Nicholas Faraclas ⓘ and Carlos Rodríguez Iglesias

Subaltern Currents and Transgressive Waves: Transoceanic Agents and "Creole Languages"

ABSTRACT In this chapter, we situate debates concerning the substantial similarities between the colonial-era Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles and the colonial-era Pacific English-lexifier Creoles in relation to some of the new ways of looking at language that are emerging within a transoceanic understanding of postcolonial linguistics. Critically questioning categories such as "pidgin," "creole," and "language" itself, we adopt a radical creole anti-exceptionalist stance that sees the study of colonial-era creolized varieties and repertoires to be more important now than ever before. The accounts predominating among creolists have largely privileged the influence of European languages and of Eurocentric understandings of language masquerading as "universals." Here, we provide substantial evidence which suggests that other influences must also be taken into account, especially those, such as transoceanic diffusion, that reconfigure our understanding of the role of marginalized peoples from one of passive victimhood to one of resourceful and creative agency.

KEYWORDS pidgin, creole, diffusion, post-creole creolistics, Atlantic Creoles, Pacific Creoles

Introduction: Science, "Creole Languages," and Postcolonial Linguistics

When we look at oceans, it becomes difficult to avoid seeing what we do not give ourselves permission to see on land. When we look at "creole" repertoires and varieties, it becomes difficult to avoid seeing what we do not give ourselves permission to see as part of our "scientific" understanding of "non-creole" repertoires and varieties. While we can pretend, according to the dominant metaphysical paradigm, that what we encounter on land is largely of a particle, defined, static, and predictable nature, as soon as we

encounter the oceans, particles dissolve into waves, boundaries are washed away, stasis breaks like a wave, and predictability swirls into serendipity. While we can pretend, according to the dominant paradigm of linguistic science, that what we encounter in "non-creole" standardized European languages (as well as in the Eurocentric linguistic "universals" which are based on those languages) can be reduced to discrete units, isolated from context, immobilized, and predicted by mechanical laws, as soon as we encounter creole varieties, units morph into quantum shape-shifters, text and context merge, boundaries are transgressed, and the only constants that remain are emergent, unstoppable dynamism and unpredictable variation.

Physicists tell us that ninety-five percent of the cosmos consists of dark energy and matter, which their science cannot see, much less understand (Kuhn 1962; Merchant 1980; Mies, Bennholdt-Thomsen and von Werlhof 1987; Alvares 1992). Linguists tell us that ninety-five percent of human linguistic behaviour is irrelevant to their obsession with idealized constructs such as Universal Grammar and Formal Semantics, and therefore does not need to be seen, much less understood, by their discipline (Lakoff and Johnson 1999). The oceans invite us to resolve and dissolve artificial oppositions such as land / sea, particle / wave upon which we have built our current ninety-five percent blind worldview. Creole repertoires and varieties invite us to resolve and dissolve artificial oppositions such as creole / non-creole, language / context, *langue/parole,* and competence / performance upon which we have built our current ninety-five percent blind linguistics.

In this chapter, we build upon the work of Nicholas Faraclas, Micah Corum, Rhoda Arrindell, and Jean-Ourdy Pierre (Faraclas et al. 2012) to reconsider the striking similarities between the colonial-era Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles and the Pacific English-lexifier Creoles, which in the past have been described and explained mainly with reference to linguistic "universals." In our study of the multiplex ocean-mediated contacts, often in subaltern communities of hospitable cohabitation, among sea-borne agents involved in the shaping of the creole varieties and repertoires of the colonial Atlantic and Pacific, a fascinating, dynamic entanglement and connectedness of waves and currents of a historical, social, political, economic, and linguistic nature emerges which compels us not only to reconceptualize the ways in which we account for these similarities, but also compels us to reconceptualize the ways in which we study language.

Since we fully recognize the very problematic and colonizing nature of the assignment of the label "language" to a particular set of linguistic practices (Makoni and Pennycook 2006; Deumert, Storch, and Shepherd 2020), we will attempt to restrict our use of the term "language" to a generic one in the present chapter, except in those instances where the terms

repertoires and *varieties*, our preferred alternatives for the non-generic use of "language," either fail to convey our desired meaning or render our prose too unwieldy.

"Creoles": Post-Creole Creolistics and Radical Creole Anti-Exceptionalism

In 1977, when the field of modern creolistics was still relatively young and linguists were still excluding "creole languages" from the category of "natural languages," David DeCamp observed that: "there is no […] agreement on the definition of the group of languages called pidgins and creoles. Linguists all agree that there is such a group […]. Yet […] any definition of these languages seems to be insufficient […]. To a creolist, almost everyone else's definition of a creole sounds absurd and arbitrary" (3–4). More than forty years later, there is still no consensus as to what, if anything, distinguishes pidgin and creole varieties from each other, and from other ("non-pidgin," "non-creole") varieties.

There is a long tradition among creolists that attempts to define creoles in terms of features that they seem to "lack" when compared to non-creoles. Among the most recent examples of this *creole exceptionalist* tendency is John McWhorter (2001) who makes the Eurocentric and largely refuted claim that creole grammars are the world's "simplest" grammars. A rapidly growing number of contemporary creolists, however, have affirmed again and again that: 1) there is no reliable set of structural characteristics that distinguish creoles from any other group of languages; and 2) there is no reliable way to compare languages in terms of "simplicity." The non-radical creole anti-exceptionalists who acknowledge this on one level or another usually assign a sociohistorical, rather than a structural definition to the term "creole language," using it to refer to linguistic repertoires and varieties that have emerged from particular types of language contact, particularly those that predominated during the era of European ocean-based colonial invasion/expansion from the 1400s onward.

In the final analysis, however, all linguistic varieties and repertoires are by their very nature contact varieties and repertoires, because a primary function of language has always been to establish and maintain contact. Borrowing some terminology from postcolonial linguistics, we suggest that language and languaging are also about emergent, trans-local hospitable connectedness (Deumert, Storch, and Shepherd 2020). Robbie Shilliam (2015, 18–9) articulates how, in precolonial societies, both language and science are conceptualized through archetypes or deities, such as:

> [Oceanian] Tāne/Māui and [Afro-Atlantic] Legba (as well as [pre-colonial European] Arcadian Hermes) [...] [have] personalities that embody the creative cultivation of deep relation. Their magic, i.e. their decolonial science, binds different domains together—individual, social, geographical and spiritual in the pursuit of restitutive justice [...]. The problem of binding back together is germane to the human condition. It is not a colonial creation. Colonial science was never that innovative [...]. European colonial science [is one] of segregation, which stands opposed to the decolonial science of cultivating deep relation.

Transoceanic contact is a paradigmatic case of such hospitable, non-invasive, non-colonizing connectedness. The non-European oceanographic and navigational sciences that were responsible for the spread of more than 1,000 Austronesian languages from Madagascar in Africa to Easter Island (Rapa Nui) in South America at least 500 years before Columbus, Magellan, or Captain Cook persisted well into the colonial era. Jeffrey Bolster observes that:

> The expansion of European shipping was indeed a two-way process of cross-cultural contact, as seafarers from African, Asian, and Pacific waters joined the enterprise and counter-explored the new global maritime circuits [...]. Such groups defied attempts to be easily categorized or confined regionally, retained significant degrees of Indigenous agency, and ultimately reminded European colonialists that they were only visitors in ancient seafaring worlds. (1997, 86–7)

In his archaeology of the word "creole," Peter Roberts (2008) traces the term back to the 1500s, when it began to be used to differentiate European-descended people born and raised in Europe from people of European descent born and/or raised in the colonies, who were considered to have been somehow "contaminated" or "corrupted" by their exposure to non-European peoples and places. He goes on to demonstrate how, while consistently retaining its association with contamination and corruption from non-European (especially African) sources, the meaning of the word was later extended not only to include people of African descent who were born in the Americas, but also to people of mixed Afro-European descent and/or Afro-Euro-Indigenous descent throughout the Atlantic Basin along with their linguistic, culinary, musical, and other cultural repertoires. Given that the term "creole" has been used in this way to articulate and operationalize the hegemonic, mutually exclusive, and conjunctively exhaustive colonizing binary that equates "European-descended/white" to "pure, natural" at one pole, and "non-European-descended/black" to "impure, unnatural" at the other, a number of creolists are initiating

a process of imagining a *post-creole creolistics* (for example, Faraclas and Delgado 2021).

Taking into account the considerable body of work that questions the supposed exceptional nature of creole varieties (DeGraff 2003) and the problematic nature of the term "creole" itself, Faraclas states that:

> While we wholeheartedly agree with Mervyn Alleyne's assessment of the inadequacies and dangers of using the word "Creole," we also agree with him that the crisis in creolistics that could result from eventually eliminating the term should neither lead us to conclude that these varieties are essentially dialects of European languages, nor lead us to abandon the study of this set of varieties as a field of academic inquiry. On the contrary, it could be argued that the continued study of [… these difficult to domesticate repertoires and] varieties, especially those that emerged during the colonial era due to intense and sustained contact among peoples of African, European, Indigenous American, Pacific and Asian descent, as a socio-historically (rather than structurally) defined set of ("creole") languages is more important now than ever before. (2020, 269)

Because research on creole repertoires and varieties has often involved the study of unpredictable, uncontrollable paradigm-defying language patterns and practices, we assert that creolistics, or some form of post-creole creolistics, will continue to play a key part in subverting the dominant discourses of colonial linguistics. Adopting a *radically anti-exceptionalist* stance in relation to creole repertoires, we therefore continue to use the term "creole" in this chapter. We do so because we contend that in non-trivial ways, all of the linguistic repertoires and varieties of the world are creoles and, despite attempts by governments to standardize them and by linguists to define and domesticate them, all but the most artificial "languages" are multiplex, heteroglossic, contradiction-ridden intersectionalities of repertoires and varieties, and therefore should be re-considered by linguists "in the light of the insights gained from the study of creoles, where heterogeneity and contradiction are less easily ignored and erased than in [the study of] other varieties" (Faraclas 2020, 270).

"Pidgins": Linguistics, Colonialism and Social Darwinism

The term "pidgin" surfaced much later than "creole" (in print, as late as the 1800s) in reference to Chinese English-lexifier Pidgin, and unlike "creole," it has always been employed in reference to language, not people.

English-lexifier colonial-era contact repertoires throughout the Pacific are commonly referred to as "pidgins" rather than creoles, as are many of the English-lexifier colonial-era contact repertoires spoken along the west coast of Africa, despite the many affinities that the latter have with what are referred to as "creoles" in the Caribbean. In fact, if we utilize the admittedly questionable criteria normally employed to measure "genetic relationships" in historical linguistics, it could easily be argued that West African English-lexifier "pidgins" and Caribbean English-lexifier "creoles" are all "dialects" of the same "language" (Faraclas 2012a; 2020).

Replicating the colonizing Enlightenment binaries of civilization/complexity vs. savagery/simplicity and the equally colonizing Romantic/Modernist socially Darwinian linear, unidirectional trajectories of the "evolution" of peoples, cultures, and languages, the standard textbook treatment of pidgins defines them structurally as "reduced" languages, at the least "developed" end of an evolutionarily defined scale. For example, Peter Mühlhäusler (1997) identifies three stages in the "development" of a pidgin, beginning with a highly variable and highly simplified "jargon"/pre-pidgin, progressing to a more complex and rule-governed "stable pidgin," and culminating in an "expanded pidgin," which, when it begins to be used as a native language, becomes a "creole." By this logic, although not all pidgins "develop" into creoles, all creoles "develop" from pidgins. While this alleged evolutionary progression from pidgin to creole has been challenged by creolists such as Mervyn Alleyne (2002) and Michel DeGraff (2003), the current popularity of Salikoko Mufwene's (2001) scenarios for language contact and change, which include a "founders principle" and "pools" of features in "survival of the fittest" and "winner takes all" competition with one another, demonstrates that many of the colonizing and patriarchal assumptions and mental models upon which such socially Darwinian notions are based are still very much alive (González-López et al. 2012).

A more functional distinction typically made between pidgins and creoles hinges on the idea of nativization, i.e. whether or not the variety has any "native" speakers. It is not difficult, however, to find linguistic communities that defy this simplistic distinction between "native creole" and "non-native pidgin." Of particular relevance to the present chapter, Nigerian Pidgin in West Africa and Melanesian Pidgin in the South Pacific are some of the clearest examples of linguistic repertoires that continue to be labelled as pidgins when in fact they are both learned as a "first language" and used as a main language in daily life by millions of people. Ross Clark (1979) concludes that: "The classic dichotomy of pidgin vs. creole, according to whether or not the language has a community of native speakers, not only lumps under 'pidgin' systems of quite different types,

but may also place unwarranted emphasis on the native-speaker criterion" (quoted in Tryon and Charpentier 2004, 34).

The Eurocentric notion of a monolithic "native" or "first" language has been shown to be a highly problematic misunderstanding of how humans interact with language that emerged as both a justification and a tool for colonization (Makoni and Pennycook 2006; Canagarajah 2017). The colonizing nature of the mix of Enlightenment, Romantic, and Modernist thinking that underpins these and related categories, which are seldom questioned by linguists, is dramatically exposed when they are assumed to be the norm in the pluri-lingual societies that predominate in West Africa and the South Pacific and most of the rest of the colonized world. What sense does it make to speak of a singular "native" or "first" language in societies where children are typically raised speaking several "languages," where translanguaging is prevalent, and where linguistic repertoires and varieties are in emergent, contradictory, and indeterminate flux, changing constantly to signal shifts in equally emergent, contradictory, and indeterminate identificational repertoires (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985).

In general, we concur with Frances Byrne and John Holm (1993) when they state that, irrespective of one's definitions, our approaches do not have to be mutually exclusive, as both pidginization and creolization, however we define them, challenge the validity of traditional assumptions regarding the genetic relatedness of languages, in particular the family-tree model, and thus stand to make a valuable contribution to moving us beyond colonial paradigms in the study of language. In this chapter, we will adapt Byrne and Holm's terminology as follows:

1. West African "pidgins" such as Nigerian Pidgin and Cameroonian Pidgin will be included under the category "colonial-era Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles" along with their Caribbean counterparts, such as Jamaican, Belizean, etc., which emerged from the late 1500s onward.
2. Pacific "pidgins" such as Melanesian Pidgin, which encompasses Tok Pisin (Papua New Guinea), Bislama (Vanuatu), and Solomon Islands Pijin, will be included under the category "colonial-era Pacific English-lexifier Creoles" along with other varieties, such as Hawaiian and Pitcairn-Norfolk, which emerged from the mid-1700s onward.

Questions of Agency: From *Plantation* to *Habitation* to *Cohabitation*

In 1981, Derek Bickerton formulated his very influential Language Bioprogram Hypothesis, which attempted to account for similarities between the

Atlantic and Pacific English-lexifier Creoles in terms of Noam Chomsky's patriarchal notion of Poverty of Stimulus and Eurocentric understanding of Universal Grammar (Chomsky 1966; 1971). According to Bickerton and the widely accepted current scenarios for creolization that invoke "universals" of L1 and/or L2 acquisition, plantation slavery impeded normal transmission of language, forcing the children of the enslaved to rely on "universals" to "reinvent" language (Bickerton 1981, 123–86). This facile erasure of the agency of women as our main and very hospitable facilitators of connectedness through language acquisition is typical of the "motherless creolistics" and "motherless linguistics" that we mechanically accept and propagate in our classrooms and publications (Faraclas 2012b).

Bickerton's stance reflects the still-dominant view that the colonial-era creoles emerged on vast cash crop *plantations* where a few mostly male European masters enslaved large numbers of people of non-European descent. Robert Chaudenson (2001) proposed that the colonial-era creoles emerged instead on *habitations* or small cash crop holdings that preceded the plantations in many colonies, where small numbers of both indentured Europeans and enslaved non-Europeans worked alongside their European masters. On that basis, he concludes that the colonial-era creoles began as dialects of European languages and remain so (2001, 146–67). This facile erasure of the agency of, and hospitable connectedness among, peoples of non-European descent and other marginalized peoples is typical of the Eurocentric creolistics and Eurocentric linguistics that we mechanically accept and propagate in our classrooms and publications (LeCompte et al. 2012).

These two positions, that of the Universalists, who see Eurocentric language "universals" as determinant, and that of the Superstratists, who see the European masters and their colonial languages as determinant, have become the two dominant views among creolists, and both erase the agency of women, people of non-European descent and other marginalized peoples. Cándida González-López et al. propose that the colonial-era creoles emerged not only in plantation and habitation societies, where European masters were in control, but also in a host of what we call *cohabitation* societies, such as those of the renegades and maroons that preceded and outlived both the plantation and the habitation, where the European masters were *not* in control (2012, 222). In the countless cohabitation societies that emerged in and around all of the seas and oceans of the world from the very beginning to the very end of the colonial-era, non-European-descended women and other marginalized peoples succeeded in recreating their traditional subsistence-based economies of abundance, their traditional inclusive politics, their traditional sciences

of deep connectivity, and their traditional pluri-lingual, pluri-cultural, and pluri-identificational repertoires. These cohabitation societies provided not only important venues for the influence of African, Indigenous, female, and working-class language structures and practices on the emergence of the colonial-era creoles of the Atlantic and the Pacific as we have argued elsewhere (González-López et al. 2012), but also important avenues for the diffusion of colonial-era creole language structures and practices from the Atlantic to the Pacific and back, as we will argue in this chapter.

Although we do not exclude influence from European colonial languages and statistical, "embodied" universals (Faraclas and Delgado 2021) in our accounts of the emergence of colonial-era creole repertoires, we consider neither of them to be preponderant, exclusive, and / or sufficient conditions in that process. Instead, we see them as necessary conditions that play a complementary role in a complex matrix of other equally significant influences, including African languages, Indigenous languages, proto-pidgin / creole varieties spoken along the West African coast, sailor / pirate varieties, cryptolects, performance genres, etc. The present chapter reflects some of our more recent work, where we have come to understand that "creolized" repertoires often constitute prototypical examples of some of the key aspects of linguistic behaviour that are beginning to be acknowledged and studied by postcolonial linguists, such as contradiction, emergence, hospitableness, deep relations, trans-locality, and connectedness.

Features Shared by the Atlantic and Pacific English-Lexifier Creoles

Momentarily leaving aside the problematic nature of the concept "linguistic feature," some of the most heated debates in creolistics have revolved around accounting for features shared among different creole repertoires and varieties. Though much work remains to be done, published work on the common features found among the Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles is fairly extensive (for example, Hancock 1969). Comparisons between the Atlantic and Pacific English-lexifier Creoles, on the other hand, are fewer and farther between. One of the first to engage in such comparative work was Clark, who in 1979 assembled a modest list of twelve features which he called "world features" of English-lexifier creoles, in which he included lexical items such as *savvy*, "to know," and functional items such as the past / anterior marker *bin*. He attributed these "shared features" to a hypothetical South Seas Jargon from which the Melanesian varieties of Pacific English-lexifier Creole emerged. Several years later, Holm (1993) identified

thirty-seven features shared by Hawaiian English-lexifier Creole and the English-lexifier creoles of the Caribbean. Contrary to Bickerton, however, Holm claimed these commonalities were due not to universals, but instead were the result of contact with Atlantic English-lexifier Creole-speaking sailors who regularly landed in the Hawaiian Islands during the 1800s. In this respect, much of the present chapter picks up where Holm left off.

To date, the largest and most comprehensive study of shared Atlantic–Pacific English-lexifier Creole lexical and functional items is that of Philip Baker and Magnus Huber (2001), who analysed 2,200 early texts, yielding seventy-five features shared by at least one Atlantic and one Pacific English-lexifier Creole. In 2004, Andrei Avram provided copious evidence which justified the reclassification as worldwide features of twenty-four of the items that Baker and Huber had listed as being exclusive to either Atlantic or Pacific English-lexifier Creoles, resulting in a total of ninety-nine common Atlantic–Pacific features. Using new sources, Faraclas et al. proposed extending the Avram list of worldwide features "by at least 50 % to include most of the creole functions and forms that linguists had previously thought to be exclusive either to the Atlantic or to the Pacific" (2012, 147), bringing the total to over 150 worldwide features.

The substantial inventory of morphosyntactic features shared by creoles worldwide can be expected to further increase thanks to new databases and publications such as the *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures* (Michaelis et al. 2013), which provides comparable synchronic data on the grammatical and lexical structures of seventy-six pidgin and creole varieties worldwide. This means that, according to the admittedly flawed criteria of colonial historical linguistics, alongside the increasing body of evidence in support of considering most or all of the Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles of the colonial era to be "dialects" of the same "language," there is a rapidly growing set of shared features that suggest similar relationships between the colonial-era Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles and the colonial-era Pacific English-lexifier Creoles.

Accounting for the Similarities between Atlantic and Pacific English-Lexifier Creoles

Bernard Comrie (1989) suggests that similarities between linguistic varieties can be attributed to: 1) independent "development"; 2) linguistic "universals"; 3) "genetic" descent from a common "proto-language"; or 4) "borrowing." Many creolists vainly pretend to avoid taking any explicit position on the question of shared features across creole repertoires

altogether, and thus, by default, are implicitly positioned by the dominant discourses of colonial linguistics as proponents of a type of independent development scenario that is automatically subject to omnipresent Eurocentric "universals." In our work, we avoid a monocausal, unidirectional, monodimensional, "zero-sum" game approach to this and other questions (Faraclas 2020; Faraclas and Delgado 2021). Instead, we consider similarities between linguistic repertoires and varieties to be the result of dynamic scenarios that involve all of the factors mentioned by Comrie plus others, but replacing conventional Chomskian linguistic "universals" with statistical, "embodied" universals, and expanding the limited concept of "borrowing" to include a broad array of diffusional and areal / typological phenomena that acknowledge the connective agency of marginalized peoples.

Using the tools of colonial historical linguistics, several linguists have proposed that the Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles can be "genetically" traced to a proto-pidgin / creole which emerged either in West Africa (Hancock 1969; McWhorter 1997) or on one of the Caribbean islands, such as St. Kitts (Huber and Parkvall 1999). Clark (1979) was among the first to do the same for the Pacific English-lexifier Creoles, proposing a late 1700s proto-pidgin / creole that he called Sino-Pacific that bifurcated into a northern branch, which gave rise to Hawaiian and Chinese Pidgin, and a southern branch that he called South Seas Jargon, which in turn gave rise to the Melanesian English-lexifier Creoles as well as some of the English-lexifier Creoles spoken in Australia. While we do not deny either the existence or the influence of "proto-pidgins / creoles" in these cases, we see them as only one contributing element in a much more complex matrix of factors.

When it comes to the similarities between the Atlantic and Pacific English-lexifier Creoles, accounts based exclusively on independent "development" and / or Bickertonian and neo-Bickertonian "universals" have predominated among creolists. Arguing for acknowledgement of African and Melanesian agency, Faraclas (1990) questions Bickerton's analysis by demonstrating that many of the "universal" features attributed to the Bioprogram can also be found in the West African languages traditionally spoken by Atlantic English-lexifier Creole speakers as well as in the Melanesian languages traditionally spoken by Pacific English-lexifier Creole speakers. In a similar vein, Roger Keesing (1988) and Emanuel Drechsel (2014) acknowledge the influence of creolized varieties that existed in the Pacific before European invasion, while Faraclas and Delgado (2021) do the same for West Africa and the Caribbean. To date, no serious proposal has been advanced that posits an Atlantic–Pacific proto-pidgin/creole.

As does Holm (1993), Clark (1983) hints at the possibility of diffusion of features from the Atlantic to the Pacific:

> A number of grammatical and lexical features occur in examples of South Seas Jargon from a significantly wide range of sources to justify the belief that the language was not simply a series of local and ad hoc systems but that it possessed a continuity of tradition throughout the region and the period (1835–1890) [...]. Most of these features also occur in pidgins elsewhere in the world, which suggests that the jargon was not purely a Pacific creation but owed much to preexisting traditions [...]. In fact, among widespread features of South Seas Jargon, there is relatively little that is unquestionably of South Pacific origin. (14–5)

The few creolists who have suggested modest Atlantic–Pacific diffusion scenarios, however, have been attacked by Universalists who deploy arguments such as those originally articulated by Bickerton (1981): "the whole problem of this transmission thing is that there were no carriers [...]. Something crops up in A, something similar crops up in B, and immediately people jump to conclusions [...] [P]idgins are not transmitted; words can be transmitted, words were transmitted all over the Pacific [...] but syntax was not transmitted" (306).

Faraclas et al. (2012) provide linguistic and socio-historical evidence to support and substantiate Clark's (1983) and Holm's (1993) Atlantic–Pacific diffusion hypotheses, in order to demonstrate that, contra Bickerton, not only were there more than 150 lexical and *morphosyntactic* features "transmitted" via Atlantic–Pacific diffusion, but also that there were an abundance of "carriers" to do the job. Based on ample documentation of intimate and prolonged periods of contact and cohabitation between African, African-American, and Afro-Caribbean Atlantic English-lexifier Creole speakers on the one hand, and Indigenous Pacific peoples on the other during the formative period of the Pacific English-lexifier Creoles from the late 1700s onwards, they identify some of the key venues and actors in the process of diffusion mentioned in the paragraphs that follow.

Faraclas et al. (2012) contend that speakers of Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles made up both a socially prestigious and numerically important part of Pacific colonial societies from their beginnings in the late 1700s, throughout the sandalwood and sea cucumber trade period in the mid-1800s, until well into the plantation period toward the end of the 1800s. Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker note that more than twenty percent of the individuals recruited to work in the sailing industry between 1800 and 1850 in both Great Britain and the United States were of African descent (1992, 311). The percentage was even higher in the case of the

American whaling industry, reaching an estimated forty percent (Farr 1983). Charles Foy (2008) describes how from the beginning of the 1700s onward, the maritime industry in the northern ports of North America provided enslaved individuals with a viable means to obtain freedom, with significant African-descended communities to be found in these port cities as well as in the larger Afro-Atlantic. There were so many ex-slaves who sought employment in the rapidly expanding merchant marine and whaling industries of Massachusetts that an African-descended community called New Guinea thrived on the southern side of Nantucket, with its own school, church, and graveyard to serve its needs (Farr 1983, 161). Likewise, the migration of African-descended Atlantic Iberian-lexifier Creole-speaking Cape Verdeans to nearby New Bedford to work in the whaling and other industries is well documented (Linebaugh and Rediker 1992).

Once the ships sailed off from ports in Britain and America, they continued to recruit crew members along the way, making stops for this purpose in the Caribbean, West Africa, and the Pacific islands. David Chappell states that "by the mid-1800s, one out of every five sailors in the American whaling fleet was Oceanian" (1997, 163). European-descended mariners were thus in the minority on many vessels, which became important venues for sustained contact between Pacific Islander sailors and their African-descended Atlantic English-lexifier Creole-speaking counterparts. British and US merchants regularly recruited sailors from the west coast of Africa during this period, especially from what is today the coast of Liberia and the Ivory Coast, who eventually became known as "Kru" or "Krumen." Adams notes that in the Caribbean "Yankee skippers recruited West Indians to fill their crews, as it became increasingly difficult for them to find American seamen to go whaling" (1971, 56) in an article that focuses on Bequia, the second largest island in the Grenadines. Home to a cohabitation society of mixed African, Scottish, and Island Carib descent, Bequia is one of the few places in the world where limited whaling is still allowed under international law, due to the islanders' long tradition of whaling and building of whaling boats.

By the 1800s, up to twenty percent of sailors who arrived in the Pacific on US and British ships were deserting and cohabiting with Pacific Islanders as casual workers in port cities such as Honolulu or as renegade beachcombers in islands throughout the Pacific (Chappell 1997). Faraclas et al. (2012) relate cases of African American renegades who became beachcombers and whose influence on the Pacific Islander communities where they settled is well documented. One of the best-known is African-descended Atlantic English-lexifier Creole speaker Edward Young, who

was born in St. Kitts and ended up as a leader of an Afro-Euro-Indigenous community on Pitcairn Island in the South Pacific. Many of Young's descendants continue to live in Pitcairn Island or nearby Norfolk Island, and there are at least fifty features of the English-lexifier creoles spoken on those islands that can be traced to the influence of Edward Young (Baker and Mühlhäusler 2013).

African and European-descended renegades were soon joined by a growing number of renegade sailors and beachcombers of Pacific Islander descent. These Pacific Islander beachcombers' mastery of the cultural and linguistic codes of Atlantic–Pacific colonial-era seaborne contact assured them positions of prestige in their own and other communities throughout the Pacific, where they became teachers of Afro-Atlantic-influenced English-lexifier creole varieties and repertoires and other survival skills to younger people who eventually would leave their islands to join the growing transoceanic colonial-era trading networks. Because of their fluency in Afro-Atlantic-influenced English-lexifier Creoles, renegades of Pacific Islander, African, and European descent were eventually hired as sandalwood logging camp managers, sea cucumber dealers, and plantation overseers, placing them in the kinds of positions of prestige and influence where their linguistic practices could be rapidly propagated by the workforces over whom they had authority (Chappell 1994).

Pacific Islander women were also key players in many of the sea- and land-based exchanges and partnerships of cohabitation and hospitable connectedness that eventually helped spread colonial-era Afro-Atlantic-influenced English-lexifier Creole repertoires across the Pacific. Some Pacific women were taken as plantation slaves, while others became beachcombers, travelled with sailors, and established their own commercial networks and empires. Chappell states that some of these women "spent so much time on ships that they helped in [...] cross-cultural mediation to the point that they often had the upper hand in trading with the sailors [...]. [These] women were in the frontline of cultural change" (1977, 18–9). Pacific women shared the fruits of their labour with their families, along with the Afro-Atlantic-influenced creolized languages and cultures that they helped to shape (Faraclas et al. 2012).

Finally, the pervasive influence of this substantial cohort of "carriers" of Afro-Atlantic influenced creolized linguistic and cultural repertoires was augmented over the course of the 1800s by the transfer of Atlantic English-lexifier Creole speaking bureaucrats, missionaries, and functionaries from the longer-established English colonial holdings in the Caribbean and West Africa to British colonial holdings in the Pacific (Faraclas et al. 2012).

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attempted to situate debates concerning the substantial similarities between the colonial-era Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles and the colonial-era Pacific English-lexifier Creoles in relation to some of the new ways of looking at language that are emerging within a transoceanic understanding of postcolonial linguistics. Critically questioning categories such as "pidgin," "creole," and "language" itself, we have adopted a radical creole anti-exceptionalist stance that sees the study of colonial-era creolized varieties and repertoires to be more important now than ever before, as we begin to question the colonial underpinnings of Western science in general, and of linguistics in particular. In an effort to initiate a process of envisioning some of the contours of what might take shape as a post-creole creolistics, we have proposed multi-causal, multi-directional matrix scenarios for the emergence of both the Atlantic and Pacific English-lexifier Creoles that: 1) allow for complex interactions among influences from "sub-/super-/ad-strates," "proto-pidgin/creoles," diffusion, areal phenomena, statistical embodied universals, etc.; and 2) acknowledge the transoceanic agency of all of the people involved in colonial-era contact in the Atlantic and Pacific, including those who have been marginalized as historical, cultural, and linguistic agents, such as women, members of the non-propertied working classes, and peoples of non-European descent. The accounts which have predominated among creolists both for the emergence of the colonial-era creoles as well as for the similarities between the colonial-era Atlantic and Pacific English-lexifier Creoles have largely privileged the influence of European languages and of Eurocentric understandings of language masquerading as "universals." In this chapter, we have provided substantial evidence which suggests that other influences must also be taken into account, especially those, such as transoceanic diffusion, that reconfigure our understanding of the role of marginalized peoples from one of passive victimhood to one of resourceful and creative agency.

ORCID®

Nicolas Faraclas ⬤ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7407-3091

Bibliography

Adams, J. E. 1971. "Historical Geography of Whaling in Bequia Island, West Indies." *Caribbean Studies* 11 (3): 55–74.

Alleyne, Mervyn. 2002. *The Construction and Representation of Race and Ethnicity in the Caribbean and the World*. Barbados: University of the West Indies Press.

Alvares, Claude. 1992. "Science." In *The Development Dictionary*, edited by Wolfgang Sachs, 219–32. London: Zed Books.

Avram, Andrei. 2004. "Atlantic, Pacific or World-Wide? Issues in Assessing the Status of Creole Features." *English World-Wide* 25 (1): 81–108.

Baker, Philip, and Magnus Huber. 2001. "Atlantic, Pacific, and World-Wide Features in English-lexicon Contact Languages." *English World-Wide* 22 (2): 157–208.

Baker, Philip, and Peter Mühlhäusler. 2013. "The Creole Legacy of a Bounteous Mutineer: Edward Young's Caribbean Contribution to the Language of Pitcairn and Norfolk Islands." *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia: International Journal of Linguistics* 45 (2): 170–86.

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

Bolster, W. Jeffrey. 1997. *Black Jacks: African American Seamen in the Age of Sail.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Byrne, Frances, and John Holm. 1993. *Atlantic Meets Pacific: A Global View of Pidginization and Creolization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2017. *Translingual Practices and Neoliberal Policies*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Chappell, David. 1994. "Secret Sharers: Indigenous Beachcombers in the Pacific Islands." *Pacific Studies* 17 (2): 1–22.

Chappell, David. 1997. *Double Ghosts: Oceanic Voyagers on American Ships*. New York: M. E. Sharp.

Chaudenson, Robert. 2001. *Creolization of Language and Culture*. London: Routledge.

Chomsky, Noam. 1966. *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought*. New York: Harper and Row.

Chomsky, Noam. 1971. *Problems of Knowledge and Freedom.* New York: Pantheon.

Clark, Ross. 1979. "In Search of Beach-la-Mar: Towards a History of Pacific Pidgin English." *Te Reo* 22: 3–64.

Clark, Ross. 1983. "Social Contexts of Early South Pacific Pidgins." In *The Social Context of Creolization*, edited by Ellen Woolford and William Washabaugh, 10–27. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeCamp, David. 1977. "The development of Pidgin and Creole studies." In *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*, edited by A. Valdman, 3–20. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

DeGraff, Michel. 2003. "Against Creole Exceptionalism." *Language* 79: 91–410.

Deumert, Ana, Anne Storch, and Nick Shepherd, eds. 2020. *Colonial and Decolonial Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drechsel, Emanuel. 2014. *Language Contact in the Early Colonial Pacific*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faraclas, Nicholas. 1990. "From Old Guinea to Papua New Guinea: A Comparative Study of Nigerian Pidgin and Tok Pisin." In *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Pidgins and Creoles in Melanesia*, edited by John Verhaar, 91–169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Faraclas, Nicholas. 2012a. "Women and Colonial Era Creolization." In *Agency in the Emergence of Creole Languages*, edited by Nicholas Faraclas, 55–80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Faraclas, Nicholas, ed. 2012b. *Agency in the Emergence of Creole Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Faraclas, Nicholas. 2020. "Identity Politics." In *Routledge Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, edited by Umberto Ansaldo and Miriam Meyerhoff, 269–85. London: Routledge / Taylor & Francis.

Faraclas, Nicholas, Micah Corum, Rhoda Arrindell, and Jean Ourdy Pierre. 2012. "*Sociétés de cohabitation* and the Similarities between the English lexifier Creoles of the Atlantic and the Pacific: The Case for Diffusion from the Afro-Atlantic to the Pacific." In *Agency in the Emergence of Creole Languages*, edited by Nicholas Faraclas, 149–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Faraclas, Nicholas, and Sally Delgado, eds. 2021. *'Creoles' Revisited: Language Contact, Language Change and Postcolonial Linguistics.* London: Routledge / Taylor & Francis.

Farr, James. 1983. "A Slow Boat to Nowhere: The Multi-racial Crews of the American Whaling Industry." *Journal of Negro History* 68 (2): 159–70.

Foy, Charles. 2008. "Ports of Slavery, Ports of Freedom: How Slaves used the Northern Seaports' Maritime Industry to Escape and Create Trans-Atlantic Identities, 1713–1783." PhD diss., Eastern Illinois University. https://works.bepress.com/charles_foy/5/.

González-López, Cándida, Lourdes González Cotto, Pier Angeli LeCompte Zambrana, Micah Corum, Diana Ursulin Mopsus, Rhoda Arrindell, Jean Ourdy Pierre, Marta Viada Bellido de Luna and Nicholas Faraclas. 2012. "Marginalized Peoples and Creole Genesis: *Sociétés de cohabitation* and the Founder Principle." In *Agency in the Emergence of Creole Languages*, edited by Nicholas Faraclas, 215–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hancock, Ian. 1969. "A provisional comparison of the English-based Atlantic Creoles." *African Language Review* 8: 7–72.

Holm, John. 1993. "Atlantic meets Pacific: Lexicon common to the English-based pidgins and creoles." *Language Sciences* 14 (9): 185–96.

Huber, Magnus, and Mikael Parkvall. 1999. *Spreading the Word: The Issue of Diffusion among the Atlantic Creoles*. London: University of Westminster Press.

Keesing, Roger. 1988. *Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic Substrate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

LeCompte Zambrana, Pier Angeli, Lourdes González Cotto, Diana Ursulin Mopsus, Susana De Jesús, Cándida González-López, Brenda Domínguez, Micah Corum,

Aida Vergne, and Nicholas Faraclas. 2012. "African Agency in the Emergence of the Atlantic Creoles." In *Agency in the Emergence of Creole Languages*, edited by Nicholas Faraclas, 41–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Le Page, R. B., and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. 1992. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves Commoners and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Makoni, Sinfree, and Alastair Pennycook, eds. 2006. *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McWhorter, John. 1997. "It Happened at Cormantin: Locating the Origin of the Atlantic-English Creoles." *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 12 (1): 59–102.

McWhorter, John. 2001. "The World's Simplest Grammars are Creole Grammars." *Linguistic Typology* 5: 125–66.

Merchant, Carolyn. 1980. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Harper.

Michaelis, Susanne Maria, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath, and Magnus Huber, eds. 2013. *The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mies, Maria, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, and Claudia von Werlhof. 1987. *Women: The Last Colony*. London: Zed Books.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1997. *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. London: University of Westminster Press.

Roberts, Peter. 2008. *The Roots of Caribbean Identity: Language, Race and Ecology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shilliam, Robbie. 2015. *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Press.

Tryon, Darrell, and Jean-Michel Charpentier. 2004. *Pacific Pidgins and Creoles: Origins, Growth and Development*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.