *Português Brasileiro: contato lingüístico, heterogeneidade e história*, C. Roncarati & J. Abraçado (eds), 272–84. Rio de Janeiro: 7Letras.

Lucchesi, D., Baxter, A. & Ribeiro, I. 2009. *O Português Afro-brasileiro*. Salvador: Editora da Universidade Federal da Bahia.

McWhorter, J. 2000. *The Missing Spanish Creoles: Recovering the Birth of Plantation Contact Languages*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Morton, T. 2005. *Sociolinguistic Variation and Language Change in El Palenque de San Basílio, Colombia*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Naro, A. 1981. The social and structural dimensions of a syntactic change. *Language* 57(1): 63–98. doi: 10.1353/lan.1981.0020

Naro, A. & Lemle, M. 1976. Syntactic diffusion. In *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, S. Steever, C. Walker & S. Mufwene (eds), 221–240. Chicago IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Naro, A. & Scherre, M. 1993. Sobre as origens do português popular do Brasil. *Revista DELTA* 9: 437–454.

Naro, A. & Scherre, M. 2000. Variable concord in Portuguese. In *Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles* [Creole Language Library 21], J. McWhorter (ed.), 235–255. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cll.21.09nar

Naro, A. & Scherre, M. 2003a. Estabilidade e mudança lingüística em tempo real: A concordância de número. In *Mudança lingüística em tempo real*, M. Paiva & M. Duarte (eds), 47–62. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa Livraria.

Naro, A. & Scherre, M. 2003b. O conceito de transmissão irregular e as origens estruturais do português brasileiro: um tema em debate. In *Português Brasileiro: contato lingüístico, heterogeneidade e história*, C. Roncarati & J. Abraçado (eds), 285–302. Rio de Janeiro: 7Letras.

Oushiro, L. & Mendes, R. 2013. A pronúncia do (-R) em coda silábica no português paulistano. *Revista do GEL São Paulo* 8(2): 66–95.

Otheguy, R. 1973. The Spanish Caribbean: A creole perspective. In *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, C. Bailey & R. Shuy (eds), 323–339. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Poplack, S. 1979. *Function and Process in a Variable Phonology*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Poplack, S. 1980. On deletion and disambiguation in Puerto Rican Spanish. *Language* 56(2): 371–385. doi:10.1353/lan.1980.0033

Reimann, C. & Yacovenco, L. 2011. A dupla negação no português falado em Vitória/ES: traço da identidade linguística capixaba? *Anais do congresso nacional de estudos lingüísticos*. Vitória: CONEL.

Richardson, B. 1992. *The Caribbean in the Wider World, 1492–1992: A Regional Geography*. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511560057

Scherre, M. 1978. *A regra de concordância de número no sintagma nominal em português*. MA thesis, Pontifícia Universidade Católica-RJ.

Scherre, M. 1988. *Reanálise da concordância nominal em português*. PhD dissertation, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

Schneider, E. 1990. The cline of creoleness in English-oriented creoles and semi-creoles of the Caribbean. *English World-Wide* 11(1): 79–113. doi:10.1075/eww.11.1.07sch

Schwegler, A. 1991. Negation in Palenquero: Synchrony. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 6(2): 165–214. doi:10.1075/jpcl.6.2.02sch

Schwegler, A. 2002. On the (African) origins of Palenquero subject pronouns. *Diachronica* 19(2): 273–332. doi:10.1075/dia.19.2.03sch

Schwegler, A. 2011. Palenque(ro): The search for its African substrate: Subject pronouns. In *Creoles, Their Substrates, and Language Typology* [Typological Studies in Language 95], C. Lefebvre (ed.), 225–249. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tsl.95.13sch

Singler, J. 1988. The homogeneity of the substrate as a factor in pidgin/creole genesis. *Language* 64(1): 27–51. doi:10.2307/414784

Singler, J. 1996. The demographics of creole genesis in the Caribbean: A comparison of Martinique and Haiti. In *The Early Stages of Creolization* [Creole Language Library 13], J. Arends (ed.), 203–232. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cll.13.10sin

Singler, J. 2006. Children and creole genesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 21(1): 157–173. doi:10.1075/jpcl.21.1.04sin

Terrell, T. 1979. Final /s/ in Cuban Spanish. *Hispania* 66(2): 599–612. doi:10.2307/340142

Trudgill, P. 2004. *New Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Oxford: OUP.

Tsounta, E. & Osueke, A. 2014. What is behind Latin America's declining income inequality? *International Monetary Fund Working Paper* 14(124): 4–35.

van Coetsem, F. 1988. *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*. Dordrecht: Foris. doi:10.1515/9783110884869

Vieira, S. & Bazenga, A.M. 2015. A concordância da terceira pessoa do plural: Padrões em variedades do português. In *A concordância verbal em variedades do português: A interface fonética-morfossintaxe*, S. Vieira (ed.). Rio de Janeiro: FAPERJ/Usina de Letras.