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There is a very clear reason why genesis is spread over two of these four volumes. Ever since Pidgins and Creoles (P/Cs) came to scholarly attention in the nineteenth century, questions about how they developed and how they compare with other languages have dominated research and debates. This interest has resulted in several theories that try to account for the linguistic and extra-linguistic mechanisms that gave rise to these contact languages, and work that aims to demonstrate the relationships between P/Cs. For reasons of space, this brief introduction to volumes 1 and 2 provides only a mere sketch of some of these theories and perspectives. More comprehensive overviews can be found in Arends et al. (1994) and Kouwenberg and Singler (2008), Mufwene (2001:1-24), Thomason (2001:157-195).

Some scholars see both P/Cs as occurring on one continuum of development (Hall 1962), with the latter being a natural outcome when the former gains native speakers. However, not all agree on whether pidginization (cf. Samarin 1971) is a necessary precursor to creolization (McWhorter 2002; Versteegh 1984); a state-of-affairs that is reflected (as we will see below) in whether Pidgins are accorded a role in a theory of genesis or not. A survey of the literature also suggests that the emergence of Creoles has, for most researchers, been the phenomenon that needs explaining. The assumption is that Pidgin genesis is more straightforward.

Many of the early theories of Creole genesis (e.g. Baby Talk Theory, Foreigner Talk Theory) were eurocentric in their approach and focused on reduction and simplification. While questions of simplicity and complexity continue to be of interest to creolists and pidginists (McWhorter 2001a; Ansaldo et al. 2007; Aboh & Smith 2009; Farcclas & Klein 2009; Mufwene 2013), these early theories have been superseded by more sophisticated alternatives. Current theories recognize that both simplification and complexification play a role in the genesis and development of these languages, and that these strategies operate under the influence of substrate and/or superstrate languages, guided by universal principles.

Superstratist approaches, some of the oldest approaches to P/C genesis, foreground the superstrate input. The superstrate refers to the language/varieties spoken by the colonizers or the socially/politically dominant group in the contact situation. Within this paradigm, Creoles are thought to be continuations of their superstrate, and proponents stress that time-relevant nonstandard dialects of the superstrate formed the input and thus should constitute the focus when comparing Creoles with their superstrates. While scholars of all theoretical persuasions agree on the latter point, its application is normally short-circuited by lack of data from the relevant period. The view that the superstrate played an important role in the formation of Creoles has been particularly popular among scholars working on French-lexicon Creoles (e.g. Chaudenson 1986; 2001). Superstratists maintain that non-standard

---

1 Note that for Bickerton (1981) nativizing a Pidgin does not automatically make it a Creole. A Creole arises from a Pidgin that has only been in existence for one generation.
varieties of a European/superstrate language were subject to different waves of restructuring, sometimes leading to relatively divergent systems, depending on factors such as changes in demographics, access to speakers of the superstrate, and the sociopolitical dynamics of the society (Chaudenson 1986; 2001; Mufwene 2001). Salikoko Mufwene argues that the earliest ethnolinguistic groups (both superstrate and substrate) on the contact scene had a founder effect (i.e., a norm-establishing influence) on the emergence of the Creole (Mufwene 1996). While the early population determines much of the structure of the Creole, the founder principle does not preclude later groups making an impact on the developing language.

The direct opposite of the foregoing are substratist approaches which give priority to the first languages (L1) of the colonized groups. Substratist approaches became more prominent in order to contest popular and scholarly views (e.g. Bickerton 1983) that the substrate languages of the creators played little or no role in the genesis of Creoles. Substratist approaches vary widely from strong versions where Creoles are essentially continuations of their substrate languages, to weaker versions where the substrate is thought to have played a major but not necessarily a uniform role (Boretzky 1983; Clements 1996; Migge & Goury 2008; Migge 2011). Some substratist work (Alleyne 1971; 1980; Jourdan & Keesing 1997; Mintz 1977) take a more anthropological approach by exploring the socio-cultural and socio-historical contexts in which Creoles emerged. Alleyne has argued that Creoles start out looking more like their substrates but may over time come to resemble their lexifier language more closely due to processes of acculturation. Therefore, Saramaccan, traditionally classified as a radical Creole, because it diverges in many ways from its European input, is considered more “African” than say Trinidadian English Creole (TrinEC), which shares a fair number of properties with non-standard varieties of English. This is due to the fact that Saramaccan was cut off from its lexifier language early in its development, while TrinEC continued to co-exist with its lexifier. By far, the most comprehensive and well-known but also much debated substratist position is Lefebvre’s (1998; 2001a; 201b; 2004) Relexification Hypothesis. The Relexification Hypothesis proposes that in the formation of Creoles, adults take phonetic strings (words) from the lexifier language and plug them into the grammar (especially semantics and morphosyntax) of their L1s. Recently, Lefebvre (cf. 2015) has switched to relabeling in place of relexification,2 and has introduced the term leveling to account for the fact that although Creoles tend to arise in highly multilingual environments, substrate patterns tend to be drawn from one or at most a handful of the available languages. For critiques of the Relexification Hypothesis, see Singler (1996), DeGraff (2002), and McWhorter (2005).

For endogenous Creoles such as those in South Asia, adstrates complicate the search for substrate features seeing that these Creoles continue to be in contact with their substrate languages. I. Smith (1979b) discusses this for Sri Lanka Portuguese (SLP), Bakker (2006) for both SLP and Sri Lanka Malay (SLM), Ansaldo (2012) for SLM, and Clements (1990) for Korlai. See the introduction to Cardoso et al. (2012) for an overview.

---

2 Lefebvre (2015:1) defines relabeling as “a process that consists in assigning a lexical entry a new label derived from a phonetic string drawn from another language”.

Contending with both substratists and superstratists, are the universalists, i.e., scholars who view creolization as a process grounded in universals of language. The chief advocate of the universalist approach to Creole genesis has been Derek Bickerton (1984) whose Language Bioprogram Hypothesis (LBH) treats Creole formation as a special case of first language acquisition. He argues that children growing up on plantations were primarily exposed to the Pidgin developed for basic communication by their parents. The LBH proposes that the impoverished input to which the children were being exposed was not sufficient for them to acquire a full natural language; therefore, the biopogram—a universal blueprint for language—was activated in order to create a maximally efficient language. Bickerton (1981, 1984) claims that recurring features in unrelated Creoles (e.g. SVO word order, order of TMA markers, etc.) provide evidence for the LBH. One of the main features of the LBH is that it sees Creole formation as an abrupt process (i.e., occurring within one generation), and the result of a break in transmission (cf. Thomason & Kaufman 1988) when compared with regular language transmission where children acquire the language of their parents.

Although not many creolists subscribe to the LBH, outside of P/C Studies it is the most well-known approach to creolization and continues to be perpetuated in introductions to sociolinguistics. It has also had a significant impact on the field in terms of the debates it has fostered and the empirical work it has inspired (cf. Veenstra 2008) on the demographic, sociohistorical (Arends 1994, 1995, 1996, 2001; Singler 1992, 1993, 1996, 2006), and linguistic inputs to Creole genesis. For example, Arends (1994) and Singler (1992) have demonstrated that the demographic profile which the LBH assumes is not supported by the available evidence. Crucially, there were far too few children in such contexts, at any given time the African population was much less heterogeneous, and the ratio between Europeans and Africans, and consequently contact patterns between them, were variable across contexts. Owens (1990) also argues that the LBH only accounts for Creoles with specific types of input languages, and so cannot be applied generally. With regard to tense, mood, and aspect (TMA) marking, Winford (2000) has shown that the three categories (anterior tense, irrealis mood, and non-punctual aspect) that Bickerton proposes for his Creole prototype, and the invariable order in which they are proposed to appear, do not hold up for Sranan, one of Bickerton’s prototypical Creoles. Carden and Stewart (1988) also show that several of the linguistic features such as reflexives and anti-reflexives in Haitian Creole developed in the opposite direction of what the LBH would predict, and more recently, Siegel (2008) has argued that not even Hawaii‘ian Creole, another of Bickerton’s LBH prototype really supports the hypothesis.

Outside of the extreme positions taken by the approaches outlined above, there is another line of research that investigates the role of second language acquisition (SLA) in pidginization and creolization (see Schumann 1974; Kouwenberg & Patrick 2003; Siegel 2006 for overviews). At their core, SLA approaches have the same starting point as the Rellexification Hypothesis, but propose that few (if any) special processes are required to account for P/C development beyond the ones already at work in regular SLA. Kouwenberg and Patrick (2003:181) claim that SLA and transfer strategies associated with it are relevant
during the early stages of contact only, after which they cease to be relevant. The strength of
SLA approaches is that there is generally no conflict in recognizing the role of the
superstrate, substrate and universals, even simultaneously (Schumann 1974; Becker &
Veenstra 2003; Clements 2001; Helms-Park 2003; Siegel 2003). More recently, Plag (2008a;
2008b; 2009a; 2009b) has revisited SLA explanations by proposing what he refers to as the
interlanguage hypothesis; a claim that “creoles originate as conventionalized interlanguages
of an early [developmental] stage” (Plag 2008b:307). Also, Clements (2014) has explored
form selection in P/Cs in the context of SLA. Despite the attractiveness of SLA approaches,
Sprouse (2010) complains that creolists have not engaged sufficiently with SLA theories in
thorizing about genesis.

Although the field has been well served by strong theories such as the LBH and the
Relexification Hypothesis, traditionally most creolists tend to prefer more integrative
approaches (cf. Baker 1997) where substrate, superstrate and universals of language all
contribute to the genesis of P/Cs in different ways and to varying degrees in different
components of grammar. The basic assumption is that no one theory can account for
everything. In some cases a lot is taken from the substrate or the superstrate and then in other
components of grammar the influence of one or the other is absent or minimal. For example,
the substrate might be more important in determining how Creoles implement aspectual
marking (Winford and Migge 2007; Kouwenberg 2009), while the superstrate might exert a
stronger influence in the area of phonotactics. Universals may constrain both in determining
the order in which features are adopted and/or adapted. The role of the researcher then is to
demonstrate in a principled way which input is relevant when and how.

All theories of genesis depend on the availability and analysis of two particular types
of data: sociohistorical and linguistic. In the early days, information on the demographics and
the cultural dynamics of the early phases of the societies in which Creoles emerged was
scarce but scholars were still cognizant of the need to be guided by the historical data (cf. Le
Page 1960). While chasing the demographic data, historians (and sometimes linguists) have
uncovered more linguistic data and made discoveries that help to sharpen or disprove the
assumptions on which various theories are based. For example, as mentioned above, the work
of scholars such as Singler shows that the data do not support the assumptions about
demographics assumed by the LBH.

Theory-internal concerns have been the foremost drivers of descriptive work on P/Cs.
This has resulted in an imbalance in the literature where topics such as copulas (McWhorter
1997; Migge 2002), TMA marking (Givón 1982), reduplication, focus, serial verb
constructions (Sebba 1987; Seuren 1991; Veenstra 1996) and predicate clefting, and
complementation (Plag 1996; Lefebvre & Loranger 2015) are over-described whereas other
areas such as relativization (Huttar et al. 2013) have been under-described. It is not
surprising that the areas which have received the most attention are those that are most likely
to have substrate origin/influence. This imbalance is a product of the fact that much of the
work done in the area of morphosyntax has been done in the context of debates between
substratists and universalists.
P/C scholars have worked with both synchronic and diachronic data in their attempts to establish the origins of these languages. The over-reliance on synchronic data is in part due to the common practice in historical linguistics of using the present to explain the past, but it also speaks to the sparseness of early descriptions of Creole languages. Only a few scholars have exploited reconstruction as a viable alternative (Alleyne 1980; N. Smith 1987). However, the neglect of linguistic reconstruction should not be interpreted as a general rejection of the methods of historical linguistics (cf. Arends 2002), because there is a growing body of work in the area of philology as old(er) texts come to light.

Scholars have been concerned with reconstructing and/or editing these older texts (Winer 1984; Arends and Perl 1995; Mühlhäusler et al. 2003; van d), mining them for relevant linguistic (Hall 1944; Lalla and D’Costa 1990; Lipski 2005; Sabino 1994, 1996; 2012; Baker and Bruyn 1999; Braun 2009; Farquharson 2014; Naro 1978; van den Berg 2007; van den Berg & Arends 2004) and sociolinguistic (Ansald and Matthews 2010; Cardoso 2014; Muysken 1995; Grant 1999; Drechsel 2012, 2014; Krämer 2014) data. There is also a complementary body of guidelines on how to handle historical texts for linguistic research (Baker and Winer 1999; Hazael-Massieux 2006). Data from historical texts have been useful for critically assessing theories of genesis with regard to the timeline the theories propose for the emergence of particular features, and determining whether those features were inherited or represent independent development. The study of historical documents has, for example, given rise to the gradualist model of Creole genesis (Carden & Stewart 1988; Arends 1989; 1992) which argues that creolization is not an abrupt process but can stretch over several generations. See Selbach et al. (2009) for discussions of the gradualist model.

Studies on grammaticalization are another spin-off of the work on older texts. Various scholars have explored whether and to what extent grammaticalization plays a role in P/C genesis, or if apparent cases are merely instances of calquing or polysemy copying (Bruyn 1996; 2009). Much of the work in this area concentrates on the influence of the substrate, covering topics such as TMA marking (Keesing 1991; Romaine 1990; Kriegel et al. 2003; Sankoff & Laberge 1973; Siegel 1998; Winford 2006), determiners and relative clauses (Bruyn 1995), demonstratives (Bruyn 1995) and other locative constructions (Yakpo & Bruyn 2015), transitivity (Keesing 1991), plural markers from particular nouns or pronouns (Roberts and Bresnan 2008), and the development of generic speech verbs into (quotative) complementizers (Crowley 1989; Lefebvre & Loranger 2006; Plag 1993; 1995; Meyerhoff 2002; Migge & Winford 2013). Unfortunately, the related area of reanalysis has mostly been dealt with incidentally in the literature (but cf. Kouwenberg 2009).

Although issues of genesis continue to be part of the debate in contemporary P/C studies, over the past two decades, the discipline has been dominated by typological work which probes how these languages should be classified in relation to non-contact languages, and the role their manner of origin plays in how they should be categorised (see Bakker et al. 2011 for overview). We owe this increased interest in typology to the rise in the popularity of language typology in linguistics generally, but in several ways, the interest may be viewed as a continuation of earlier work which sought to establish relatedness among P/Cs (e.g.
Hancock 1969) or disciplinary practices which classify them based on their lexifier languages or the regions in which they are spoken. There has been a concentration on shared features in these contact languages with a view to determining historical trajectories of diffusion and contact, and genealogical relatedness. These shared features have been drawn from various levels of grammar: phonology (e.g. Smith 1987), lexicon (e.g. Smith 1997; 2015a), and morphosyntax (e.g. Hancock 1969).

One prominent line of investigation aims at demonstrating that there is some amount of intra-regional homogeneity among P/Cs with the same lexifier. To accomplish this, shared features have been used with varying degrees of success to argue in favor of a single starting point and subsequent diffusion from one territory to the next as opposed to multi-genesis (Baker 1987; Hancock 1969; Devonish 2002; and McWhorter 2000). While some creolists now accept diffusion as an explanation for many shared features, there is lack of agreement on how much diffusion should account for and where the starting point should be. On the latter, compare Hancock's (1986) Domestic Hypothesis which places the origin of the English-lexicon Atlantic Creoles (ELACs) along the Upper Guinea Coast of West Africa, with the work of McWhorter (1995; 1996; 2000) who points to the Gold Coast, versus others who believe a Caribbean beginning to be highly probable (Baker 1999; Smith 1987; 2015); but see Bickerton (1998) and Huber (1999) for some arguments against Afro-genesis. Similar work has been done on the French-lexicon Atlantic Creoles (FLACs) of the Caribbean (Parkvall 1995), Papiamentu and its relation to Portuguese Creoles in Africa (Jacobs 2012), the Pidgins of the Pacific area (Baker 1987; Drechsel 2014), and the spread of Kriol in Australia (Munro 2000). There are also more global studies such as Baker and Huber (2001) which look at a large number of P/Cs.

The remaining line of typological research signals the participation of P/C Studies in the big data revolution, and P/Cs have been included in or significantly benefitted from large-scale typological research. For example, the inclusion of Saramaccan (Good 2009a; 2009b) and Seychelles Creole (Michaelis & Rosalie 2009; Michaelis et al. 2009) in the World Loanword Database (WOLD = Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009) has given us an empirical basis for claims about the proportionate lexical contribution of input languages; however, it has also raised an old question about what should be considered loanwords in P/C languages (cf. Alleyne 1980). Also, the publication of large typological databases such as the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS=Haspelmath 2005) has allowed us to retest old claims. This has not been borne out by the data in WALS where SOV languages are more common cross-linguistically than SVO ones (Dryer 2013).

But WALS has also contributed to the debate about whether Creoles are structurally different from non-Creoles (Parkvall 2008; Bakker et al. 2011). The main questions of this debate as outlined by Muysken (1988) are: whether Creoles are (i) simpler than other languages; (ii) more similar to each other than they are to other languages; (iii) or more mixed than other languages. Holm and Patrick's (2007) quasi-parallel coverage of the structure of 18 Creole grammars provided the first step in answering question (ii). Being paper-based, the data in Holm and Patrick (2007) were not easy to manipulate to facilitate the sort of analysis required to answer these questions. Those issues were solved with the
production of the *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures* (APiCS = Michaelis et al. 2013a; 2013b; 2013c), a digital typological database (with companion volumes) that covers 130 structural features (phonological, lexical, morphosyntactic) for 76 P/Cs across the globe. Seeing that APiCs incorporates some of the features and feature values from both Holm and Patrick (2007) and WALS, it allows us to test how similar P/Cs are to each other, and--for some features--how similar they are to non-contact languages. While it is still early days yet, scholarship based on APiCS has already started to appear (Holm 2013; Gil 2014; Bakker 2015; Jungbluth 2015; Velupillai 2015). While welcoming the ascendancy of typology and the potential of large-scale typological databases such as WALS and APiCS, some scholars have admonished caution with regard to the quantity and quality of the data, the assumptions which underly data collection/selection, and the appropriateness of the methods used (e.g. computational phylogenetics) in light of the nature of the data (cf. Kouwenberg 2010a, b).

DeGraff (2003; 2004; 2005) has written against Creole exceptionalism, i.e., the ideology underpinning many approaches to Creoles that views them as different from other languages. For example, Bickerton through his LBH claimed that Creoles were distinguishable on structural grounds. The argument for Creole distinctness was taken up in full by McWhorter (1998; 2001a; 2001b) who proposed that Creoles are structurally simpler than non-Creoles and that three tell-tale signs (lack of inflectional affixation, lack of contrastive tone, and lack of opaque derivational morphology) set them off as a distinct class of languages. For critical responses to McWhorter’s Creole prototype theory, see the commentaries which appeared in the same issue of *Linguistic Typology* as McWhorter (2001a) and the papers in Ansaldo et al. (2007). A few other scholars such as Parkvall (2008) and Bakker et al. (2011) support the claims that Creoles are typologically distinct from and less complex than non-Creoles, but contrast with McWhorter in using different methods, different data, and in proposing different defining features. Arguments against distinctness and lower levels of complexity have focused on the difficulty in agreeing on a suitable metric for complexity, the fact that most P/Cs are severely under-described, and that existing criteria tend to admit languages that are not known to be P/Cs. With regard to comparative complexity, Klein (2006; 2011) has shown that Creoles are fairly average with regard to phoneme inventories and permissible syllable types, and Good (2012) argues that Creoles are paradigmatically simple, but syntagnostically average.

Whether they have gained general acceptance in the field or not, the claims, hypotheses, and theories, discussed above have indirectly contributed to the description of structural aspects of P/Cs. This has been driven by the need for data which support or refute particular theories of genesis or claims about P/C typology. Our survey of the literature has revealed particular biases in terms of a preference for (morpho)syntax over other components of grammar, and a further bias towards particular topics within components, for example, prosody (tone, intonation) in phonology and copulas and TMA marking in syntax. Additionally, far more work has been done on Atlantic varieties than on varieties spoken elsewhere. In the following paragraphs, we highlight some of the work that has been done on P/Cs especially in regard to genesis and typology.
As mentioned before, phonology has received far less attention than morphosyntax in discussions about genesis, and there is a scarcity of comprehensive work on the level of Lefebvre’s (1998) work on Haitian morphosyntax, that looks at the contribution of all input languages to the phonological system of P/Cs (see N. Smith 2008 for an overview). Scholars have generally targeted specific areas such as tone, syllable structure and prosody, mostly with a view to establishing substrate influence. On the assumption that tone would provide convincing evidence for a link between Creoles and substrate languages, it was one of the first aspects of phonology addressed by linguists working on Atlantic Creoles (Berry 1971; Daeleman 1971; Carter 1983; Good 2006; 2009c; Ham 1999; Rivera-Castillo 2011; Rountree 1972; Voorhoeve 1961). Tone continues to be of interest in the typological turn that the field has taken, and Velupillai (2015) shows that there is no Creole with a complex tone system, a few have a simple system (32%) and the majority (68%) has no tone. P/Cs with tone tend to be endogenous ones, still spoken alongside tonal input languages (Farasclas 1996; Huber 1999; Menang 2004).

A fair amount of work has also been done on phoneme inventories, syllable structure, and phonotactic constraints to test whether P/Cs tend toward a universal default (Clements 2012; Plag & Schramm 2006; Plag & Uffmann 2000; Schramm 2015; Uffmann 2007; 2008; 2009; Klein 2011). Additionally, scholars have looked at a wide range of other prosodic features (Carter 1987; Devonish 1989; 2002; Gooden et al. 2011), comparing Creoles with their substrate languages. More recent scholarship has identified features that have clear substrate origin such as prenasalized stops (Rivera-Castillo 2013; N. Smith 2007; but also Voorhoeve 1959) and implosives (N. Smith & Haabo 2007) in Saramaccan, and the implosive articulation of voiced stops in Jamaican Creole in some environments (Devonish & Harry 2004; Harry 2006).

Unfortunately, morphology and word-formation have only received minimal attention from scholars interested in genesis. This low level of interest has undoubtedly been fed by the belief that P/C languages are structurally poor in these areas. The bulk of existing work in these areas focus on word-formation processes (but cf. Good 2012) that exhibit high productivity in both P/Cs, e.g. compounding (Brousseau 1989a; 1989b; Lefebvre 1998:Chapters 11; Farquharson 2012:Chapter 8), or those which are productive but exotic, e.g. reduplication (e.g. Cassidy 1957; Kouwenberg 2003; Kouwenberg and LaCharité 2003; 2004). Only a few works so far have addressed the origin and historical development of derivational affixes in P/Cs (Lefebvre 1998:Chapter 10; DeGraff 2001; Braun 2009). Research on the morphology of P/Cs has given us insights such as that Pidgins are “in some respects morphologically richer than creoles” (Bakker 2002:3), and that reduplication is near universal in Creoles but near absent in Pidgins (Bakker 2003). See Muysken (2004) for a brief overview of morphology in P/Cs, Holm (2008) for a discussion on the loss of inflectional morphology in creolization, and Keesing’s (1988) work that includes some discussion of morphology in Melanesian pidgins, and Clements and Luís (2015) show that Korlai not only has inflectional morphology, but also exhibits a fair amount of complexity (e.g. allomorphy). The latter forms part of a growing body of research on inflectional
morbidity in the Portuguese Creoles of Asia (Cardoso 2009; Clements 1996; Luis 2008; Nunes 2011).

Treatment of P/C morphosyntax has covered a wide range of topics including multifunctionality (Lefebvre 1988; Bakir 2014) and the supposed tendency of Creoles toward semantic transparency (cf. Lefebvre 2004: Chapter 7 contra Seuren & Wekker (1986), and the number of grammatical constructions that a Creole will possess. Morphosyntax has dominated the attention of scholars and most theories of genesis devote a disproportionate amount of their attention to morphosyntax such as copulas, serial verb constructions, focus and predicate clefting, and TMA marking. Substratists argue that the foregoing features tend to have partial/full models in substrate languages, but superstratists contend that suitable patterns can be found for some of them in the nonstandard dialects of the lexifier that were involved in the contact. This can be illustrated by the debate a couple of decades ago regarding the origin and development of serial verb constructions (SVCs) in the Indian Ocean Creoles (IOC). The discussion has ranged between questions about whether SVC really exist in the IOCs (Seuren 1990, Corne et al. 1996), whether their presence should be attributed to the LBH (Bickerton 1989; 1996) or to internal development (in Mauritian Creole), but with possible substrate reinforcement (Syey 2013). Also on SVCs, see the work of Baxter (2009); Déchaine (1986), Déchaine & Lefebvre (1986), Muysken & Veenstra (1994), Sebba (1987), Veenstra (1996), Hagemeijer & Ogi (2011), and McWhorter (1992); double object constructions (Bruyn et al. 1999); copulas and other predicative constructions (Baker & Syew 1991; DeGraff 1995; Kouwenberg 1996; Siegel 2000; Winford 1997); issues of word order (Clements 2001; I. Smith 2012); inflectional categories (Neumann-Holzschuh 2006); markers of ergativity (Meakins & O'Shannessy 2010); prepositions (Li 2011); comparative constructions (Hall 1966; Gilman 1972; Valkhoff 1966; Markey 1982; Cardoso 2012), the noun phrase (Aboh & DeGraff 2014; Baptista & Guéron 2007; Grant 2007; Intumbo 2008; Lefebvre 1998), relative clauses (Huttar et al. 2013), TMA marking (Baptista 2002; Migge & Gouw 2008; Schröder 2003; Van den Berg & Aboh 2013; Luis 2008; I. Smith 1977; Velupillai 2003; Versteegh 2014; Winford 2002), copula constructions (Arend 1986; Holm 1984; Lipski 2002; McWhorter 1995; Migge 2002) focus and predicate clefting (Aboh 2007; Manfredi & Tosco 2014), valency (Michaelis 2008), and negation (Vitale 1980; Alexandre 1963; Kouwenberg 2000)

Work on the historical development of the lexis of P/Cs was seriously hampered in the early days by the under-documented status of P/Cs and many substrate languages. The situation has improved on both sides with the sporadic appearance of dictionaries for both groups of languages. For P/Cs we have, among others, Araújo and Hagemeijer (2013); Baxter and de Silva (2004); Cassidy and Le Page 1967; Fyle and Jones 1980; D’Offay & Lionnet 1982; Holm and Shilling 1982; Mondesir & Carrington 1992; Bollée 1993-2007; Allsopp 1996; Senna Fernandes and Baxter (2001); Valdman et al. 1998; Volker 2008; Winer 2009). The lexicographic documentation has been complemented by work on etymology and the investigation of semantic continuities.

Although highly relevant, etymology has been under-utilised in the study of P/Cs, but where it has been used, substrate contribution has generally been the focus (but cf. Smith and Cardoso 2004). Of particular note is the pioneering work of Turner (1949) on Africanisms in
Gullah which demonstrated that Gullah had more material from substrate languages than generally thought. Turner’s book laid the groundwork for successive investigations which sought to identify the specific lexical contribution of substrate languages to Creoles, the volume and nature of that contribution in comparison with the rest of the lexicon, and implications for the genesis of Creoles. Scholars have generally used morphemic retentions from substrate languages as an indicator of deeper structural influence from those languages (cf. Cassidy 1961; Daeleman 1971; Mittelsdorf 1978). A few have addressed methodological issues that need to be addressed in order to ensure that we get data of the highest quality (Cassidy 1986; Schwegler 2000; Farquharson 2012; Mittelsdorf 1978; N. Smith 2015b; 2015c; Smith et al. 1987) on Atlantic varieties, Mühlhäusler (1985) on the etymology of Pacific varieties, Jourdan (2000) on kinship terms in Solomon Islands Pijin, Baker (1993) on lexical Africanisms in the French-lexicon Creoles of the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean, and the volume edited by Bartens and Baker (2012) which covers various P/Cs. Unfortunately, there are several gaps in the research. For example, calquing/loan translation and other types of ‘camouflaged borrowing’ have only been dealt with in a piecemeal fashion, and not enough scholars have explored the contribution made by substrate languages at the level of semantics. Huttar (1975; 2003); Huttar et al. (2007) are among the few exceptions.

While the field has been well served by the various theories and approaches outlined above, there is now a need for greater integration of interactionally-based frameworks as well as approaches that explore issues of P/C genesis in relation to identity and power dynamics.
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