

Kofi Yakpo and Pieter Muysken

Language contact and change in the multilingual ecologies of the Guianas

1 Introduction

This book deals with multilingualism, language contact, language change and convergence in the Guianas of South America, with a focus on Suriname. The Guianas are a very complex region. The national identity of the countries in the Guianas involves both a sense of common destiny and of multiple ethnic affiliations. In this sense it presents a condensed microcosm of the Latin American and Caribbean quest for identity that we find in works as apart geographically, if not intellectually, as José Vasconcelos' *La Raza Cósmica* in Mexico (1925), José Carlos Mariátegui's *7 Ensayos de Interpretación de la Realidad Peruana* in Peru (1928), or Jean Price-Mars' *Ainsi parla l'oncle* in Haiti (1928) (see also the overview of essays on ethnicity and boundaries gathered in Oostindie 1996).

We have named our volume *Boundaries and bridges* because it reflects at the same time the maintenance of ethnic and linguistic boundaries, through the languages involved, but also the numerous instances of cross-linguistic influence across these boundaries. It illustrates the point that in the complex multilingual and multi-ethnic area of the Guianas, the languages spoken have been part of an effort of groups to keep themselves apart, as boundaries, but have also undergone numerous changes in the presence of other languages, and thus form bridges. The Guianas, or any part of them, do not form a single language community, but rather a chain of interacting and intersecting communities, which have very diverse and complex relations among themselves. Hence the term *multilingual ecologies* in our subtitle.

However, these cases of cross-linguistic influence are very diverse in nature, and involve many parts of language. They result from different contact scenarios and include maintenance, shift, and creation.

Our main focus in this book will be the Republic of Suriname, but it is useful to consider Suriname for a moment in the more global context of the Guianas. The term Guianas refers to a region bordering on the Amazon basin but straddled along the Caribbean coast of northern South America. The tropical coastal areas were discovered to be suitable for sugar plantations, as we will discuss below, and the inlands are mostly tropical rainforest, which are currently being exploited. The southern part of the Guianas is a plateau, separating the coastal plains from the Amazon basin proper.

Different parts of the Guianas were occupied by five European colonial powers: from west to east these were Spain, England, the Netherlands, France, and Portugal. This has resulted in the fact that nowadays, they correspond to five different political entities: the provinces Amazonas, Bolivar, and Delta Amacuro of Venezuela, the Republic of Guyana, the Republic of Suriname, the French colony Guyane, and the state of Amapá in Brazil. The histories of these five entities are necessarily quite different, but there are a number of common threads as well: the continued presence of different Amerindian peoples particularly belonging to the Cariban and Arawakan language families, the deportation from Africa and exploitation of enslaved Africans in the seventeenth through the nineteenth century, struggles for independence as well as internal strife and some border disputes.

In addition to the Amerindians, people of European, and African origin, there is also the presence of Asian-descended populations. Their immigration started around the middle of the nineteenth century. Thus, the region is thoroughly

Tab. 1: Overview of the five Guianas in terms of their history and ethnic composition

	Venezuelan Guayana	Guyana	Suriname	Guyane	Amapá
<i>Status</i>	Three states in Venezuela	Republic (since 1970, independence 1966) Former British colony	Republic (independence in 1975) Former Dutch colony	French colony	State of Brazilian Federal Republic
<i>Official language</i>	Spanish	English	Dutch	French	Portuguese
<i>Creole languages</i>		Guyanese English Creole, Berbice Dutch, Skepi Dutch	Sranantongo, Maroon Creole languages, Haitian, Guyanese English Creole	Guyanese French Creole, Haitian, Maroon Creole languages	Guyanese French Creole (Lanc-Patuá), Karipuna French Creole
<i>Amerindian languages</i>	Arawakan, Warao	Arawakan, Warao	Arawakan, Cariban, (Warao)	Arawakan, Cariban, Tupí-Guaraní	Arawakan (Palikúr), Tupí-Guaraní (Karipuna, Wayampí), Galibi (Cariban), Iapamá (isolate)
<i>Asian languages</i>	Chinese	Guyanese Bhojpuri	Sarnami, Javanese, Kejia (Hakka)	Kejia (Hakka), Hmong, Vietnamese	
<i>Other languages</i>	English		Portuguese, English	Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch	

multi-ethnic and multi-lingual. In Tab. 1 above, we give a broad overview of the five Guianas in terms of their history and ethnic composition. Suriname, the focus of the present book, is linguistically and ethnically the most diverse of the five Guianas, as we will illustrate in the following sections. Through processes of convergence, it has also become a linguistic area in its own right.

2 Linguistic areas and contact linguistics in the Guianas

This collective volume looks at the dynamics of a specific type of linguistic area from a fresh perspective. Based on case studies, it strives to integrate common concepts in contact linguistics such as borrowing, contact-induced change, language maintenance and shift, creolization, koineization, genealogical differentiation, typological change, and areal convergence.

The most common contact situations described in the linguistic literature involve (1) synchronic and diachronic studies of language contact with one language *uni-directionally* exerting influence on another (e.g. the studies in Thomason and Kaufmann 1988, Thomason 2001, Matras and Sakel 2007a, 2007b); (2) studies in areal linguistics addressing the *outcomes* of contact between more than two languages. Here the time-depth and lack of documentation often make it difficult to describe with more accuracy the *processes* leading to contact-induced changes and their directionality (e.g. Aikhenvald and Dixon 2007; Nicolai and Zima 2002).

This study adds to the types of studies listed above in looking at the situation of *multiple language contact*, characterized by multilevel interactions between more than two languages, involving Sranantongo, Dutch, and multiple other languages, and simultaneous multidirectional change. Furthermore, it studies contact-induced change in a selection of languages that are typologically and genetically highly *diverse*, and describes the emergence of complex linguistic areas over a five hundred year period, taking into account both synchronic variation, and changes at various time depths, involving shifting sociolinguistic configurations. The volume offers detailed information on different grammatical domains (among which tense, mood, aspect and argument realization) across various case studies, and in doing so, allows a thorough reassessment of the two important notions of borrowability and stability of linguistic elements and structures in language contact.

The studies and findings of this volume have a high potential for generalization. Multiple language contact and change involving more than two languages is little described. However, it probably represents the most common type of contact ecology in most parts of the (non-Western) world, where fast demographic and socio-economic change, and multilingualism have led to equally rapid linguistic change.

This book attempts to draw the outlines of language contact and change in multilingual ecologies more clearly, and it proposes a framework for comparable studies.

The case studies are centred on the Guianas in South America, and Suriname in particular. In this region, we can see the formation and transformation of a linguistic area unfolding before our eyes. The area has been recognized by anthropologists, historians, and linguists alike as an object of intense study for several reasons:

- The socio-history, culture, and demographic development of this region, within a diachronic depth of about five centuries, are exceptionally well documented;
- The Guianas, and Suriname in particular, boast a higher number of “new” languages and cultures that have arisen through language contact, than many other regions of the world; these have been the subject of very central theoretical debate. But many aspects of these languages still remain to be studied;
- Currently more than twenty genetically diverse languages are spoken in the region;
- There is an astounding typological spread with representatives of the following major linguistic groupings: Afro-Caribbean English-lexifier Creoles, Indo-Aryan, Indo-Germanic, Austronesian, Sinitic, Arawakan, Cariban;
- Language contact is multidirectional and minimally involves two main donor or target languages, namely a dominant Creole language and European colonial languages;
- The impact of the main target languages is temporally layered, as well as sociolinguistically diverse with correspondingly differentiated impacts on the domains of phonology, lexicon and morphosyntax, as well as style and register;
- We have identified various hotspots of contact and structural convergence between the languages studied and we draw numerous comparisons with other contact scenarios in the wider region and other parts of the world.

3 Multilingualism and language contact in Suriname

Suriname has been the scene of complex and overlapping population movements throughout its history. In this section, we give a brief overview of how these movements have driven the development of multilingualism in the recent history of Suriname and in present times.

Patterns of community-wide multilingualism have probably characterized the societies of Suriname from well before colonial conquest. Linguistic diversity in

Suriname has increased significantly since the beginning of the colonial period, reaching a peak in contemporary Suriname and ushering in the type of extensive language contact that characterizes the country today. For detailed overviews of multilingual Suriname see Charry, Koefoed and Muysken 1983; Carlin and Arends 2002 and the chapter by Borges in this volume, which also includes a historical overview.

Some key events in the history of Suriname with sociolinguistic significance are presented in Tab. 2.

Tab. 2: Some key events in the history of Suriname and their sociolinguistic significance (taken from Yakpo and Muysken 2014)

Date	Event and its demographic significance	Contact-related aspects
1200–1500s	Migratory movements in the Guianas	Extensive contact between Warao, Cariban and Arawak languages
1650	Establishment of an English colony in Suriname	Varieties of English brought to Suriname
1652–	Beginning of the deportation and enslavement of West Africans in Suriname	Gradual creation of an English lexicon coastal Creole language which would develop into Sranan in the latter part of the 17 th century
1665	Arrival of the Portuguese Jewish planters from Brazil, possibly with some enslaved Africans	Varieties of Portuguese and quite possibly Portuguese-based Creole brought to Suriname
1667	Suriname becomes a Dutch colonial possession	Varieties of Dutch brought to Suriname as an elite language; speedy end to the presence of English
1685	Emergence of the Saramaccans as a separate ethnic group	Creation of the Saramaccan (or Saamaka) language out of West-African languages, a Portuguese and the English lexicon pidgin/Creole
1730	Emergence of the Ndyuka as a separate ethnic group	Creation of Ndyuka out of West-African languages and the English lexicon Creole
1804–1816	English occupation	English superstrate influence on Sranan lexicon limited to few words
1844–1854	Enslaved Africans were allowed to learn how to read and write	Sranan texts created; consolidation of a written register of the language
1863	Emancipation of the enslaved rural population and dismantlement of the traditional plantation system	Increased presence of Sranan speakers in the urban centre Paramaribo
1853	First arrival of Chinese indentured laborers and traders	Hakka and other Chinese languages brought to Suriname

Tab. 2 (continued)

Date	Event and its demographic significance	Contact-related aspects
1876	Dutch introduced into schools as only medium of instruction and part of universal education	The beginnings of urban Dutch-Sranan multilingualism in a slightly larger population; begin of prestige loss of Sranan. The adoption of Dutch as an L2 by increasing numbers of Surinamese causes the creation of a profoundly Sranan-influenced Surinamese Dutch.
1873–1916	Arrival of Indian indentured laborers	Varieties of north Indian languages brought to Suriname, such as Bhojpuri, Magahi and Maithili
1890–1939	Arrival of Javanese indentured laborers	Varieties of Javanese brought to Suriname
1975	Independence of the Republic of Suriname	Symbolic break with the former colonial power, possibility for autonomous developments in Surinamese Dutch, stronger Dutch influence on Sranan due to circular migration Netherlands-Suriname
1990s	Economic development	Gradual influx of Haitians, Brazilians, Chinese

3.1 Pre-colonial contact and creolization in the colonial period

Taking pre- and early colonial times as a starting point, there were originally three indigenous language families represented on the territory of present-day Suriname, namely Warao, Carib, and Arawak (cf. Hoff 1995). Particularly striking is the partly convergent development within the Arawak and Cariban languages, including the creation of a sixteenth century Carib Coastal Pidgin (Taylor and Hoff 1980). Convergence must have been the consequence of multilingualism in a situation of language maintenance, probably with both Carib and Arawak enjoying similar degrees of prestige.

With the beginning of the European colonization of Suriname in the seventeenth century, the linguistic situation becomes more complex. The Netherlands ends up being the sole colonial power in 1667. The establishment of a plantation economy leads to the deportation from the western seaboard of Africa and enslavement of an estimated total of approximately 350,000 Africans by the Dutch between 1675 and 1803 (Postma 1990).

Various interlocking linguistic processes played a role in the emergence of the Creole languages of Suriname, among them the present-day lingua franca Sranan-tongo. Language creation led to the rise of early Creole varieties largely drawing

on first Portuguese, then English superstrate lexicon, and as well as grammatical features from African substrate languages (cf. e.g. Huttar 1983; Huttar, Essegbey and Ameka 2007; Winford and Migge 2007). High mortality rates under the brutal laboring conditions on Dutch-owned plantations made it impossible for the enslaved African population to replenish itself through natural growth (Arends 1995). Therefore most sources agree that creolization in Suriname must have been gradual, involving a long period of multilingualism in the emerging Creole, and African and European languages (Selbach, Cardoso and Van den Berg 2009). Language creation must therefore have been accompanied both by gradual language shift (to the Creole and for some Dutch) by Suriname-born Africans as well as maintenance of African languages among African-born Africans and Suriname-born children. African languages have only survived into the present in a fossilized form in the ritual languages Kumanti, Ampuku and Papa (Thoden van Velzen and van Wetering 1988; Thoden van Velzen and van Wetering 2004).

The Creole languages of Suriname, however, thrived and have differentiated into the three distinct clusters of Sranantongo, Western and Eastern Maroon Creole (Smith 1987; Smith 2002). Amongst these, Sranantongo has spread beyond the coastal belt into the interior to become the most-widely spoken Creole of the country.

The indigenous languages of Suriname have undergone quite fundamental contact-induced changes since colonization as well, both through contact with each other (Carlin 2006, this volume) as well as with Sranantongo and Dutch (Rybka, this volume).

3.2 The abolition of slavery and the Asian languages of Suriname

The full abolition of slavery in 1873 after a transitional period of ten years of forced labor prompted the Dutch colonial regime to “import” indentured laborers from Asia, as in other plantation economies throughout the Caribbean and elsewhere in the colonial world in order to substitute for slave labor (Saunders 1984; Kale 1998). Through these arrangements, a total of about 30,000 (male and female) laborers were transhipped to Suriname from northern India between 1873 and 1916 (Damsteegt 1988: 95). A total of about 30,000 laborers arrived from Java (Indonesia) between 1890 and 1939 (Berselaar, Ketelaars and Dalhuisen 1991). A third, much smaller wave of migrants arrived from Guangdong province of southern China from the 1850s onwards as laborers and traders, numbering only about two thousand but constituting an important community in economic terms (Fat 2009: 52).

These migratory movements brought about a fundamental transformation of the previously established demographic constellation in Suriname. A country

with a largely African-descended population with relatively small Indigenous American and European components in the mid-nineteenth century had acquired an Asian-descended population numbering nearly half the size of the population by the turn of the twenty-first century. Hence in the 2004 national census about 27% of the total Surinamese population of half a million self-identifies as “Hindoe-staans” (Indian-descended) and 15% as “Javaans” (Javanese-descended) while the category “others” of 6% subsumes amongst others the Chinese-descended population and the Indigenous peoples of Suriname. Self-identified “Kreolen” and “Marrons” (both African-descended) Surinamese make up 18% and 15% respectively of the population. The substantial number of Surinamese who self-classify themselves as “mixed” (12%) or leave their ethnicity unreported (6%) is indicative of a growing proportion of Surinamese either claiming a mixed heritage of various constellations or rejecting ethnic labelling altogether.

The migratory mass movements of the indenture period have been equally transformative for the linguistic situation in Suriname as they have been for the demography of the country. Various northern Indian language varieties merged to form the koiné Sarnami, the community language of the Indian-descended population of Suriname (Damsteegt 1988, Yakpo, this volume).

Besides change due to contact with Sranantongo and Dutch, some degree of koineization also affected the Javanese language since it arrived in Suriname (cf. Vrugink 1987). This is probably also due to the fact that a small but not insignificant part of the “Javanese” population of Suriname had its origins elsewhere in the Indonesian Archipelago than Java (Gobardhan-Rambocus and Sarmo 1993). Contrary to Sarnami, there are indications that Javanese is not as vital anymore as it still was in the second half of the twentieth century and that there is an ongoing language shift, particularly by speakers below twenty to Sranantongo and Dutch.

The language of the Chinese community was, for a long time, chiefly Hakka (also called “Kejia”). But Cantonese and more recently Mandarin have played important roles as prestige languages within the community and there is an ongoing language shift to Sranantongo and Dutch (Tjon Sie Fat 2002).

3.3 Sranantongo and Dutch as lingua francas

Sranantongo and Dutch play a special role in Suriname: they are the only languages extensively used outside of their traditional speaker communities (principally the Afro-Surinamese population of the coastal belt). Within the four hundred years or so since its creation by enslaved Africans on the European plantations of Suriname, Sranantongo has evolved into a multi-ethnic dia-system used as a

lingua franca by the ethnically diverse population of the coast. The language has also made inroads into the interior where it shares a common space with various Maroon Creoles (Migge 2007; Migge and Léglise 2011, 2013) and Indigenous languages. Sranantongo served as the primary donor of lexical material to the Asian languages of Suriname during the indenture period, when knowledge of Dutch was not yet as widespread within these communities as it now is. Nowadays Sranantongo plays the role of a donor language together with Dutch. Sranantongo is the only language of Suriname that virtually every Surinamese has at least some knowledge of, however in growing competition with Dutch. It should be pointed out that the expansion of Sranantongo is solely a consequence of an incremental growth because the language has not benefited from state support of any kind whatsoever since it was abolished as a language of instruction in 1876 (cf. Tab. 2).

This stands in stark contrast to the development of Dutch, which has also witnessed a considerable growth in speaker numbers throughout the 20th century due to sustained institutional and elite support. Since colonial times, Dutch has been the sole language of government business and parliamentary affairs, and the de facto language of education at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels. It has remained the language of upward social mobility and high prestige and is extensively used by officialdom and by coastal Surinamese in a variety of registers. One of the consequences of this disposition is that Dutch has witnessed a fundamental transformation within the last hundred years or so. From being a language of the colonial administration and a relatively small Dutch-educated elite, it has been appropriated by larger sections of Surinamese society. In the process, Dutch has engaged on a trajectory of its own and today plays an important role as a donor language to Sranantongo and other languages of Suriname. At the same time, Dutch has itself become a recipient language for lexical (cf. De Bies, Martin and Smedts 2009) and structural borrowing from Sranantongo (De Kleine 1999). Our sociolinguistic interviews show widespread competence in (varieties of) spoken Dutch with Surinamese of diverse class backgrounds hence beyond the traditional patterns of upper and middle class use of Dutch inherited from the colonial period. Together with Sranantongo, Dutch is also a target for language shift from traditional community languages such as Javanese, Sarnami and Hakka.

The hierarchical superposition of Dutch to Sranantongo and the other languages of Suriname is being driven by a similar set of ideological, political and economic factors as in other postcolonial societies (cf. Omondi and Sure 1997; Heine 1990; Veiga 1999 for the status quo of colonial and African languages in African nations). The widespread assumption and acceptance of the “superior” status of Dutch in Suriname is reflected in often negative and self-denigrating

attitudes of speakers towards the non-European languages they speak and in the corresponding language practices.

However, the social and functional division of labor between Dutch and Sranantongo outlined above has also led to Sranantongo enjoying a large amount of covert prestige. In many contexts, using Sranantongo is an act of identity assertion, defiance and resistance against norms transmitted through Dutch, with all its problematic associations with elitism, the colonial past and a post-colonial present.

3.4 Contemporary data on multilingualism in Suriname

Determining the size of speaker communities in present-day Suriname is not easy in the absence of a comprehensive linguistic survey. Chapter 2 by Borges provides a detailed overview of the highly complex and still rapidly changing current situation. Sranantongo and Dutch constitute the two main axes of multilingualism. These two languages show the highest total percentages of self-reported “most often” and “second language” uses. At the same time they manifest the largest differences between “most often” and “second language” uses. The differences in social function between these two most widely spoken languages of Suriname transpire in the significant differences in percentage of “most spoken”. The percentage of 9% for Sranantongo for “language spoken most often” is surprisingly low, particularly in comparison to an equally surprisingly high score of 46.6% for Dutch. We attribute these percentages to prevailing language attitudes in Suriname that result from the functional and prestige differences between these languages referred to in the preceding section. Hence the high prestige of Dutch leads to over-reporting of use as “language spoken most often”, while the, the low prestige of Sranantongo leads to underreporting of use as a primary language. As for the other languages listed in Tab. 2, the lower percentages in the “second language” column seem to point to these languages largely functioning as in-group “ethnic” languages. For Sarnami for example, the relation of “most spoken” (about 75% of the total) and “second language” (about 25% of the total) may well be indicative of a partial language shift to Dutch and Sranantongo, or at least a certain decline in use. The same holds for Javanese.

We have seen that language creation has been of primordial historical importance for the rise of linguistic diversity in the country. In the present context, we find the maintenance of community languages alongside language shift to the two dominant languages, Sranantongo and Dutch.

4 Data collection methods in the present volume

The studies reported on this book rely for the largest part on field data collected in Suriname in 2011–12 as part of the ERC project “Traces of Contact” at the Centre for Language Studies at Radboud University Nijmegen. The corpus contains recordings in eight Surinamese languages: The Creole languages Sranantongo, Ndyuka, Kwinti and Saramaccan, as well as Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese, Surinamese Hakka and Surinamese Dutch. Comparative data has been collected in India, the Netherlands, West Africa and Mauritius. The corpus consists of a total of about hundred and fifty hours of data, of which the recordings of Sarnami and its control groups in India (Awadhi, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Magahi) and Mauritius (Mauritian Bhojpuri) make up about thirty hours. All unreferenced examples in this paper stem from our own field data. The chapters of Carlin, Rybka, and Migge rely on data collected in the course of many years of field research in the Guianas.

The data was collected according to a unified methodology in order to allow comparison across varieties and languages. Data collection methods involved the use of broad (story-based) and narrow (video clip-based) visual stimuli on the one hand and (semi-)structured interviews on specific topics on the other. Elicitation was complemented by recordings of natural discourse. In Suriname, we also conducted about fifty sociolinguistic interviews in Sranantongo on the backgrounds of speakers and their attitudes vis-à-vis the languages they speak.

We are much in favor of approaches employing quantitative analyses based on large diachronic and synchronic corpora in order to differentiate between codeswitching and borrowing, as well as between “normal” variability and contact-induced change (e.g., Van Hout and Muysken 1994; Poplack, Zentz and Dion 2012). However, when working with less documented languages, as in the case of Suriname, one is in a less fortunate position. There is a lack of sizeable corpora of diachronic data for all languages but Sranantongo (cf. <http://suca.ruhosting.nl>), and the collection and handling of even modest corpora of synchronic data involves considerable efforts. It seems then that only a mixed strategy is feasible. This involves quantitative investigations based on smaller corpora and extrapolation based on in-depth morpho-syntactic investigations of particular structural areas.

5 Theoretical background

Language contact and mutual borrowing of lexical items and structures in the languages of Suriname is a consequence of widespread multilingualism. We will therefore first review some of the concepts related to language contact and multilingualism

that we will be referring to. The typology of language contact that Thomason and Kaufman (1988) propose provides for three principal contact scenarios. We define scenario as the organized fashion in which multilingual speakers, in certain social settings, deal with the various languages in their repertoire.

In the *maintenance* scenario the language that borrows (henceforth the recipient language), from another language (henceforth the donor language) continues to be spoken by its speaker community, i.e. it is maintained. The literature shows that there is a large range of variation in maintenance scenarios. In some cases of maintenance, the recipient language may undergo more moderate lexical and structural transfer from a donor language. Other cases of maintenance show extensive transfers of phonological features, lexical material and structural patterns (e.g. Hainan Cham, whose Austronesian typological profile has been significantly altered due to contact with Sinitic, cf. Thurgood and Li 2003). The classification of a scenario as involving maintenance may also be theory-dependent. For example, a strong position on relexification – i.e. the mapping of one language’s semantic and morphosyntactic properties onto another’s phonological shapes – may in fact be seen as an extreme case of maintenance of the language providing the semantic and morphosyntactic content. Such a position is implicit in Lefebvre’s (1993, 1998) interpretation of the rise of Haitian Creole.

In the second scenario suggested by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), *shift*, a community leaves behind its traditional language and shifts to another language, usually due to the socio-economic and/or political dominance of the community speaking the language shifted to. Contact effects in shift scenarios may be very similar to those encountered in maintenance scenarios. Studies have shown that intermediary stages of language shift and obsolescence (cf. e.g. the case study in Aikhenvald 2012) show the same kind of heavy structural and lexical borrowing that may characterize maintenance scenarios in which a recipient language is not threatened by language loss (for an illustrative example, cf. Gómez-Rendón 2007).

A principal difference between shift and maintenance is pointed out by Van Coetsem (2000): Language shift involves a change in directionality of borrowing (termed “agentivity” by Van Coetsem) between a recipient language and a source language. Hence during a shift, contact effects chiefly manifest themselves through structural rather than lexical influence from a shifting community’s traditional language which is usually still spoken alongside the dominant language by some proportion of the shifting community. In a maintenance scenario, however, the traditional language of the community remains the dominant language and lexical borrowing is usually far more common, than or at least as common as structural borrowing from the donor language. The distinction is

also relevant for Suriname, which features a range of maintenance scenarios of varying depth or extensiveness of contact.

The third major scenario proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) involves the *creation* of new linguistic systems composed of elements of contributing languages. Creolization as one type of language creation is particularly important in the linguistic trajectory of Suriname. In the Surinamese creolization scenarios, European superstrate languages (English and Portuguese) provided most of the lexicon while several African substrate languages provided some lexicon and substantial parts of the grammatical and phonological systems. Next to genetic inheritance from contributing languages, creolization in Suriname also seems to have involved various degrees of restructuring of the input languages driven by linguistic-cognitive factors – the respective contribution ascribed to either of the two factors being subject to theoretical preferences (Alleyne 1980; Lefebvre 1998; McWhorter 2005; Bickerton 2009).

However, in the context of Suriname, other scenarios play a role as well. Language creation in Suriname concerns not only creolization but also *koineization* as diachronic and synchronic processes. We understand koineization as a less pervasive type of language creation in that there is less restructuring of the input languages involved in the creation of the koiné, as has been amply observed in cases of dialect contact (cf. e.g. Auer 1998b and the classic study of the rise of the Indic koiné of Fiji by Siegel 1985, 1987). The literature suggests that typological proximity and mutual intelligibility are the chief linguistic reasons responsible for the more modest restructuring of an interlanguage or koiné with respect to its input languages (cf. e.g. the studies in Braunmüller 2009; Kühl and Petersen 2009).

Stable multilingualism over some generations, as in Suriname, can lead to *structural convergence* between the various languages spoken in the same geographical space (Winford 2003). In the process, the languages in contact may become more similar by mutual accommodation, i.e. bidirectional change, for example by adopting a compromise on the basis of already existing common structures. In this paper, we employ “convergence” in a broader sense, however, as a cover term for the multiple contact scenario characteristic for Suriname. Here, borrowed structures may stem from the two dominant donor languages Dutch and Sranantongo simultaneously, and these two languages may interact in their influence on a recipient language. Due to this circumstance, it is often difficult to attribute instances of contact-induced change in a language like Sarnami to a single source.

In our classification of contact phenomena in the Surinamese languages we rely on models that differentiate between the borrowing of a specific form or *matter* (morphemes and their phonological shapes) and structure or *pattern* (morphosyntactic and semantic structures without the corresponding forms).

The latter phenomenon has been also been referred to in the literature (with varying degrees of overlap in meaning) by terms like “calquing” (Haugen 1950), “metatypy” (Ross 1996), “grammatical replication” (Heine and Kuteva 2003; Heine and Kuteva 2010), “pattern replication” (Matras and Sakel 2007; Sakel 2007), “rule borrowing” (Boretzky 1985) and last but not least “relexification” (e.g. Muysken 1981; Lefebvre 1993). We also refer to the code-copying model proposed by Johanson (1992).

Such approach not only allow operationalizing these two fundamental types of borrowing, it also allows yet finer distinctions of structural borrowing. Borrowing of patterns allows us to differentiate for example, between the replication of lexical versus grammatical structures. It may also encompass cases of partial replication in which a donor language pattern undergoes adaptation, i.e. is grammaticalized to fulfill functions in the recipient language that differ to some degree from those attested in the donor language (Heine and Kuteva 2003; Meyerhoff 2009). The differentiation between the borrowings of forms (matter) and structure (pattern) also leaves room for identifying combinations of matter and pattern borrowing, in which a form *and* its morphosyntactic and semantic specifications are carried over into another language. As we move on, we will see that both types of borrowing and combinations between them can be found in our Surinamese corpus.

Before moving on to the next section with the chapters in this book, we wish to point out that we share the general understanding that the outcomes of multilingualism and language contact are of course not solely determined by linguistic factors. Socio-economic, political, cultural and demographic factors, the time-depth of cultural and linguistic contact between communities and so forth, are at least as important in fashioning the processes and outcomes of contact between languages (Myers-Scotton 1993; Roberts 2005; Gómez-Rendón 2008). Our focus in this paper is on the linguistic as much as the extra-linguistic factors of contact-induced language change in Suriname.

6 Chapters in the present volume

In *The people and languages of Suriname*, **Robert Borges** reviews the various contact processes in the multilingual Guianas. Five processes are considered: (1) the partly convergent development within the Arawakan and Cariban languages (2) the introduction of the languages of three competing colonial powers: English, Dutch, French, and Portuguese; (3) the introduction of West African Gbe languages and languages of the Central African Kikongo cluster with enslaved Africans.

This led to the emergence of the various Creoles; (4) after the abolition of slavery indentured laborers were brought in, speaking northern Indian languages, Kejia, Cantonese, and Javanese; these languages underwent leveling; (5) with increasing regional migration in recent times speakers of Guyanese Creole, Haitian Creole, Brazilian Portuguese, and Mandarin have come to Suriname. Currently Surinamese Dutch is the dominant language, transformed from a metropolitan standard language to a local interethnic urban variety.

Kofi Yakpo presents a systematic overview, in *Creole in transition: Contact with Dutch and typological change in Sranantongo*, of how the expression of spatial relations and grammatical relations in Sranantongo has undergone typological change from a more West African typology inherited from the substrates to a more Dutch-like system. Sranantongo is the only language of Suriname spoken to some degree by the vast majority of the Surinamese population, irrespective of their class, ethno-linguistic and regional background.

Robert Borges, in *The Maroon Creoles of the Guianas: Expansion, contact, and hybridization* provides an account of the historical developments, up to the present, of the Maroons and Maroon languages in Suriname and French Guiana. Following the arrival of enslaved Africans, groups of individuals fled their captivity, taking creole varieties with them as they established independent communities outside the plantation area. The relative isolation of the Maroon groups provided a setting in which the Maroon languages diverged substantially from the Creole varieties associated with the plantation area. This isolation came to a gradual end, leading to increased contact between Maroon varieties on the one hand, and Sranan and Dutch, on the other, and to the leveling of Maroon varieties.

In *Out of India: Language contact and change in Sarnami (Caribbean Hindustani)*, **Kofi Yakpo** describes how Sarnami of Suriname, the only Indo-Aryan koiné of the Caribbean that still enjoys a stable speaker community, has diverged from its north Indian contributing languages due to contact with Sranan and Dutch. The study shows that head-initial order has increased or supplanted head-final order inherited from Indo-Aryan in some domains (i.e. SVO, AuxV, NRel), while other domains have remained head-final (e.g. NAdp, AdjN).

Sophie Villerius, in *Developments in Surinamese Javanese*, shows how Javanese was brought to Suriname during the colonial labor trade within roughly the same period as Sarnami and still serves as a community language to a sizeable portion of the Javanese-descended population of Suriname. This chapter addresses effects of contact with Dutch and Sranan that have so far remained unstudied.

In an exploratory paper **Luis Miguel Rojas-Berscia** with **Jia Shi** in an exploratory paper entitled *Hakka as spoken in Suriname*, analyze recordings of Hakka or Kejia Chinese. An ethnic Chinese population began constituting itself in

Suriname in the mid nineteenth century, when the Dutch colonial regime started importing Asian indentured labor as a substitute for African slave labor. This first cohort of Chinese migrants largely stemmed from Hakka/Kejia-speaking villages in the Fuidung'on Region. In the 1960s, a second wave consisting of acculturated Fuidung'on Hakka chain migrants joined the Chinese population already present in Suriname via Hong Kong. The third and latest migratory wave began in the 1990s after the People's Republic of China (PRC) eased restrictions on emigration.

The paper *Cariban in contact: New perspectives on Trio-Ndyuka pidgin* by **Sergio Meira** and **Pieter Muysken**, analyse the Trio-Ndyuka pidgin of the interior of Suriname, and situate the pidgin in the context of Carib/non-Carib contacts during the last five or six centuries. In earlier important work by Huttar and Venantie (1997) the pidgin was looked at from the Ndyuka perspective. Here the Carib perspective is focused upon.

In *Language contact in Southern Suriname: The case of Trio and Wayana*, **Eithne Carlin** presents an in-depth overview of different types of language contact phenomena involving the Amerindians of southern Suriname and non-Amerindian groups, over a period of approximately 400 years. Overall, most of the language contact has resulted in lexical borrowing, but this process has been quite complicated.

Konrad Rybka, in *Contact-induced phenomena in Lokono (Arawakan)* shows that a number of contact-induced phenomena have affected a variety of Lokono spoken in Suriname. Setting out from an account of the different layers of old nominal borrowings, it moves on to focus on synchronic examples involving hybrid verbal paradigms. This category shift is a sign of a new contact situation in the history of Lokono – the widespread multilingualism in Lokono, Sranantongo and Dutch makes it possible for the languages to exert influence on one another far beyond simple lexical borrowing.

Pieter Muysken, in *The transformation of a colonial language: Surinamese Dutch* analyzes the structural evolution of Dutch in Suriname since the mid seventeenth century. Historical records show that the language was used by Dutch colonists, and albeit fewer, free and enslaved Africans alike from the very beginning of its implantation in Suriname and the Dutch Antilles. In the course of this development, Surinamese Dutch has also undergone dramatic changes due to substratal influence, mainly from Sranantongo.

Robert Borges, **Pieter Muysken**, **Sophie Villerius** and **Kofi Yakpo** describe in *The tense-mood-aspect systems of the languages of Suriname* how the expression of Tense, Mood, and Aspect (TMA) has received a great deal of scholarly attention by contact linguists, in particularly by those interested in pidgins and creoles. Thus there is a wealth of data on the expression of TMA in monolingual varieties of these languages, and on how these expressions emerged, but we know

very little about their behavior in multilingual practices. This chapter compares the use of TMA markers in several types of contact languages (creoles, koinés, Surinamese Dutch) in their respective monolingual and multilingual settings.

Bettina Migge in *From grammar to meaning: Towards a framework for studying synchronic language contact*, explores the dynamic nature of language contact. Taking a language or system-based perspective, research on language contact tends to focus on describing the structural effects of language contact on particular structural sub-domains. Contact mechanisms and processes are inferred from macro-social data and structural linguistic comparative data alone. Such an approach creates homogenizing and one-dimensional contact scenarios. This chapter critically examines the viability of this approach for understanding synchronic contact settings, and drawing on contact between Maroon Creoles, Srananatongo, Dutch and other languages, shows how people make use of language contact to negotiate different social and interactional meanings.

In the final chapter *Multilingual ecologies in the Guianas: Overview, typology, prospects*, **Kofi Yakpo** and **Pieter Muysken** discuss to what extent and in which way the grammatical systems of the various languages covered in this volume have converged. Are the changes these languages have undergone the result of contact or are they motivated by other factors? How stable are specific structural features and areas in this particular contact setting? The crucial aspects of borrowability and stability of linguistic features during contact are also addressed here.