Mikael Parkvall* and Bart Jacobs*

Returning a maverick creole to the fold: the Berbice Dutch enigma revisited

https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2022-2051
Received May 31, 2022; accepted September 27, 2022; published online December 19, 2022

Abstract: Berbice Dutch was a creole language spoken in the Republic of Guyana in South America, a country first under Dutch, and later under British colonial rule. Owing mainly to Silvia Kouwenberg (*A grammar of Berbice Dutch Creole*, De Gruyter Mouton, 1994), we were blessed with a detailed synchronic documentation of Berbice Dutch before its demise. However, the formation of the language remains clouded in mystery: its grammar and (basic) lexicon display a seemingly unique mixture of Dutch (Creole) and Eastern Ijo, as a result of which the language is often portrayed as a challenge to existing contact-linguistic theory. In this paper, a scenario is proposed that, rather than challenging the said theory, is fully grounded in it: it will be argued that the language was a case of serial glottogenesis: a first stage of creolisation was later followed by language mixing. The paper furthermore presents hitherto unknown historical data pertaining to the arrival of Ijo speakers in Berbice.

Keywords: Berbice Dutch; Berbice River; creolisation; Dutch; Eastern Ijo; Guyana; intertwined languages

1 Introduction

Berbice Dutch was a creole language spoken along the Berbice River in the Republic of Guyana in South America, a country first under Dutch, and later under British colonial rule. The language was officially declared extinct in 2010. While many of its features are reminiscent of the more familiar creoles of the Caribbean, Berbice Dutch is considered a highly atypical creole language. The main reason for this is the unusually large impact on the language of one single substrate, (Eastern) Ijo, an impact first recognised by Smith et al. (1987). The majority of the lexicon is of Dutch origin, but around 30% of the basic vocabulary is derived from Ijo

***Corresponding authors: Mikael Parkvall**, Institute for Linguistics, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden, E-mail: parkvall@ling.su.se; and **Bart Jacobs**, Institute for Romance Philology, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland, E-mail: bart.jacobs@uj.edu.pl

(Kouwenberg 1994: 530). This is unusual: the majority of creoles derive their basic vocabularies from a single predominant source, referred to as the 'lexifier'.

Berbice Dutch also has plenty of Ijo function words including tense/mood/aspect markers, and its entire arsenal of bound (or cliticised) morphemes hails from the same source (e.g. Bakker 2017; Kouwenberg 2012b). This, again, is unusual, as the average creole's function words, for the most part, tend to be unbound and to trace back to the lexifier etymologically.

As a result of its atypical typological profile, and owing to the above-average quality of documentation of the language (Robertson 1979 and especially Kouwenberg 1994), Berbice Dutch has obtained a prominent place in creolistic discourse. However, the origins and history of the creole remain poorly understood: two overlapping issues remain unresolved:

i. Diachrony: Why is Berbice Dutch so different from the majority of creoles, despite having emerged in what seems to have been a rather similar plantation setting? Which linguistic processes were fundamental in its formation? Could this creole be the result of processes other than those that shaped most other creoles, and does it represent a challenge to Thomason's (1997) taxonomy which stipulates that there are three and only three types of contact languages, viz. pidgins, creoles and intertwined languages?
ii. History: It is clear that at some point in history, speakers of Ijo must have disembarked in the colony of Berbice. Saliently, however, such an arrival has as of yet not been identified.[1] Knowing when speakers of Ijo arrived in Berbice, and in which numbers, would obviously contribute greatly to our understanding of the origins and nature of the language.

Below we offer solutions which, when combined, allow us to propose a scenario which pinpoints fairly accurately when and how Berbice Dutch was formed. Section 2 addresses the diachronic question. Whilst our account of the origins of Berbice Dutch is new, the linguistic processes we invoke are not: we argue that the creole constitutes a case of what one might call 'serial glottogenesis', in that a first phase of creolisation was, a few decades later, followed by a second phase of language mixing. In the historical Section 3 we discuss a particular ship that has hitherto gone unnoticed in the literature but which we think brought the right speakers to the right place at exactly the right time.

1 This gap in the historical record is sometimes (and rightly so, in our view) put forward as an example of why, in any discussion on creole genesis, priority should be given to linguistic over historical data, and by extension of the potential value of linguistic data to historiography (e.g. Robertson 1994: 68; Smith 1999; Parkvall 2000: 149).

2 Diachrony: the Dutch-Ijo mixture explained

(1) is an example of what Berbice Dutch looked like before it became extinct. Ijo-derived words and morphemes are in bold.

(1) *Tigri* ***ma*** *deki skelpata* ***jɛrma*** *fi ʃi* ***jɛrma.***
tiger IRR take tortoise woman for 3.POSS woman

Tigri ***jɛrma*** *doto* ***-tɛ,*** *so* ***o*** *lahan* ***-tɛ*** *tigri mɛtɛ ʃi* ***toko -apu.***
tiger woman die PFV so 3s leave PFV tiger with 3.POSS child PL

So nau skelpata horo ***-tɛ*** ***bifi*** *da tigri* ***ma*** *deki ʃi* ***jɛrma***
so now tortoise hear PFV say COP tiger IRR take 3.POSS woman

'Tiger is going to take Tortoise's wife for his wife. Tiger's wife died, so she left Tiger and his children. So now, Tortoise heard that Tiger will take his wife' (Kouwenberg 1994: 497).

Smith et al. (1987: 52) estimate that 27% of the creole's 200 word Swadesh list is Ijo-derived. By comparison, the 200 word Swadesh list of the neighbouring maroon creole Saramaccan, despite being known for its strong African component, contains no more than 4% African-derived lexemes (Good 2009) and that number includes words not from one single, but from at least three different West African source languages (Kouwenberg 2012a: 2). Note also that the more basic the vocabulary, the stronger the Ijo contribution: Kouwenberg (1994: 530) counted 27% Ijo-isms in the 200 versus 38% in the 100 word Swadesh list. In most creoles that ratio is reverse. However, while unusual, it is not necessary, as we shall see, to invoke new theories of contact language formation in order to account for this particular typological profile. Let us first review the state of the art.

2.1 State of the art

The prevailing view in creolistic scholarship is that Berbice Dutch is a product of the same processes that gave rise to other creoles but with one key difference, to wit an exceptionally homogeneous (Ijo) substrate input. Thus, the early Berbice colony is considered "the only known single-substrate plantation setting in the Caribbean" (McWhorter 2005: 255) and a colony in which "all the substrate speakers were a linguistically homogeneous group" (Gross 2000: 78).[2]

2 Gross's (2000: 67–69) "homogeneous substrate hypothesis", which aims to explain why Berbice Dutch is the way it is, is a textbook example of circular reasoning as it uses the (unproven)

Accordingly, Berbice Dutch has become known as "a creole whose basis lies in a single West African language" (Smith et al. 1987: 79) and as "the only creole language of the Caribbean which has been identified with a single substrate" (Kouwenberg 2012a: 35).[3] Very similar statements and/or summaries can be found across the literature (e.g. Holm 2000: 113; Michaelis 2020: 12; Mufwene 2001: 133; Robertson 1994: 69; Sidnell 2005: 548, 550; Thomason 2001: 160). We are, in other words, dealing with a consensus view which has not yet been put to the test.

Integral to this consensus is the view that the Ijo speakers predominated in the early slave population of Berbice: Smith et al. (1987: 50) hypothesised "an initial period in the seventeenth century during which one African language – Eastern Ijo – was spoken in Berbice". Surprisingly, this view has more than once been presented as documented fact in subsequent scholarship. For instance, without providing references, Gross (2000: 67) maintains that "the *historical record* indicates that the slaves brought to the colony during this time spoke a single language, Eastern Ijo", and Schneider (2010: 486) likewise claims that "[i]t is *known* that all slaves there brought the same African language to the contact situation" (emphasis added in both cases). The sobering reality is that it is not "known" that all the early slaves were Ijo, much less that this is shown by "the historical record". Such records simply do not exist, or are at least unknown to slave trade historians. We will return to the issue in Section 3.1.

Ever since the identification by Smith et al. (1987) of the Ijo contribution to Berbice Dutch, a range of scholars from different branches of linguistics have commented on the potential theoretical implications, a common theme being that the case of Berbice Dutch shows creoles can indeed be formed in a contact setting involving only two languages:

- "The assumption of heterogeneity of ethnic input at the substrate level may be challenged, as well as the assumption that this nascent language was necessary for communication across slave groups of different ethnic origin" (Robertson 1993: 301).
- "This suggests that creolisation can arise from the contact of two languages only, provided that exposure to one of the languages is indeed restricted. It also provides striking evidence of the possible role of the substrate language in

conclusion that the substrate of Berbice Dutch was homogeneously Ijo as evidence for the said hypothesis.

3 Kouwenberg (2013a: 707, 2013b: 889), who is the prime expert on Berbice Dutch, suggests that the language was created by mixed-race children. It might be added that throughout her oeuvre Kouwenberg has kept a relatively low profile with regard to the genesis issue, and does not seem to be deeply invested in any specific genesis theory.

the formation of a Creole. The nature of Berbice Dutch Creole thus forces us to reconsider basic questions of Creole genesis" (Comrie 1998: 990).

– "For creoles with unusual demographic histories, such as Berbice Dutch […], evidence points to a sole substrate and therefore a sole source of the Matrix Language frame" (Myers-Scotton 2001: 237).

If formed in a two-language setting, it follows that Berbice Dutch poses a challenge to contact-linguistic theory that distinguishes pidgins and creoles on the one hand from intertwined languages on the other, insofar as the former are usually assumed to arise in *multi*lingual, the latter in *bi*lingual settings (e.g. McWhorter 1999: 25; Winford 1997: 10).

Others have put forth the case of Berbice Dutch as counterevidence to Bickerton's (1981) Language Bioprogram which had obtained a central position in 1980s creolistic discourse and which rejected substantial substrate influence in creole formation. Berbice Dutch, allegedly, evidenced not only that substrate influence exists but that it can in fact be very strong: Bickerton (1981) says that "it is at least highly questionable whether even an absolute majority of speakers of a single substrate language can influence the formation of a creole." The case of Eastern Ijo and Berbice Dutch would seem to provide an answer to this question (Smith et al. (1987: 79; cf. e.g. Kouwenberg 2006, 2007; Lefebvre 1998; Robertson 1993).

Berbice Dutch has also earned a place in more typology-oriented discourse, and this for two main reasons. Firstly, the handful of bound morphemes in Berbice Dutch have been used to argue against McWhorter's (1998 and elsewhere) 'Creole Prototype' hypothesis, which holds that creoles are characterised, amongst other things, by an almost complete lack of productive morphology (e.g. Farquharson 2007; Kouwenberg and Patrick 2003: 182; Mufwene 2014). Secondly, the rather strict SVO word order of the language, despite both Dutch and Ijo being (at least underlyingly) SOV, has been claimed to show not only that SVO is a creole universal but that it is a universally more unmarked order altogether (Baltin 2007: 77; Green and Vervaeke 1997: 160; Lipski 2005: 246; Meisel 2011: 106; Muysken 1988: 290; Roberts 2001: 307).

In sum: to account for the creole's unusual character, it has become accepted as a (documented) fact that the substrate of Berbice Dutch was homogeneously Ijo. This assumption, in turn, has been alleged to have a number of implications on theories of language contact.[4]

4 An outlier here is Mufwene (2007: 71), according to whom Berbice Dutch is not very remarkable after all, because its formation "seems comparable to […] the emergence of the Romance languages from the gradual shift by Southwestern European populations from their Celtic languages

2.2 What the cross-linguistic evidence tells us

Although the glossonym does not reflect this,[5] Berbice Dutch is universally considered a creole language. This is due both to its social history – its having emerged as the language of slaves in a colonial plantation context – and to its linguistic characteristics, most notably a loss of morphology in relation to the input languages. However, whereas creoles typically have a vocabulary mainly derived from one single language (the lexifier), and a grammatical structure which only vaguely resembles the various languages that were present during the formation process, Berbice Dutch is obviously different. The main difference is that this creole presents similarities with mixed or intertwined languages.

Intertwined languages (in the literature also known as 'intertwiners' and 'mixed languages' among several other soubriquets) are speech varieties exhibiting an extreme mixture of two clearly identifiable source languages, e.g. French and Cree in the case of Michif (Bakker 1997), Spanish and Quechua in the case of Media Lengua (Muysken 1981), or Mbugu and Cushitic in the case of Ma'a (Mous 2003). Intertwined languages and creoles coincide in that (a) their formation is the direct result of intense language contact, (b) they are not mutually intelligible with their source languages and (c) both types of language are often thought to emerge rather abruptly, in the space of only one or two decades.[6] However, McWhorter (1999) already noted the importance of distinguishing taxonomically between creoles and intertwined languages. To begin with, the very *raison d'être* of pidgins and creoles differs from that of intertwined languages. Whereas the former emerge in settings where the creation of a new vernacular is a matter of survival, intertwined languages by contrast are created to mark or flag a new (bicultural) in-group identity (McWhorter 1999: 25).

Moreover, in strictly structural terms, there are crucial differences which, in most cases, allow us to easily tell creoles and intertwined languages apart. Firstly, overall, creole grammars are, as noted, characterised by structural (especially morphological) reduction *vis-à-vis* the source languages, while mixed languages

to Vulgar Latin", with the main difference being that the substrate population had been relocated from their homeland in the Berbice case. Like everybody else, however, he subscribes to the notion of only two languages being in contact.

5 The customary name makes it sound as if the language were a variety of Dutch rather than a language in its own right, which it clearly is, as it is mutually wholly unintelligible with Dutch. 'Berbice Creole Dutch' would therefore be preferable, in line with the common PLACE + LEXIFIER + 'creole' way of referring to creole languages. While we are not fond of the traditional label, we retain it here for convenience.

6 We are aware that the claim of abrupt formation, though generally accepted for intertwined languages, is controversial for creoles, but that is not vital to the issue at hand.

are not. Secondly, as noted, intertwined languages display the intertwining (or mixing) of two clearly identifiable source languages.[7] This is normally not the case for creoles, whose (basic) vocabulary – including function words – is etymologically attributable to one, and only one, clearly identifiable source (the lexifier),[8] while the grammar (with the occasional exception of more or less isolated features), is not clearly traceable to any of the (alleged) input languages.[9]

Now, Berbice Dutch appears to occupy a place in between these two language types: on the one hand, it displays creole-like levels of restructuring of especially the Dutch component; on the other, in keeping with intertwined languages, the basic vocabulary is composed of material from two (and only two)[10] clearly identifiable source languages: (Creole) Dutch and Eastern Ijo.

Interestingly, Berbice Dutch is not alone in straddling the border between creole and intertwined language. There is in fact a small group of languages that combine the characteristics of both types and display an unusual amount of mixedness in the basic vocabulary. This group could be taken to include Angolar, Saramaccan, Indo-Portuguese, Zamboangueño, Papiamentu, Gurindji Kriol and Light Warlpiri.[11] The similarities between these varieties should not be exaggerated, as the nature and degree of the mixing differs significantly from one case to another. But one thing they do have in common is that they share typical features of both creoles and intertwined languages. More precisely, the grammatical matrix of these languages appears to be 'creoloid', whereas the basic vocabulary shows a considerable mixedness of two clearly identifiable source languages (see Table 2 below).

But do these languages really challenge Thomason's (1997: 3, 4) tripartite taxonomy for contact languages (pidgins – creoles – intertwined languages)? Do we need to expand linguistic theory with a new process of contact-induced change

7 Intertwined languages are often, but not always, characterised by a lexicon-grammar split. Canonical examples include languages such as Ma'a, Media Lengua and Para-Romani, which (roughly speaking) combine the lexicon of one language with the structure of another. One of the best known intertwined languages, Michif (Bakker 1997), diverges from that pattern in that it, again roughly speaking, consists of French NPs and Cree VPs.

8 For most creoles, the lexifier contributes over 90% of the entire vocabulary. This percentage is usually higher still in the most basic vocabulary.

9 To be sure, creole grammars do often incorporate elements from several of the input languages (or families) but they are far from replicating or copying (subsystems from) any input language in particular.

10 Provided one excludes a lexical subset primarily relating to local realia most of which hail from Arawak.

11 The first five are typically referred to as creoles in the literature, while the last two are more commonly grouped with the intertwined languages. Additional varieties could of course be added, depending on how restrictively one interprets the concepts.

in order to account for their existence? Our answer to these questions is negative. Rather, all of the above-mentioned varieties can easily be accounted for through a succession of *first* creolisation and *then* mixing. Representing what one might call cases of 'serial glottogenesis', these are languages that in their history appear to have undergone not one, but two consecutive, extreme processes of contact-induced restructuring.

For both Gurindji Creole and Light Warlpiri, such a two-stage development is in fact acknowledged: both languages formed and nativised in the 1970s, and their developments (in both cases the intertwining of an English-lexicon Creole with an aboriginal language) were observed by modern linguists (O'Shannessy [2005] and elsewhere; Meakins [2012] and elsewhere). For Angolar, Saramaccan, Zamboangueño, and Papiamentu, the succession of first creolisation and then mixing was not observed but can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty. Strong cases have been made for their descendance from, respectively, Sãotomense, Sranan, (Manila Bay) Chabacano and Cape Verdean Creole.[12] Indo-Portuguese might theoretically always have been as mixed as it is now, but the fact that its non-European substrate has also acted as adstrate for centuries at the very least justifies speculating that it was once less mixed, resembling more 'traditional' creoles.[13] And indeed, for several varieties of Indo-Portuguese, there are very strong indications to this effect (e.g. Clements 2009; Smith 1977: 154, 1984: 298 and elsewhere; Cardoso 2021; Ladhams 2009: 290).

12 Tellingly, Sãotomense largely lacks the lexical Bantu material found in Angolar, Sranan the Portuguese component that characterises Saramaccan, and roughly the same is true for Cape Verdean which lacks the Spanish material found in Papiamentu, whereas the Manila varieties of Chabacano lack the Visayan features typical of Zamboangueño. For Angolar, see e.g. Maurer (1992: 164), Lorenzino (1998), Ferraz (1983: 122); for Saramaccan see e.g. McWhorter (1997: 13–19), Parkvall (2000: 133–134), Smith (1999), Smith and Cardoso (2004); for Zamboangueño see e.g. Lipski (2010), Parkvall and Jacobs (2018); Jacobs and Parkvall (2020); for Papiamentu see Quint (2000) and Jacobs (2012).

13 In popular scientific discourse, creoles are often mistakenly described as mixtures. Taking well-known creoles such as Cape Verdean, Jamaican, or Haitian, typically no more than 5–10% of the vocabulary derives etymologically from sources other than the lexifier. Furthermore, the more basic the vocabulary, the less mixed it usually is. The same holds true for the majority of creoles world-wide, regardless of the lexifier. To be sure, creoles can be said to be "mixed" insofar as the lexifier vocabulary is combined with a grammar of other origin, but this "other" does not equal any previously existing language(s). In other words, most creoles do not represent a mixture of existing linguistic systems. And while individual features of creole grammars can be attributed to existing (substrate or adstrate) languages, this never entails entire subsystems of the grammar. Palenquero, for example, displays a number of pronominal features that appear borrowed from Kikongo, but its pronominal system as a whole is not remotely identical to that of Kikongo (Schwegler 2002). Likewise, Saramaccan displays serial-verb constructions that appear calqued on Gbe, but its verbal system as a whole is clearly not copied from Gbe (McWhorter 1992).

In sum, for all seven mixed creoles, an earlier, less mixed (and more traditional-creole-like) state is either attested, or can reasonably be inferred. Their synchronic character can be explained through the subsequent mixing of a creole proper with another language; instead of invoking a novel process of contact-induced change, therefore, we can postulate a succession of two existing ones: first creolisation, then mixing (see Table 2). Let us now go into a little more linguistic detail as to why we think Berbice Dutch does indeed fit the same mould as Saramaccan, Gurindji Kriol, etc., and why a two-language creolisation scenario does not hold water.

2.3 What the Berbice Dutch data tell us: creolisation followed by mixing

Berbice Dutch is widely and uncontroversially classified as a creole language. The main reason for this is that the Dutch component displays grammatical features and degrees of simplification that are typical of creoles. Interestingly, however, the creole-like appearance of Berbice Dutch is visible mainly in the Dutch-derived component. If we were to isolate only the Dutch part of Berbice Dutch, nothing would suggest anything other than run-of-the-mill creolisation. But for the Ijo-derived parts of the grammar, this is much less obvious. To be sure, the Ijo component is reduced as well (Kouwenberg 1994: 237, 290, 2009, 2013a: 706), but less so: as noted, all bound or clitic elements in Berbice Dutch are of Ijo origin (Table 1). Bound morphology (in particular inflexions) is rather scarce in creoles in the first place, and when it does occur, the morphemes are rarely derived from substrate languages.

Equally problematic for the two-language creolisation account is the fact that we know of no other (proven) cases where creolisation occurred in a setting with

Table 1: Affixes and clitics in Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1994).

PERFECTIVE	*-tɛ*[a]
PLURAL	*-apu*
IMPERFECTIVE	*-arɛ*
NEGATION	*=ka(nɛ)*
NOMINALISER	*=jɛ*
(CAUSATIVE	*-ma*)[b]

[a]With possible influence from Dutch PAST *-də* ~ *-tə* (Bruyn and Veenstra 1993: 73).
[b]No longer productive, but believed to have been so.

two and only two languages.[14] We assume that the main reason why this has not happened is that a two-language situation offers both sufficient opportunity and sufficient motivation for speakers of one language to acquire that of the others, so that there is less need for a new language to be created. In a setting where dozens of languages are present, by contrast, learning each and every one of them is nigh impossible. In other words, the opportunity to learn the language(s) of other groups diminishes proportionally to the number of languages present in a contact situation. To be sure, two-language pidgins do exist, Russenorsk being a well-known example, but these are numerically limited. Moreover, such trade pidgins, we think, are unlikely to ever nativise to form a creole, due to the very nature of the setting in which they emerge, i.e. settings where the contact is mostly transactional and trade-based so that there is not much incentive to learn the other language more than in a pidgin form. Therefore, while a two-language creolisation scenario is theoretically possible, the chances of it happening appear to be slim. In short, the two-language (Dutch + Ijo) creolisation scenario proposed in the literature fails to explain why Berbice Dutch has the appearance of a creole in the first place.[15]

A hypothesis that takes all of the above into account, is that Berbice Dutch is the product of a creole that sometime after crystallisation mixed with another, non-creole, language, namely Eastern Ijo. Most importantly, this two-stage development accounts for the nature of both the Dutch component, which is characterised by the absence of affixes from Dutch – these were, as per usual, lost in the initial creolisation process – and the morphologically richer Ijo component, which would have been borrowed (or mixed) into the language at a later date. We propose, in other words, that before speakers of Ijo arrived on the stage, the population of the Berbice colony used a more conventional-looking creole, a variety more similar to (but, we believe, not related to) the other two known Dutch-lexicon creoles in the Caribbean, Negerhollands and Skepi. Let us label it the 'Early Berbice Plantation Creole', in order to be able to refer to it. Needless to say, if the Early Berbice Plantation Creole was created among enslaved Africans speaking languages other than Ijo, one might expect these other languages to have left at least some linguistic traces in Berbice Dutch.

14 Indeed, McWhorter (1999:25) made a point of the number of languages involved specifically determining the nature of the outcome: "[i]n contexts conditioning a culturally intermediate identity, of which plantations are one of several, an intertwined language results when there is one substrate language, and a Creole when there are two or more."

15 We are of course aware of the work of Schwegler (e.g. 2011 and elsewhere) treating Palenquero as the result of an encounter between Spanish and Kikongo only. Parkvall and Jacobs (2020), however, challenge this claim and present an alternative – and, we think, more economical – formation scenario for Palenquero involving more than two languages at the onset.

Indeed, though not abundantly, they did leave traces. The dictionary part of Kouwenberg (1994) contains about 1200 words, of which about 200 are Ijo.[16] For a 'traditional' creole, we would perhaps expect at most fifty Africanisms in a thousand-word sample. Needless to say, in our scenario, when Ijo replaced parts of the vocabulary, it would have replaced not only Dutch words, but also non-Ijo Africanisms. And the same is true for borrowings from Arawak: these too may have replaced some of the original Africanisms. Therefore, tentatively, we would perhaps expect a couple of dozen non-Ijo Africanisms, give or take.

As it happens, going through all the lexical items for which Kouwenberg (1994) did not provide a conclusive etymon, we were able to identify around three dozen potential non-Ijo African items in Berbice Dutch. If we disregard the items that are virtually pan-Caribbean and/or pan-African, we are left with around 29 items. Eight of these are common in the English-lexified creoles including Guyanese (a long-time adstrate language of Berbice Dutch), and are therefore likely to represent post-formative loans. That leaves us with some 19 possibly relevant words, listed in the Appendix.[17]

To sum up the above, a plausible scenario is that Dutch creolised in the mid-17th century along the Berbice River in a ethnolinguistically heterogeneous plantation setting. The resulting Early Berbice Plantation Creole crystallised and nativised, before it went through a second phase of substantial restructuring in close contact with Eastern Ijo. As such, instead of being an aberrancy within contact-linguistic theory, Berbice Dutch has earned a place among the aforementioned "mixed" creoles, summarised in Table 2.

While the linguistic traces of Ijo in Berbice are undisputed, as of yet no historical documentation of the arrival of speakers of this language in the colony was known to exist. Below we present such documentation. We also discuss historical-demographic data that helps understanding how these speakers were able to have such a significant impact on local speech patterns.

---

16 Not all of the remainder is Dutch – there is a stock of non-basic cultural vocabulary of Amerindian (mainly Arawak) origin, as well as a number of contributions from Guyanese English Creole, the language which ultimately replaced Berbice Dutch.

17 Only four ships are known to have delivered slaves to Berbice before the arrival of the *Antony Galeij* (see Section 3). These would not have been the only ones to do so, but the around 600 Africans that they together disembarked in the colony would nevertheless have constituted about half of the total imports, judging from Postma's (1992: 292) estimate. The slaves on board these four ships were acquired in Lower Guinea (Slave Coast and Gold Coast) and Kikongo-speaking areas (corresponding roughly to the overall Dutch African slave trade during the 17th and early 18th century). Therefore, we would expect the potential pre-Ijo lexical Africanisms in Berbice Dutch (or those of the Early Berbice Plantation Creole) to be first and foremost of Lower Guinean and Kikongo origin and this is indeed what we find (see Appendix).

Table 2: (Creole) languages that arose through a succession of creolisation and mixing.[a]

Language	Location	Contributing creole	Contributing other language
Angolar	São Tomé & Príncipe	Sãotomense	Kimbundu
Saramaccan	Surinam	Sranan	Portuguese (Creole?)[b]
Indo-Portuguese	India + Sri Lanka	a hypothesised less mixed Portuguese creole	Indian languages
Zamboangueño	Philippines	(Manila Bay) Chabacano	Visayan languages
Papiamentu	Aruba, Bonaire & Curaçao	Cape Verdean	Spanish
Gurindji Kriol	Australia	Australian Kriol	Gurindji
Light Warlpiri	Australia	Australian Kriol	Warlpiri
Berbice Dutch	**Guyana**	**Early Berbice Plantation Creole**	**Eastern Ijo**

[a]To be sure, we are not claiming that these languages are 'pure' intertwined languages in the strict sense of that label. Rather, what we are saying is that they display considerable mixing that is reminiscent of intertwining, and that this mixing appears to postdate the birth of the creole that provided the basis for the language. We are also aware that, in the cases of Angolar, Saramaccan, Indo-Portuguese, Zamboangueno, Papiamentu and Berbice Dutch, this mixing is visible mainly at the level of the vocabulary (including the very basic vocabulary), and not so much at the level of grammar. Gurindji Kriol and Light Warlpiri are arguably more 'genuine' intertwined languages, in the sense that they combine wholesale grammatical subsystems from two different source languages and that it is more difficult to ascertain which of the two input languages 'came first'. [b]Djutongo, a Portuguese-lexicon creole believed to have been spoken alongside (proto-)Sranan on plantations owned by Jews (many of whom were exiles from Brazil) in the early days of the colony, has been claimed to be responsible for the Portuguese lexicon of Saramaccan; Smith 1999). Jacobs and Quint (2016) tentatively propose a link with Cape Verdean Creole. Smith (1999) and Jacobs and Quint (2016) agree that the Lusophone vocabulary in Saramaccan seems to hail from two different sources.

3 History: the right speakers to the right place at the right time

Sadly, the formidable linguistic documentation of Berbice Dutch is not matched by the historical. In fact, the history of the Berbice colony, founded in 1627 by the Van Pere family, is much less well documented than most other plantation colonies where creoles emerged. As Kouwenberg (2013a: 275) notes, "[n]othing is known from the historical record of the provenance of slaves in Berbice for the entire 17th century", and according to Kars (2009: 193), "Almost nothing is known about Berbice before 1720". In fact, well over a century earlier Netscher (1888: 59) complained that it was unusually difficult to locate archival information on the subject. This is not so much a result of a lack of scholarly effort as it is of the fact that the Berbice colony, in addition to being geographically remote, was privately owned by the Van Peres until 1714. The administrative records pertaining to this period are correspondingly scarce.

Following the attack on Berbice by the French in 1712 (to which we shall return below), private investors saved the colony from bankruptcy. After a few transitional years, in 1720, with the financial backing of the West India Company, the *Sociëteit van Berbice* was founded (mirroring the *Sociëteit van Suriname*) and tasked with administrating and reviving the colony (Kouwenberg 2013a; Robertson 1979; Smith 1962). The documentation for that period vastly improved compared to the pre-1720 period.

We now turn to the sorely missing historical link: when did speakers of Ijo arrive in the colony and by which numbers? And which historical-demographic circumstances allowed them to impact the local lingua franca so significantly?

3.1 On the timing of the arrival of Ijo speakers

Smith et al. (1987), who discovered the linguistic link with Ijo, still represent the state of the art as far as the purely historical side of the story is concerned. As mentioned in Section 2.1, they believed Ijos must have predominated from the outset of the colony, a view that has been adopted by subsequent scholarship as (near-)fact. The arguments they put forth to support this view are threefold:

i. In the 17th century the Dutch West India Company was known to trade slaves in the Calabar region where Eastern Ijo is and was spoken.
ii. It is assumed that a (presumably small) contingent of Ijos could only have imposed so much of their own language on the colony's emerging lingua franca if they were part of the founding population. After all, *other things being equal*, founder populations are likely to have a greater impact on local language development (or on any other culturally transmitted behaviour for that matter) than newcomers.[18]
iii. The lack of historical evidence of the arrival of Ijos in Berbice is easiest explained by assuming the Ijos were early arrivals: only by being early arrivals would they have been able to 'escape' the historical records of the colony, which are particularly deficient for the 17th century when the colony was privately owned.

On closer inspection, however, these arguments are not enough to make a strong case. As for (i), it suffices to note that a direct link between the 17th-century Dutch slave trade in Calabar and the privately owned Berbice colony has never been

18 Unsurprisingly, Mufwene (2001: 66) adduces Berbice Dutch as proof of the so-called "Founder Principle" (i.e. the idea that early arrivals will have more impact on the emerging creole than later ones) – another illustration of circular reasoning.

established, and Calabar was only one of several areas where the Dutch traded in slaves. As for (ii), while we do not deny that early arrivals would in general be more likely to exert an influence on any budding contact language, it is not the case that the strong contribution of Ijo to Berbice Dutch can *only* be explained by assuming the Ijos were there from the start. In fact, we would argue the opposite is true. After all, the contribution of Ijo to Berbice Dutch, although certainly impressive, is quantitatively secondary to that of our hypothesised Early Berbice Plantation Creole. Under that hypothesis, it follows that the relevant contingent of Ijos must have arrived sometime *after* the emergence and stabilisation of the said Creole, rather than from the outset of the colony. As for (iii), we do indeed agree that the arrival of the relevant contingent of Ijos likely pre-dates the afore-mentioned foundation of the *Sociëteit van Berbice* in 1720. After all, the *Sociëteit* prompted a vast improvement of the quality of administration – and thus its historical documentation – of the colony. It therefore seems likely that if a significant number of Ijo speakers had arrived in the post-1720 period, the colony's post-1720 archives would have revealed this. Furthermore, whereas the number of plantations hovered around a dozen or so in 1714, in 1732 the colony counted 10 times as many (Kouwenberg 2009: 118). Needless to say, this expansion would not have favoured a mixing scenario involving two, and only two, languages.[19]

But while we acknowledge that the Ijos had most likely arrived in Berbice before 1720, that clearly does not make the view that they were present from the outset inescapable. After all, the window of opportunity for their arrival comprises almost a century since the colony was founded in 1627. And, as noted, the linguistic nature of Berbice Dutch is rather suggestive of a first phase in which Dutch creolised and then nativised, and a second, later phase of mixing following the arrival of Ijo speakers. In sum, we diverge strongly from the existing historical consensus in as far as we do not think the first generation of slaves in the colony was a homogeneous group of Ijo speakers. Rather, we think the Ijos arrived *before* 1720, but *after* the development and stabilisation of the Early Berbice Plantation Creole (which we may tentatively situate in the second third of the 17th century).[20]

19 We can in any case be fairly certain that the language mixing process had been fully completed well before the end of the 18th century: this can be inferred from a word list produced in 1794 by Pieter Constantijn Groen (Robertson 1994). The list contains a total of 44 "Berbiciaansche Woorde", many of which are Ijo, and all of which closely resemble modern-day Berbice Dutch in form and meaning. Also note that the transcripts of the hearings in the wake of the 1763 rebellion contain a few Ijo items (Kars, p. c.).

20 It furthermore seems worth pointing out that, if Ijos dominated the slave population in the early days, one might expect to find traces of this in the toponymic domain. Admittedly, place names in plantation colonies typically derive either from aboriginal or from European languages, but not rarely are there at least a few which can plausibly be derived from one or more of the non-

3.2 The *Sint Antony Galeij* (1712/13, captain: Pieter Thebeu)

Is it possible to pinpoint the arrival of the contingent of Ijo speakers – and therewith the starting point of Berbice Dutch – with more precision? We think it is. In fact, we are able to suggest a slave ship that could have brought the right speakers to the right place at exactly the right time. The ship in question is the *Sint Antony Galeij* (#11918 in the *Voyages* [2013] database for the Atlantic slave trade) which left Zeeland in 1712 and is thought to have disembarked 403 slaves in Berbice before returning to Zeeland in 1713. The *Antony Galeij* was a so-called *lorrendraaier*, the contemporary Dutch term for 'interloper', in other words a contraband slave ship operating outside the control of the official trading companies. This may be part of the reason why the *Galeij* was able to escape the official historical record for so long. And it is probably for that same reason that the *Galeij*'s 'principal place of slave purchase' is listed in *Voyages* (2013) as 'unspecified'. While it is known that the ship also bought some slaves on Príncipe (listed as 'second place of slave purchase' in the *Voyages* database), needless to say this ship is only worthy of consideration if there are clues of its having loaded (the majority of) its human cargo in southern Nigeria, in Ijo-speaking territory.

Such clues are indeed available: The captain of the *Galeij* was a certain Pieter Thebeu, who is known to have made two other slaving trips to Africa, undertaken in 1709 and 1715. On neither of these did he sell slaves in Berbice. Crucially, however, on both journeys he is known to have bought slaves in Calabar, a contemporary slave-trade hotspot situated in the Bight of Biafra, in Ijo-speaking territory. As ship commanders often preferred to trade in locations they were already familiar with, it is anything but implausible to assume that the *Galeij*'s 'principal place of slave purchase' was likewise Calabar.

Note that in historical sources as well as in contemporary scholarship, there is some confusion as to the scope of the geographic term 'Calabar' (found under a

indigenous substrate languages (i. e. usually of African slaves). In plantation colonies where the original substrate is known to be rather homogenous, such place names are considerably more common. A case in point is Réunion, where place-names of Malagasy origin are rather plentiful. Incidentally, the early settlement of Réunion also featured quite a bit of intermarriage between French settlers and Malagasy women, with mixed-race children as the expected result. That is not dissimilar to what Kouwenberg (2013) hypothesises for Berbice. Yet, as far as we can determine, there is no place-name in Berbice which is of undoubtable Ijo derivation: the name of the estate Mingemama, just outside the plantation area along the Canje river, might be Ijo-derived but could equally be Berbice Dutch. While a few more may be African, none looks specifically Ijo to us.

number of different spellings in older sources).[21] Kolapo (2004) deals extensively with the issue, and explains that, historically, three Calabars must be distinguished: 1. New Calabar, or simply Calabar, in the Bight of Biafra, Eastern Nigeria, at the mouth of the Calabar River; 2. Old Calabar, also at the mouth of the Calabar River, in-between New Calabar and Bonny; 3. Old Calabar, or simply Calabar (current-day Calabar), some 80 km eastward, up the Cross River. The first two Calabars are of main interest to us, as those were situated on the eastern fringe of Ijo-speaking territory, whereas the third Calabar was and is Efik-speaking.[22]

To make sure that the Calabar reference in *Voyages* (2013) indeed refers to Ijo-speaking Calabar, we went through the archival documents pertaining to Pieter Thebeu's journey to the Bight of Biafra in the interloper the *Jonge Elseboom* in 1714–15, which, as noted, is registered in *Voyages* (2013) as having traded slaves in Calabar. The *Elseboom* was intercepted by the Dutch West India Company cruiser the *Faam* in 1715, as a result of which Thebeu's travel journal, as well as the corresponding court-case documents, are found in the Dutch national archives.[23] From Thebeu's journal, it is clear that as a captain of the *Elseboom* in 1715 he spent more than two months off the coast of Bonny (<Bany>) Island, sailing back and forth between Bonny and nearby places like Fokke (<Cap de Focq>, at the time also known under the Dutch name *Wyn-Dorp*), New Calabar (<Galbary>) and Old Calabar (<vieux Galbary>) whilst also passing by Sangama (<Signamma>), St. Bartolome, Rio Tilana and Rio St. Nicolas. All these places are situated in the Ijo-speaking Calabar area, so we can assert with a high degree of certainty that in 1709 and 1715, Thebeu purchased slaves in the Ijo-speaking (as opposed to the Efik-speaking) Calabar area. Moreover, a reading of the diary allows for the conclusion that Thebeu was a regular customer in this Ijo-speaking Calabar area. In the final pages of his *Elseboom* journal,[24] he explicitly mentions trading slaves with both the "Roy de Bany" and the "Roy de Calbary". When the latter promises to sell Thebeu a "120 slaves in 4 weeks", Thebeu is hopeful to have these delivered in time, because "*on every previous journey that I made to this place*, he [the King of Calbary] has always kept his promise"[25] (emphasis and translation ours). The sum of these data, we

21 We are grateful to Norval Smith for reminding us of this.

22 See Kolapo (2004:117–123) for further details and discussion; see also the map published in Prevoste (1748, in-between pp 52–53; it is also reprinted in Paesie 2008: 247).

23 Nationaal Archief, *Archief Nederlandse Bezittingen ter Kuste van Guinea*, file 261, pp 192–495.

24 Nationaal Archief, *Archief Nederlandse Bezittingen ter Kuste van Guinea*, file 261, pp 333–495.

25 Nationaal Archief, *Archief Nederlandse Bezittingen ter Kuste van Guinea*, file 261, pp 485–490. The precise quote in French (and in Thebeu's original spelling) is as follows: "Le Roy [de Galbary] et Lességneurs mon promis de nous doner 120 Esclaves en 4 semaines. Dedan tous les voyages que jay fait en se lieu il mon toujours tenu se qui mon promis" (p. 490).

think, make it highly plausible that the principal, but hitherto unidentified, port of slave purchase of Thebeu's *Antony Galeij* in 1712, was the same Ijo-speaking Calabar region.

3.3 French raid on Berbice (1712) and arrival of the *Antony Galeij* (1713)

Having identified with a fair degree of confidence the first (and very possibly the *only*) documented importation of Ijo-speakers to Berbice in the history of the colony, there still remains the question as to which historical-demographic circumstances would have allowed these speakers to so significantly impact the local lingua franca.

Let us first consider how many of the slaves on board the *Antony Galeij* would have been Ijo-speaking. This cannot be asserted with any degree of certainty, but we can make an educated guess. Since, as noted, *Voyages* (2013) specifies "Prince Island" (Príncipe) as the "second place of slave purchase", it is clear that not all of the 403 slaves sold in Berbice by Thebeu would have been bought in Ijo country. However, it seems fair to assume that a considerable majority did hail from there. Calabar was in the beginning of the 18th century a popular hive for Dutch contraband slave trade, so much so that Bonny Island was at the time alternatively known as *Lorrendraaijers Eiland* (Paesie 2008: 247). Príncipe, meanwhile, was not a major market in that period (or, for that matter, in any other period); it is simply unlikely that Thebeu would have been able to purchase a large number of slaves there. In fact, the log book of the *Jonge Elseboom* reveals that Thebeu, instead of buying slaves on Príncipe rather sold a number of them there and explicitly complained that there is "nothing to buy here".[26] Whilst acknowledging a degree of uncertainty, for the sake of the argument we will in the remainder of this section assume that 300 of the ca. 400 slaves delivered to Berbice by Thebeu were speakers of Ijo.

The Berbice colony would at the time have had a slave population of around 500 to 600[27] (based on the figures in Postma 1990: 194, Kouwenberg 2009: 117–118, 2013: 699, 702 and Daly 1975: 119, adjusted for attested and assumed

26 Nationaal Archief, Archief Nederlandse Bezittingen ter Kuste van Guinea, file 261.

27 According to Kouwenberg (2009: 121), this number includes only black slaves. Adding some Amerindians might make the figure somewhat higher.

imports), the vast majority of whom, we assume, were speakers of the Early Berbice Plantation Creole.

Could 300 Ijo newcomers really have exerted such a heavy influence on Berbice's already existing speech community that a virtually new language emerged from it? At first sight, this might appear unlikely. But 1712-13 happens to be an important period in the history of Berbice for another reason: In the months of November and December of 1712, the colony was attacked and pillaged by the French privateer Jacques Cassard (Hartsinck 1770: 299–304; Ishmael 2005; Marley 2008: 362; Netscher 1888: 158–159; Postma 1990: 193). The political consequences of this raid were grave, but need not concern us here. Rather, what is important in the present context is that the French, upon their departure on the 8th of December, carried off a reported 259 of the total of 500–600 slaves. Thus, starting from an estimated 500–600 slaves present at the beginning of the French raid, the colony would have counted, give or take, 300 afterwards.

At this point it is important to stress that although the precise dates of departure and arrival of Thebeu's *Galeij* are unknown, the ship most likely arrived in Berbice *after* the raid – we suspect somewhere in the beginning of 1713. The winter months were in general the most common arrival dates for slavers in the *Voyages* (2013) database, and in that same dataset, we may also observe that a normal time lapse between leaving the European home port and the first disembarkation of slaves in the Guianas was around 10 months. Since Thebeu left the Netherlands in 1712, he is likely to have reached Berbice no earlier than in early 1713.[28] In other words, at the start of 1713, the Berbice colony would, in our scenario, have hosted a situation where around 300 speakers of the Early Berbice Plantation Creole were united with a rather similar number of speakers of Ijo. Indeed, the conditions for a mixing scenario seem to have been almost perfect.

Of course, other things being equal, we would, in line with the Founder Effect, expect the old slaves to have been linguistically more influential than the new ones, and we should also take into account that the local whites would have been

28 Further support for this assumption can be gleaned from the schedules of other ships that made similar journeys in the same period. The afore-mentioned *Jonge Elseboom* (#11923 in *Voyages* 2013), also captained by Thebeu, left Zeeland in October 1714, and was intercepted by the Dutch West India Company off the Calabar coast in November 1715. In other words, it had already spent 13 months at sea without even crossing the Atlantic. Another fair *comparandum* seems to be the *Acredam* (#10001 in *Voyages* 2013), which travelled from Texel to Whydah, then to Suriname and back to Texel. It left Texel in July 1712 and arrived in Suriname in November 1713, i. e. more than a year later. So even if the *Antony Galeij* left Zeeland at the very beginning of 1712, it would still most likely have arrived in Berbice after the raid, assuming it followed a schedule similar to the *Jonge Elseboom* and the *Acredam*.

speakers of the Early Berbice Plantation Creole. These two factors combined could explain (at least in part) why Berbice Dutch is lexically 60-40 in favour of (Creole) Dutch and why the Plantation Creole seems to have provided (most of) the grammatical matrix of the ensuing mixed language. It is of course also possible that our estimate of the *Galeij*'s Ijo-speakers is on the low side while that of the already present slave population is overestimated, something that would produce an Ijo majority on the plantations in 1713.

In our scenario, then, the years 1627–1712 saw the emergence and stabilisation of Early Plantation Creole in Berbice. The early-1713 arrival of a couple of hundred Ijos would have a had a moderate linguistic impact, *had it not been* for the results of the French raid, which had halved the existing slave population, thereby allowing Ijo and Early Berbice Plantation Creole to mix into what we today know as Berbice Dutch. Table 3 sums up the different stages of language contact we think succeeded each other in the Berbice colony from 1627 to present.

The new mixed language would have had about one or two decades to crystallise before the slave population of the colony began to expand in the 1720s and 1730s, and thus become the target of subsequent (and more numerous) arrivals. Note that, while one or two decades may seem like a short period of time for a new language to form and crystallise, there seems to be general agreement that a process of language intertwining or heavy mixing need not take more than a single generation to be brought to completion (Bakker 2003: 136; Comrie 2008: 25; Muysken 1997: 374; Thomason 2007: 55).

Table 3: Overview of the different stages of language contact in the Berbice colony from 1627 to present.

Year	Languages predominating in the colony	Processes started	Outcome
1627	Dutch, various African languages, various Amerindian languages	Pidginisation and creolisation	Early Berbice Plantation Creole (Dutch-lexified)
1713	Early Berbice Plantation Creole, Ijo	Mixing	Berbice Dutch
1720	Berbice Dutch, Arawak, Dutch	Regular language contact, diffusion, stabilisation	Berbice Dutch
ca. 1800	Guyanese English Creole, English	Anglicisation, diffusion of Guyanese at the expense of Berbice Dutch	Guyanese English Creole, demise of Berbice Dutch

4 Conclusion

We have argued that Berbice Dutch represents a case of serial glottogenesis: a first stage of creolisation was, half a century or so after crystallisation, followed by a second stage of language mixing. This is comparable, linguistically, to what happened to other mixed creoles such as Saramaccan and Angolar and the others listed in Table 2.

Our account explains the hitherto mysterious origins of the Berbice Dutch Ijo component in a straightforward manner without having to invoke hitherto unknown processes of contact-induced language change, such as the alleged two-language creole-formation scenario that has become accepted despite not being supported by any evidence. Thomason's (1997: 3–4) taxonomy still holds, and seemingly aberrant cases such as Berbice Dutch or Saramaccan can be accounted for within the boundaries of that taxonomy. The two-stage scenario furthermore accounts for the fact that there are no (productive) Dutch-derived affixes in the language (these were lost, as such items usually are, in the initial creolisation), despite the presence of bound morphemes from Ijo (which were borrowed at a later date).

As we have seen, the years 1712–13 appear to us to be the best prospect as far as the arrival of Ijos and the formative 'starting point' of Berbice Dutch are concerned: the colony was raided by the French who decimated the existing slave population shortly before the arrival of a shipment that is likely to have consisted of Ijo speakers. Furthermore, the fact that the 'old' slave population was roughly comparable in size to the group of newly arrived Ijo speakers could help explain why the Dutch and Ijo components in Berbice Dutch are more or less equally conspicuous. It follows that our hypothesis is falsifiable in that if a creole sample from Berbice dating from before 1712 should ever turn up, we predict it will be devoid of Ijo material.

Finally, if our scenario is correct, it is implied that the Ijo component of Berbice Dutch should largely be disregarded in future discussions on substrate influence on creolisation since it represents a case of *ad*stratal rather than *sub*stratal admixture.

Acknowledgments: Thanks go to Peter Bakker, Silvia Kouwenberg and Norval Smith for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

Appendix: Possible Non-Ijo Africanisms in Berbice Dutch

Berbice[a]	Gloss	Potential etymology
akruma ~ gruma ~ gurma	okra, *Abelmoschus esculentus*	Akan *nkurūmā́* 'okra' (Christaller 1875: 267).[b]
alala	tongue	Cf. Edo *áʃ́áṍɛ̀* 'tongue' (Melzian 1937: 12).
awisa	Guinea pepper, *Aframomum melegueta*	Akan *wisa* 'pepper' (Alleyne 1980: 157, Hall-Alleyne 1990:34). Éwé *awisa* '*Aframomum melegueta*' (Andel et al. 2014). Found in Sranan (Surinam) and in the Surinamese-descended Maroon varieties of Jamaica, but seemingly not elsewhere in the Anglophone Caribbean.
baŋga	kernel	Kikongo *baŋga* 'roches, pierres, projectiles', *mbaŋga* 'testicules' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
kili	penis	Kikongo *kila* 'chose, objet qu'on ne veut nommer, d'où penis' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
kloro	to scrape	cf. Sãotomense Portuguese Creole *klolo* and Guianese French Creole *krokro* 'to scrape'. Éwé *kra kora*, Igbo *-kɔ ɔkɔ* 'scratch, itch' (Fyle & Jones 1980: 206). Vai (Hancock 1987: 274). Éwé, Igbo (Holm 1989: 421). Fon *klú* 'to scratch' (Lefebvre & Brousseau 2002; Delafosse 1894).
koso	cough, to cough	Kikongo *kòso kóso, kòsu kósu* 'toux' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
kumbi	common opossum, *Didelphis marsupialis*	Kikongo *nkumbi* 'rat de Gambie' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
kuria	snail	Kikongo *kodya* 'coquille d'escargot' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
kwandi	pronominal (emphasis) marker, the precise scope of which is unclear	Quite possibly the Kikongo pronominal emphasis marker *kwandi* (Bentley 1887: 316). In Kikongo *kwandi* is used for all persons and numbers (except the 3p), which could in part explain the confusion among Kouwenberg's informants about the precise pronominal reference of *kwandi*. Also, according to Donnelly (1982: 74) *kwandi* "changes its meaning according to the context" and "can imply either scorn or sympathy", which sits rather well with the examples given by Kouwenberg (1994: 633).
landa	to follow	Kikongo *landa* 'suivre, poursuivre, pister, accompagner, escorter, marcher derrière … ' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
malaŋga	American taro, *Xanthisona sagittifolium*	Kikongo *malaŋga* 'taros' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).

(continued)

Berbice[a]	Gloss	Potential etymology
mutete	basket	Kikongo *mutete* 'panier improvisé avec des tronçons de palmes tressés' (Swartenbroeckx 1973). Also found in English creoles (Ndyuka and Saramaccan) of Surinam, as well as in Principense (Portuguese Creole) and Palenquero (Spanish Creole).
rum	to stir	Cf. Edo *rɔ̃* 'to stir' (Melzian 1937: 176), Yoruba *rú* 'to stir up' (Anonymous 1914: 23).
samba	to groan	Kikongo *samba* 'crier, gemir (bébé)' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
tambla	to answer	Kikongo *tambulula* 'répondre' (Swartenbroeckx 1973).
titi	older sister (term of address)	Cf. Vai *titi* 'little girl' (Turner 1949: 170).
toto	to push	Gbe *tutu* 'to push' (Kluge 2000: 155), Efik *tut* 'to push' (Goldie 1862).
tuka	to pull out, to extract	Cf. Yoruba *tuka* 'to separate, to disunite, to disperse' (Crowther 1843: 246).

[a]Needless to say, this list is not likely to be exhaustive. Kouwenberg's (1994) Berbice Dutch word list contains another couple of dozen unetymologised words, some of which have at least the superficial appearance of being Africanisms.

[b]According to Kouwenberg (1994: 606), this is a loan from Guyanese English Creole. However, the allomorphy, as well as the metathesis (otherwise only seen in Dutch-derived vocabulary items that almost certainly can be traced back to the Early Berbice Plantation Creole), can in our view be taken to suggest that *akruma* pre-dates the contact between Berbice Dutch and Guyanese English Creole. Also, Guyanese was almost certainly imported into the country from the insular English Caribbean; therefore, if *akruma* is an original Guyanese item, we would expect to find it in one of the other Atlantic English-lexicon creoles. However, to our knowledge, this is not the case. In sum, it seems perfectly possible, if not probable to us, that this item was borrowed from Berbice Dutch into Guyanese, rather than the other way round. By the same logic, this list could also be expanded by a few more items common to Berbice Dutch and Guyanese but which are unattested on the Antilles.

References

Alleyne, Mervyn. 1980. *Comparative Afro-American*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Andel, Tinde van, Charlotte van 't Klooster, Diana Quiroz, Alexandra Towns, Sofie Ruysschaert & Margot van den Berg. 2014. Local plant names reveal that enslaved Africans recognized substantial parts of the New World flora. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(50). 346–353.

Anonymous. 1914. *Language studies in Yoruba*. Lagos: Church Missionary Society's Bookshop.

Bakker, Peter. 1997. *A language of our own*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, Peter. 2003. Mixed languages as autonomous systems. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 107–150. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bakker, Peter. 2017. Dutch creoles compared with their lexifier. In Peter Bakker, Borchsenius Finn, Carsten Levisen & Eeva Sippola (eds.), *Creole studies – Phylogenetic approaches*, 219–240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baltin, Mark. 2007. Remarks on the relation between language typology and Universal Grammar. In Martina Penke & Anette Rosenbach (eds.), *What counts as evidence in linguistics: The case of innateness*, 75–79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bentley, Holman. 1887. *Dictionary and grammar of the Kongo language as spoken at San Salvador, the ancient capital of the Old Kongo Empire, West Africa*. London: Baptist Missionary Society/Trübner & Co.

Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Bruyn, Adrienne & Tonjes Veenstra. 1993. The creolization of Dutch. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 8(1). 29–80.

Cardoso, Hugo. 2021. Convergence in the Malabar: The case of Indo-Portuguese. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 36(2). 298–335.

Christaller, Johann Gottlieb. 1875. *A Grammar of the Asante and Fante language called Tshi (Chwee, Twi)*. Basel: Evangelical Missionary Society.

Clements, Joseph Clancy. 2009. Accounting for some similarities and differences among the Indo-Portuguese creoles. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 8(2). 23–47.

Comrie, Bernard. 2008. Inflectional morphology and language contact, with special reference to mixed languages. In Siemund Peter & Noemi Kintana (eds.), *Language contact and contact languages*, 15–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Comrie, Bernhard. 1998. Review of Kouwenberg. (1994). *Linguistics* 36(5). 988–990.

Crowther, Samuel. 1843. *Vocabulary of the Yoruba language*. London: Church Missionary Society.

Daly, Vere. 1975. *A short history of the Guyanese people*. London: Macmillan.

Delafosse, Maurice. 1894. *Manuel dahoméen: grammaire, chrestomathie, dictionnaire français-dahoméen et dahoméen-français*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Donnelly, Kevin Gerard. 1982. *A comparative study of tone and intonation in seven Kongo dialects*. London: University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies.

Farquharson, Joseph. 2007. Creole morphology revisited. In Umberto Ansaldo, Stephen Matthews & Lisa Lim (eds.), *Deconstructing creole*, 21–37. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ferraz, Luís. 1983. The origin and development of four creoles in the Gulf of Guinea. In Ellen Woolford & William Washabaugh (eds.), *The social context of creolization*, 120–125. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Fyle, Clifford & Eldred Jones. 1980. *A Krio-English dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press/ Sierra Leone University Press.

Green, Christopher & John Vervaeke. 1997. But what have you done for us lately? In David Martel Johnson & Christina Erneling (eds.), *The future of the cognitive revolution*, 149–163. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Good, Jeff. 2009. Saramaccan vocabulary. In Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (eds.), *World loanword database*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library.

Gross, Steven. 2000. When two become one: Creating a composite grammar in creole formation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(1). 59–80.

Goldie, Hugh. 1862. *Dictionary of the Efik language, in two parts: I. Efik and English, II. English and Efik*. Glasgow: Dunn and Wright.

Hall-Alleyne, Beverly. 1990. The social context of African language continuities in Jamaica. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 85. 31–40.

Hancock, Ian. 1987. A preliminary classification of the Anglophone Atlantic Creoles, with syntactic data from thirty-three representative dialects. In Glenn Gilbert (ed.), *Pidgin and creole languages: Essays in memory of John E. Reinecke*, 264–333. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Hartsinck, Jan Jacob. 1770. *Beschryving van Guiana of de Wilde Kust in Zuid-America*. Amsterdam: S. Emmering.

Holm, John. 1989. *Pidgins and creoles*, vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holm, John. 2000. *Introduction to pidgins and creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ishmael, Odeen. 2005. The Guyana tory – from earliest times to independence. https://guyaneseonline.wordpress.com/2011/11/23/history-the-guyana-story-dr-odeen-ishmael/ (accessed 06 April 2017).

Jacobs, Bart & Mikael Parkvall. 2020. Chavacano (Philippine Creole Spanish): Are the varieties related? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 35(1). 88–124.

Jacobs, Bart. 2012. Embedding Papiamentu in the mixed language debate. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 2(1). 52–82.

Jacobs, Bart & Nicolas Quint. 2016. On the relevance of Classical Portuguese features in four Atlantic creoles. In Armin Schwegler, Liane Stroebel & John McWhorter (eds.), *The Iberian challenge: Creoles beyond the plantation setting*, 67–83. Frankfurt am Main: Klaus Vervuert/Iberoamericana.

Kars, Marjoleine. 2009. Policing and transgressing borders: Soldiers, slave rebels, and the Early Modern Atlantic. *New West Indian Guide* 83(3–4). 191–217.

Kluge, Angela. 2000. *The Gbe language varieties of West Africa: A quantitative analysis of lexical and grammatical features*. Cardiff: University of Wales MA thesis.

Kolapo, Femi. 2004. The Igbo and their neighbours during the era of the Atlantic slave-trade. *Slavery & Abolition* 25(1). 114–133.

Kouwenberg, Silvia & Peter Patrick. 2003. Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25. 175–184.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 1994. *A grammar of Berbice Dutch Creole*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2006. L1 transfer and the cut-off point for L2 acquisition processes in creole formation. *Language Acquisition and Language Disorders* 42. 205–219.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2007. Bare nouns in Berbice Dutch Creole. In Marlyse Baptista & Jacqueline Guéron (eds.), *Noun phrases in creole languages: A multi-faceted approach*, 437–458. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2009. The invisible hand in creole genesis: Reanalysis in the formation of Berbice Dutch. In Enoch Aboh & Norval Smith (eds.), *Complex processes in new languages*, 115–158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2012a. Finding the source: Creole substrate research in the 21st century. In Sarah Berson, et al. (eds), *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special session on pidgins, creoles and mixed languages*, 35–52. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2012b. The Ijo-derived lexicon of Berbice Dutch Creole: An a-typical case of African lexical influence. In Angela Bartens & Philip Baker (eds.), *Black through White: African words and calques which survived slavery in creoles and transplanted European languages*, 135–154. London: Battlebridge.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2013a. The historical context of creole language emergence in Dutch Guiana. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 91(3). 695–711.

Kouwenberg, Silvia. 2013b. Dutch Creole in the Caribbean. In Frans Hinskens & Johan Taeldeman (eds.), *Language and space*, vol. 3, 879–896. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lefebvre, Claire & Anne-Marie Brousseau. 2002. *A grammar of Fongbe*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Ladhams, John. 2009. The formation of the Portuguese-based Creoles: Gradual or abrupt? In Rachel Selbach, Hugo Cardoso & Margot van den Berg (eds.), *Gradual creolization*, 279–303. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Lefebvre, Claire. 1998. *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lipski, John. 2005. *A history of Afro-Hispanic language: Five centuries, five continents*. Cambridge: Cambrdige University Press.
Lipski, John. 2010. Chabacano y español: resolviendo las ambigüedades. *Lengua y migración* 2(1). 5–41.
Lorenzino, Gerardo. 1998. The diachronic relevance of affixation in two Afro-Portuguese Creoles. Paper presented at the Meeting for the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, New York, January 9–10.
Marley, David. 2008. *Wars of the Americas*, 2nd edn., vol. 1. Santa Barbara: ABC/Clio.
Maurer, Philippe. 1992. L'apport lexical bantou en angolar. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 29. 163–174.
McWhorter, John. 1992. Substratal influence in Saramaccan serial verb constructions. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 7(1). 1–53.
McWhorter, John. 1997. *Towards a new model of creole genesis*. New York: Peter Lang.
McWhorter, John. 1998. Identifying the creole prototype. Vindicating a typological class. *Language* 74(4). 788–818.
McWhorter, John. 1999. A creole by any other name: Streamlining the terminology. In Magnus Huber & Mikael Parkvall (eds.), *Spreading the word*, 5–28. London: Battlebridge.
McWhorter, John. 2005. *Defining creole*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Meakins, Felicity. 2012. Which mix – code-switching or a mixed language? – Gurindji Kriol. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 27(1). 105–140.
Meisel, Jürgen. 2011. *First and second language acquisition: Parallels and differences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Melzian, Hans Joachim. 1937. *A concise dictionary of the Bini language of Southern Nigeria*. London: Taylor & Francis.
Michaelis, Susanne. 2020. Avoiding bias in comparative creole studies: Stratification by lexifier and substrate. *Isogloss* 6(8). 1–25.
Mous, Maarten. 2003. The linguistic properties of lexical manipulation and its relevance for Ma'á. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 209–236. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Mufwene, Salikoko. 2001. *Ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mufwene, Salikoko. 2007. Population movements and contacts in language evolution. *Journal of Language Contact* 1(1). 63–92.
Mufwene, Salikoko. 2014. The case was never closed: McWhorter misinterprets the ecological approach to the emergence of creoles. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 29(1). 157–171.
Muysken, Pieter. 1981. Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: The case for relexification. In Highfield Arnold & Valdman Albert (eds.), *Historicity and variation in Creole studies*, 52–78. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
Muysken, Pieter. 1988. Are creoles a special type of language? In Frederick Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey 2: Linguistic theory: Extensions and implications*, 285–301. Cambridge: Cambrige University Press.

Muysken, Pieter. 1997. Media Lengua. In Sarah Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages: A wider perspective*, 365–427. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2001. Implications of abstract grammatical structure: Two targets in creole formation. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 16(2). 217–273.
Netscher, Pieter Marinus. 1888. *Geschiedenis van de koloniën Essequebo, Demerary en Berbice*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
O'Shannessy, Carmel. 2005. Light Warlpiri: A new language. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25(1). 31–57.
Paesie, Ruud. 2008. *Lorrendrayen op Africa: de illegale goederen- en slavenhandel op West-Afrika tijdens het achttiende-eeuwse handelsmonopolie van de West-Indische Compagnie*, 1700–1734. Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw.
Parkvall, Mikael. 2000. *Out of Africa*. London: Battlebridge.
Parkvall, Mikael & Bart Jacobs. 2018. The genesis of Chavacano revisited and solved. *Lingua* 215. 53–77.
Parkvall, Mikael & Bart Jacobs. 2020. Palenquero origins: A tale of more than two languages. *Diachronica* 37(4). 540–576.
Postma, Johannes Menne. 1990. *The Dutch in the Atlantic slave trade 1600–1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Prevost, Antoine François. 1748. *Historische Beschryving der reizen of nieuwe en volkoome verzameling van de aller-waardigste en zeldsaamste zee- en landtogten, part III–VI*. De Hondt: The Hague.
Quint, Nicolas. 2000. *Le Cap-Verdien: origines et devenir d'une langue métisse*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Roberts, Ian. 2001. Verb movement and markedness. In Michel DeGraff (ed.), *Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony, and development*, 2nd edn., 287–327. Cambridge: MIT.
Robertson, Ian. 1979. *Berbice Dutch – a description*. St. Augustine: University of the West Indies dissertation.
Robertson, Ian. 1993. The Ijo element in Berbice Dutch and the pidginization/creolization process. In Salikoko Mufwene (ed.), *Africanisms in Afro-American language varieties*, 296–316. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
Robertson, Ian. 1994. Berbiciaansche woorde. *Amsterdam Creole Studies* 11. 67–74.
Schneider, Edgar. 2010. Contact Englishes and creoles in the Caribbean. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The handbook of language contact*, 478–497. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
Schwegler, Armin. 2002. On the (African) origins of Palenquero subject pronouns. *Diachronica* 19(2). 273–332.
Schwegler, Armin. 2011. Palenque(ro): The search for its African substrate. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Creoles, their substrates, and language typology*, 225–249. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Sidnell, Jack. 2005. Creole languages of the Americas. In Colin Palmer (ed.), *Encyclopedia of African American culture and history*, 543–553. Detroit: Thomson Gale.
Smith, Ian. 1977. *Sri Lanka Creole Portuguese phonology*. Ithaca: Cornell University dissertation.
Smith, Ian. 1984. The development of morphosyntax in Sri Lanka Portuguese. *York Papers in Linguistics* 11. 291–301.
Smith, Norval & Hugo Cardoso. 2004. A new look at the Portuguese element in Saramaccan. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 3(2). 115–147.

Smith, Norval. 1999. Pernambuco to Surinam 1654–1665? The Jewish slave controversy. In Magnus Huber & Mikael Parkvall (eds.), *Spreading the word. The issue of diffusion among the Atlantic Creoles*, 251–298. London: University of Westminster Press.

Smith, Norval, Ian Robertson & Kay Williamson. 1987. The Ijo element in Berbice Dutch. *Language in Society* 16(1). 49–89.

Smith, Raymond. 1962. *British Guiana*. London: Oxford University Press.

Swartenbroeckx, Pierre. 1973. *Dictionnaire kikongo et kituba-français*. Bandundu: Ceeba.

Thomason, Sarah. 1997. Introduction. In Sarah Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages: A wider perspective*, 1–7. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thomason, Sarah. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, Sarah. 2007. Language contact and deliberate change. *Journal of Language Contact* 1. 41–62.

Turner, Lorenzo Dow. 1949. *Africanisms in the Gullah dialect*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Voyages. 2013. *Voyages: The Trans-Atlantic slave trade database*. www.slavevoyages.org (accessed 12 March 2020).

Winford, Donald. 1997. Introduction: On the structure and status of pidgins and creoles. In Arthur Spears & Donald Winford (eds.), *The structure and status of pidgins and creoles*, 1–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.