A COMMUNITY-BASED APPROACH TO THE PROVENANCE OF URBAN GUYANESE CREOLE

Walter F. Edwards

(Wayne State University)

The existence of varieties of Creole in Guyana has been documented in the published literature by several scholars including Derek Bickerton (1973, 1975, 1981). The latter has proposed that the Creole to English variation in Guyana can be generally divided into three levels the basilect, the mesolect and the acrolect. These levels are seen by Bickerton as merely convenient ways of dividing what in reality is a linguistic continuum, i.e. a seamless linguistic whole in which subsystems are in dynamic relationship with each other.

I have also, in Edwards (1980) and elsewhere, proposed three varieties of Guyanese English but I have labelled these varieties Standard Guyanese English (SGE), Urban Creole English (UCE) and Rural Creole English (RCE). The last variety is restricted to rural areas but SGE and UCE can be heard throughout the country. I have used other labels than Bickerton's because I do not share the latter's belief that the three varieties comprise a seamless linguistic whole, although I do know that they have influenced each other linguistically. This mutual influence is not, in my view, unidirectional. Consequently, I am as prepared to find that UCE influenced RCE and SGE as I am prepared to find other directions of influence.

The purpose of this paper, despite its polemical preamble, is not primarily to challenge the basilect to acrolect model or the linguistic continuum idea. Rather, I wish to attempt to sketch the historical and sociological contexts within which what I have here designated Urban Guyanese Creole English developed. The urban Creole English I shall be discussing developed in Georgetown, the capital city of Guyana. I wish to establish that UCE resulted from the kind of community Georgetown was, and is: a community that is historically and contemporarily different from rural communities in Guyana. In the process of this presentation, I will attempt to identify some of the principles which distinguished the Georgetown community from rural communities in Guyana and to apply some of the ideas of Gumperz (1982), Le Page (1977) and Milroy (1980) to my attempts to provide a societally based explanation of the phenomenon of UCE.

Present-day Guyana (formerly British Guiana) is comprised of the countries of Essequibo, Berbice and Demerara, in descending order of physical size; but the most technologically and industrially advanced of these countries is Demerara. The capital city, Georgetown, is in Demerara and so are the headquarters of all the major businesses in the country. The Essequibo, Berbice and the Demerara rivers are the three main waterways that flow into the Atlantic.

Dutch settlements were established on the Essequibo River around 1600 (Netscher, 1931) and on the Berbice River, some eighty miles east of the Essequibo in 1626. The Dutch West India Company administered Essequibo. The

Berbice settlements initially came under the jurisdiction of the Zeeland Chamber of the Dutch West India Company, but was from its inception a separate colony from Essequibo.

Although Essequibo and Berbice engaged in similiar agricultural activities, Essequibo did not fare as well as Berbice. Throughout the seventeenth century Essequibo experienced various kinds of economic hardship. Part of the problem was that the original settlers had chosen to farm on land several miles upriver from the mouth of the river where the settlements were safer from pirates but where the land turned out to be less fertile than land on the coast and near the river mouth.

The Demerara colony, established on the Demarara river, between the Essequibo and Berbice rivers, owed its founding to the economic difficulties of Essequibo and to the administrative talents of Laurens Storm van's Gravesande who became the Commandeur of Essequibo in 1742. Gravesande's regime began at a time when the proprietors of Essequibo were almost desperate to make the colony more profitable. To this end, Gravesande decided to encourage the enterprises of a few English planters who had seen the wisdom of settling on the lower Essequibo coast. These English planters had found farming difficult and taxes high in Barbados, Antigua and other West Indian islands and had immigrated illegally to the Essequibo coast.[1] Gravesande saw in these English planters the opportunity for unofficial trade in slaves and other supplies needed in Essequibo. In addition, these English settlers possessed useful, and apparently scarce, farming expertise which they had developed in the islands. Consequently, Gravesande sought and obtained permission from the colony's Directors in Holland to allow the British settlers to remain in Essequibo.

Four years after the legitimizing of the small English settlements on the Essequibo, the Directors of the Essequibo colony gave permission for the settlement of Demerara and English planters from the West Indies, particularly Barbados, were the most eager foreigners to immigrate to Demarara. In a relatively short time, the English comprised a significant percentage of the Demerara population. Peter Newman (1964: 18) notes that 'by 1760 the British were more numerous than the Dutch in Demerara.' Peter Simms (1966: 34-35) also observes that:

> When in 1746, the Dutch declared the land around the mouth of the Demerara River open for settlement many British planters moved to Guiana bringing their slaves with them . . . the number of British settlers soon began to outstrip the Dutch and by 1786 the colony was effectively under British control.

We must note here, too, that van's Gravesande's open-door, policy was not limited to the English planters in the Caribbean area. In fact, Demerara attracted settlers from many nations and quickly became the most cosmopolitan of the three colonies.

The bustling colony of Demerara was such a success that, as Dalton (1855: 234) notes, 'in a short time (by 1773) it became necessary to have separate courts of policy and criminal and civil justice for its district

administration.' Before this, Demerara was regarded as an extension of Essequibo and was administered from Kyk-over-al, the original Essequibo capital. Demerara's independent courts were first located on Borselen island, twenty miles up the Demerara river, but as the colony rapidly expanded and settlements moved towards the mouth of the Demerara river the need was felt for a less remote and more convenient administrative capital. In 1774 the seat of government was moved to the east bank of the mouth of the Demerara and named Stabroek. In 1782, under the French, a start was made on a modern capital where, as the proclamation stated "Religion will have a temple, Justice a palace, War its arsenals, Commerce its counting-houses, and industries, its factories; where also the inhabitants may enjoy the advantages of social intercourse' (Rodway, 1912: 103). When the Dutch regained control of the two-river colony in 1784, they continued the building program started by the French and confirmed the name Stabroek.

In 1774 Stabroek 'consisted of two rows of isolated buildings wide apart with a grass lot between them' (Dalton 1855; 235) but the town grew rapidly and by 1789 its population, according to R. T. Smith (1962: 20), was 780, consisting of '238 whites, 466 slaves, and 76 free coloured people.' These latter figures are probably low since Dalton (1855: 237-238) writing about events occurring 'about 1778' observed that:

> About this time also, these settlements received a considerable accession of strength by the arrival of a number of English specultators from the islands, who brought with them considerable capital, and introduced a more intelligent and better educated class of tradesmen along with them. . . But not only did English arrive, but people from all nations began to be attracted to this spot. . . The Dutch and the British, however, were the most numerous, and the latter soon formed at least two-thirds of the white population which in the town of Stabroek alone mustered at this period about 1000 inhabitants. (my emphasis)

Table I below gives demographic statistics for Georgetown for selected years.

TABLE I

Population of Georgetown 1789, 1820, 1824, 1830 by Race and Status

YEAR	WHITES	FREE COLOURED	SLAVES	TOTAL
1789	238	76	466	780
1820	1471	2500	4839	8,810
1824	1500	3317	5699	10,516
1830	1620	4368	6616	12,604

Source: Edwards (1975: 80)

Since English planters were reported to be the largest group of whites in Demerara and were the settlers who most preferred to farm land close to the mouth of the Demerara River, it seems reasonable to assume that the bulk of the white population in Georgetown, almost from its inceptions, were English.

That this was indeed the case is supported by the observations of Henry Bolingbroke (1813: 35). Soon after he landed in Stabroek in 1799, Bolingbroke observed:

> I have often considered with astonishment, the mixture of European inhabitants which destiny has heaped together in this community (Stabroek) Dutch, Germans, Prussians, Russians, Swedes, Danes, Spaniards, French and Americans may be incorporated as one-third of the white population and Great Britain claims the other two. All natural enmity seems forgotten while the pursuits of the motley groups are directed unanimously to climbing the ladder of fortune
>
> (my emphasis)

Bolingbroke describes a bustling town teeming with huskers and various entrepreneural types from several ethnic backgrounds. By 1799, according to Bolingbroke (1813: 38), Stabroek was surrounded by busy townships, including Kingston, Bridgetown, Cummingsburg, Newtown and Werkenrust; the first four of these towns having been built by the English. Stabroek was re-named Georgetown (the name used hereafter in this paper) in 1831.

At this point in this presentation I wish to stop to consider the sort of community Georgetown was around the end of the eighteenth century. This is crucial to a description of the kind of sociolinguistic community this city was near its inception. But before I go any further I wish to indicate the kind of sociolinguistic model I shall be using to interpret the data being presented in this paper.

As I indicated in Edwards (1983), I favor a model of sociolinguistic dynamics which sees linguistic behavior as consequences of social, cultural, motivational and other humanistic considerations. Cognitive and linguistic constraints apply, of course. My orientation to this kind of sociolinguistic model, makes the work of Alleyne (1971, 1980, Gumperz (e.g. 1982), Milroy (1980) and Le Page (e.g. 1977, 1980) especially appealing. Alleyne argues that linguistic change comes about as a result of language contact. For him, one kind of language contact situation is that of social equals speaking mutually unintelligible languages. Linguistically, this may or may not lead to the creation of a lingua franca. Such a lingua franca has been given the label 'pidgin'. Another kind of language contact situation is one in which a politically and economically subordinate group lives in the same political entity as their political and economic superiors and the two groups initially speak mutually unintelligible languages. In such cases the former group may attempt to learn the latter group's language but in doing so the former group retains many of the abstract linguistic principles in their native language, especially if there is no formal attempt to teach the subordinate group the language of the dominant group. Alleyne refers to the process I have just described as linguistic acculturation, a term I agree with. I also agree with Alleyne's scepticism about the usefulness of the terms pidginization and creolization. Alleyne points out that:

> What are being termed pidginization and creolization are really

> initial movements in the transmission of West African linguistic features in a billingual situation and the subsequent progressive elimination of these features in cases where contact with English has been relatively intense and for prolonged duration.
>
> (Alleyne 1980: 189)

Gumperz has been concerned for a long time with the socio-cultural principles in communities and with the way language behavior reflects these principles. These concerns are discussed in several of the studies in Anwar Dil's anthology of Gumperz's work (Gumperz 1971). More recently, Gumperz has used the concept of social network to explain sociolinguistic patterns. Gumperz, in an article which appeared in 1976 but was recently published in Gumperz (1982), explains social network this way:

> If one maps the total range of an individual's contacts with others over time and group them in terms of the social ties they reflect, these contacts pattern in such a way that some types of encounters are carried out more frequently with some categories of individuals than with others. Systematic tracing of the regularities involved yields networks of social relationships (Gumperz 1982: 41).

The social network concept, first employed by sociologists (see Bott 1971 and studies in Boissevain and Mitchell (eds)) has been used very recently by Milroy (1980), Milroy and Margrain (1980) and Russell (1982) to provide societally based explanations of language behavior in Belfast and Kenya respectively (Also see studies in Romaine (ed.) 1982).

For my present paper I find Le Page's ideas most attractive. His general conception is presented many places but is here taken from Le Page (1980: 15):

> We create our 'rules' so as to resemble as closely as possible those of the group or groups with which from time to time we wish to identify.

This simply stated 'hypothesis' expresses a powerful truth of social and therefore sociolinguistic behavior. Le Page's general theory includes the principles of projection, focussing and diffusion which are explained and exemplified (using Caribbean language data) in his very important article (Le Page 1977) in Valdman's (1977) anthology. I find Le Page's work particularly interesting because his theory is equally comfortable with the individual and with groups of individuals as they live in a multidimensional social world and use language to make individual and community 'acts of identity'.

We now return to Georgetown in the late eighteenth century and find that its white population consists mainly of English colonists who had migrated from Barbados and the other English colonies in the West Indies at the time. These colonists spoke eighteenth century English. The slaves these English colonists had brought with them from the islands spoke either eighteenth

century English or a variety of acculturated English close to eighteenth century English. There seems to be general agreement that no pidgin or Creole developed in Barbados in its early history. According to Hancock (Ms: 11)

> There is no evidence of an early, distinctive Barbadian pidgin or Creole based on English. In fact the evidence suggests the contrary . . . The first slaves learned English from their owners and fellow white bondsmen, who spoke nautical and regional forms of British English. Those English speaking slaves and their children were the first to be taken from Barbados to other parts of the Western Hemisphere; because of their linguistic background, they did not disperse any kind of Creole.

My own opinion is that the English of the slaves with Barbadian backgrounds might not have been as innocent of the influence of their African linguistic heritage as Hancock suggests, since I believe that linguistic acculturation proceeds generally along the lines suggested in Alleyne (1980). However, as Le Page would note, English colonies in Barbados and the Leeward islands in the seventeenth century were little worlds of their own and were highly focussed communities. In such circumstances linguistic acculturation is likely to have led to a variety close to the dominant language. Note, however, that linguistic acculturation does not entail 'decreolization', according to Alleyne (1980: 190). In his view the social situation between Africans and Europeans and among Africans can lead to the chrystalization of what he calls 'intermediate varieties' such as Barbadian English, without prior creolization and subsequent decreolization.

In early Georgetown, then, we have a significant portion of the population uncontestably speaking English or acculturated English. We also have another group, the free coloreds, who might have been monolingual English speakers, bilingual in Dutch and English or monolingual in Dutch. If they had immigrated to Demerara (or were immediate descendants of people who had) then they probably spoke English. Those who were from Dutch backgrounds probably saw the social advantage of learning English, for both social and commercial purposes. As a group the free coloreds were regarded by the slaves and by the whites as black (Farley 1955: 132-153) in spite of the fact that they were by then people of considerable means. Bolingbroke (1813: 35) found many prosperous free colored women involved in the retail trade:

> Hucksters are free women of colour, who purchase their commodities of merchants at two or three months' credit, and retail them out. . . Many of them are, indeed, wealthy, and possess ten, fifteen, and twenty negroes, all of whom they employ in this traffic.

Farley (1955: 142-3) claims that these free coloreds had no strong desire to escape identification with the blacks but considered that their education and means qualified them for the privileges of the planter class. We can assume that the free coloreds would, as a group (individual variation was surely in evidence) want their public, social and linguistic behaviors to resemble those of the socially and politically dominant group in the colony of

Demerara and the city of Georgetown, and it is clear that the English enjoyed this dominance during the period under consideration. An indication of the political prestige of the English was the fact that in 1799 the English party was the strongest in the College of Keizers, the six representatives of the inhabitants of the colony.

Contemporary Georgetown society also had, almost surely, ex-slaves; blacks who had bought their freedom and who, like the free coloreds, would have found the city a more comfortable habitat than plantations. Having rejected the plantation ethos, they would have embraced the developing norms of the urban society.[2] The latter group was the nucleus of the urban working class, a class which Rodney (1981: 219) writing about late eighteenth century Georgetown described as, 'heterogeneous--reflecting miscellaneous job categories in an urban center which had only administrative, commercial, part and service facilities.'

The Georgetown society was stratified, even at this early period in its history, on the principle of class, with the most sharply defined class being the planter class (which probably included the white administrators and entrepreneurs in the city). The working class loosely comprised the slaves, ex-slaves and probably a small group of African indentured servants (a group that became numerically and socially significant after emancipation in 1833). The free colored comprised an ambiguous group in the contemporary society. In my view this class system allowed for more interactivity between social groups and intra-activity within groups than the caste-like social structure of the typical plantation.

The class structure led to the forging of working-class solidarity and to other social features such as residential separation and job specialization. Under these circumstances the working class developing strong social network relationships leading to the emergence of social and linguistic norms and the merchanism to enforce these norms through social sanctions of various sorts. The way in which low-status communities can develop norm-enforcing social network patterns has recently been clearly demonstrated by Milroy (1982) and Cheshire (1982). Milroy (1982), quite appropriately, saw the similarity between the social and linguistic consequences of high scores on her network strength scale and the social and linguistic consequences of what Le Page refers to as focussing. Le Page claims (1977: 239) that 'the more intra-active the community the more homogeneous, stable and prescriptive will its behavioral norms become. . . while pidgin is a product of interaction between cultures, a stable Creole is the product of intra-action, leading to focussing.'

The urban milieu I have briefly characterized differed from the contemporary rural communities which were plantations. Urban anthropologists, such as those who contributed to Abu-Lughod and Hay Jr. (1977) would posit a rural-urban 'antagonism' between Georgetown and the non-urban areas in the colonies and predict that antagonism would have led to the emergence of social and sociolinguistic differentiation.

I am claiming in this paper, therefore, that the sociocultural milieu of early Georgetown has to be described in terms of the linguistic, national and cultural backgrounds of its original inhabitants, the social structure of the community, the nature of the social networks that developed, the special urban characteristics that the early Georgetown community evinced, the political power of the dominant group in the city and the political influence that Britain was beginning to wield in the Caribbean at the time. I feel these various circumstances resulted in the chrystalization among working-class Georgetown citizens of a language variety that was close to eighteen century English but had many characteristics of the linguistic properties of the West African languages that slaves brought with them from Africa. This variety I have labelled urban Creole English. This variety was not, and is not 'pure' in any linguistic sense, since it is clearly a synthesis. I do not think that anyone can adequately explain precisely why the synthesis selected the particular linguistic properties it did, although it is possible to describe in general linguistic terms the synchronic organization of the variety.

A sample of Georgetown Creole English appears in the Appendix to this paper. Readers will see that it is not a 'basilect' nor is it Georgetown colloquial English (see Edwards 1978), nor is it the 'acrolect'. If there was space in this paper for a close linguistic analysis, it could be shown that the variety displays features associated with both the basilect and the acrolect, much in the way Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1982: 174-177) show that a sample of Belizian Creole speech contains several idealized linguistic systems.

Reliable examples of early Georgetown Creole English are difficult to find. The samples that appear in the travel, historical and 'folk' anthropology literature are unconvincing for various reasons. I wish to suggest, however, that the samples appearing in Rickford (1978: 205-214) as dialogues in cartoons printed in the now defunct Argosy newspaper are reasonably authentic, but even here we have to allow for the tendency of cartoons to negatively stereotype working class speech. These dialogues do have so-called basilect features but are not very much different from speech I recorded in Georgetown in 1974.

Early Georgetown speech (from Rickford 1978: 205)

Customer: Manyell, I wants a jill salt fish, and you muss gi'e me a bit of cheese, a few match, taste of butter, and lend me you haxe to cut me firewood. You knows I am reg'lar customah.

Manoel: Me Gad. Before so I sa gie you the saltfish fa not'ing

(ibid: 213)

First sister: Class-leader made me to know that you call me daughter name. You getta no make you mout' so fas'

Second sister: Class leader tell you dat? Well I sure. An all I say was dat you daughta always have new boots w'en gold-digger come to town.

(We only have space here for the above two samples, and we must note that the samples were printed between 1891 and 1894).

After emancipation, the Georgetown population became even more cosmopolitan with the addition of indentured laborers who were natives of India, China, Madiera and, of course, Africa. These new immigrants came, no doubt, into a stable urban community with already focussed and stabalized linguistic habits and had to learn the acculturated English of the residents.

The Georgetown society has remained internally stable over the decades. Georgetown's stability was promoted by its unchallenged position as the most important city in Guyana. The class relationships have remained intact, thereby supporting the loose distinction between a 'standard' colloquial English and Georgetown Creole English. The societal role of Georgetown (as the main commercial center) and the norms of behavior it sanctions have also remained stable. Immigration has been uniformly into Georgetown and immigrants have had to learn the Georgetown Creole. Georgetowners have traditionally not taken up permanent residency in other places, therefore large kinship and friendship networks stretching back dozens of years have been typically established.

It is impossible to escape the theoretical implications of what I am proposing in this paper. If I am right in thinking that what is referred to here as Georgetown Creole had different linguistic inputs and developed within a different socio-cultural milieu from the language varieties in the rest of Guyana, and if the linguistic consequences of this mix were different from the linguistic systems in general use in the rest of the country, then it cannot be reasonable to refer to Georgetown Creole English as a decreolization of a basilect which developed in the same country. In other words the continuum model stumbles here. Nor can one reasonably claim that an acrolect exists if that acrolect is not an evolution of the present mesolect or of Georgetown Creole. In my view Standard Guyanese colloquial English is a local modification of British English varieties. The historical predecessor of this variety in Georgetown, seventeenth century English, evolved separately from Guyanese Englishes. The most that can be proposed, and what indeed, I suggest, is that a convergence between the co-existent Creole varieties did occur over the course of the social life of the present Guyanese society. Urban Creole influenced Creole and vice versa and they both influenced Guyanese English.

This approach would explain why urban Creole English differs in phonological, morphological and grammatical respects from rural Creole even though the varieties do resemble each other in important respects. Bickerton's attempts to describe Guyanese linguistic phenomena in terms of a linguistic continuum is sociolinguistically flawed since his theory fails to take into

account crucial social matters. Bickerton's work is brilliant and useful, but I think we should look at other approaches and I hope my ideas are worthy of your consideration.

FOOTNOTES

1 Barbados had been colonized in 1627 by the English under Henry Powell. Initially, the Barbadian planters cultivated cotton and tobacco principally but sugar cane cultivation was soon introduced. This move had tremendous social and economic effects. As Hamshere (1972: 56) observes 'sugar-planting. . . turned the small island from a struggling community into the most prosperous English colony'. Unfortunately, sugar cane cultivation had a devastating effect on small farmers who could not afford the capital outlay necessary to convert successfully to sugar planting. Thus 'for the ruined and dispossessed smallholder there were no prospects and Barbados was faced with the first "poor whites" problem' (Hamshere 1972: 57). The solution for many of these latter farmers was migration to other territories in the Caribbean and the Guianas. Although this dispersal of white Barbadian planters was a seventeenth century phenomenon, it probably explains the presence of white planters from Barbados in Essequibo in the mid-eighteenth century.

2 Other language varieties spoken in late eighteenth century Georgetown included, most likely, a variety resembling present-day Sranan, a Creole variety which was probably spoken by some slaves throughout the three colonies. This variety developed in Suriname (the Dutch colony immediately to the east of the Berbice colony) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The precise period when Sranan chrystalized is in dispute (see Hancock Ms) but it is agreed that English is part of its linguistic input. Sranan-speaking slaves would have come to Guyana from Suriname to help staff the Essequibo and Berbice plantation in the late seventeenth century and afterwards. It is also reasonable to assume that a Dutch Creole might have emerged in the colonies and was also spoken in eighteenth century Georgetown. It is not inevitable that when two peoples speaking mutually unintelligible languages are forced into social co-existence that a Creole would develop but Robertson (e.g. nd, 1982) has brought to our attention considerable and persuasive evidence that such a creole did develop and was in general use in the colonies during the Dutch occupation. Robertson's work describes two varieties of this Creole: Berbice Dutch and Essequibo Dutch. That Demerara Dutch did not develop might be explained by the fact that the English were numerically and linguistically dominant in the Demerara from its beginning.

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, J. & R. Hay Jr., eds. (1977). Third world urbanization. Chicago: Maarouia Press, Inc.

Alleyne, M. (1971). 'Acculturation and the cultural matrix of creolization'.

In D. Hymes ed. pidginization and creolization of languages. London: Cambridge Univ. Press. 169-86.

_____ (1979). 'On the genesis of languages'. In K. Hill ed. the genesis of language. Ann Arbor: Karoma Press. 89-107.

_____ (1980). Comparative Afro-American. Ann Arbor: Karoma Press.

Bickerton, D. (1973). 'On the nature of the Creole continuum'. Language 49, 640-69.

_____ (1975). Dynamics of a Creole system. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

_____ (1981). Roots of language. Ann Arbor: Karoma Press.

Boissevain, J. & J. Mitchell eds. 1973. Network analysis: studies in human iteraction. The Hague: Mouton.

Bolingbroke, H. (1813). A voyage to the Demerary, containing a statistical account of the settlements there, and of those on the Essequibo, Berbice, and other contiguous rivers of Guyana. Philadelphia: M. Carey.

Bott, E. (1971). Family and social network. rev. ed. London: Tavistock.

Dalton, M. (1855). The history of British Guiana. Vol. 1. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans.

Edwards, W. F. (1975). 'Sociolinguistic behavior in rural and urban circumstances in Guyana'. Unpublished D. Phil. dissertation, University of York.

_____ (1980). 'Varieties of English in Guyana'. Linguistics 18,289-309.

_____ (1983). 'Code selection and shifting in Guyana'. Language in Society 12, 3. 285-312.

Farley, R. (1955). 'The shadow and the substance'. Caribbean Quarterly 4,2.

Gibson, K. (1982). 'Tense and aspect in Guyanese Creole: a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis.' Unpublished D. Phil. dissertation Univ. of York.

Gumperz, J. (1971). Language in social groups. California: Stanford Univ. Press.

_____ (1982). 'Social network and language shift'. In Gumperz ed. Discourse strategies. London: Cambridge Univ. Press. 38-58.

Hamshere, C. (1972). The British in the Caribbean, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Hancock, I. nd. 'Gullah and Barbadian-origins and relationships'. Ms. Univ. of Texas at Austin.

Le Page, R. (1977). 'Processes of pidginization and creolization.' In Valdman ed. Pidgin and Creole linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press. 222-255.

_____ (1980). 'Projection, focussing, diffusion'. York Papers in Linguistics 9. Fetschrift R. B. Le Page. 9-32.

_____ and Tabouret-Keller. 1982. 'Models and stereotypes of ethnicity and of language'. Journal of Multicultural Development. 3,3. 161-192.

Milroy, L. (1980). Language and social networks. Baltimore: University Park Press.

_____ and S. Margrain. 1980. 'Vernacular language loyalty and social network'. Language in Society 9,1. 43-70.
Netscher, P. M. (1931). History of the colonies Essequibo, Demerara and Berbice from the Dutch establishment to the present day. trans. by W. E. Roth. Georgetown: the Daily Cronicle.
Newman, P. (1964). British Guiana: Problems of cohesion in an immigrant society. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
Rickford, J. ed. (1978). A festival of Guyanese words. Georgetown: University of Guyana.
Robertson, I. nd. 'Dutch Creole in Guyana--some missing links'. Occasional Paper No. 2. Society for Caribbean linguistics.
_____ (1982). 'Redefining the post-creole continuum'. Occasional Paper No. 14. Society for Caribbean Linguistics.
Rodney, W. (1981). A history of the Guyanese working people. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Univ. Press.
Rodway, J. (1912). Guiana: British, Dutch, and French. London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd.
Romaine, S., ed. (1982). Sociolinguistic variation in speech communities. London: Edward Arnold.
Russell, J. (1982). "Networks and sociolinguistic variation in an African urban setting.' In Romaine ed. 125-140.
Simms, P. (1966). Trouble in Guyana. London: Allen & Unwin.
Smith, R. T. (1962). British Guiana. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
Valdman, A. ed. (1972). Pidgin and Creole Linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

APPENDIX

A brief sample of Georgetown Creole English. The full text of this conversation is found in Edwards (1980: 293-294).

The behaviour of Ingrid

A. Interviewer (Informant's Employer)
B. Informant

A. we ˌɪŋgrɪd-ʃɪ gʌ:n 'wa:kɪn.
B. 'no mɪsa pɛri wɛn aɪ se ˌaɪ 'sɪk ʌ 'sɪk. aɪ do:n se aɪ ˌsɪk an gʌ:n 'wʌ:kɪn. aɪ do:n 'laɪk 'ste ho:m yʊ no:. ivn ɪf ɪf aɪ se aɪ ˌsɪk an aɪ ˌste ho:m aɪ-ɪs fil 'bo:rd. 'ivn tə wɛn aɪ 'prɛgnʌnt, yʊ no wət aɪ 'faɪnd di mo:r aɪ laɪ 'dəŋ ən ˌyil tə dat 'sɪknɪs laɪk a ˌsɪk 'mo:r 'aɪ ˌfil sə tə məsɛlf. an ˌaɪ dəz 'faɪt ɪt. di ˌo:nli 'tɪŋ diz kɪl mi ɪŋgrɪd kʊʔn ˌsɪk laɪk mi. di 'o:nli 'θɪŋ diz kɪl mi ɪz dɪ ˌvʌmɪtɪn ən ɪf ə gɛ tablɪts tʊ kʊntro:l ˌdat, aɪ 'stɪl wʌ:k, bət a aɪ si ɪŋgrɪd ˌdo:n vʌmɪt 'laɪk mi'ʃi do:n gɛ ba:d 'fi:lɪns ˌlaɪk mi, 'nʌtn laɪk mi ʌn 'evride ʃɪ sɪk. her ˌstori. nɔʊ ʃɪ 'sɪk ʃɪ gɔ 'prɛʃʌ ʃɪ bɪn ˌadmɪtɪd frʌm 'fraɪdi, ˌsatəde, ˌsʊndi, ɪŋgrɪd ɔn di ro:d bə aɪ ɪz 'wʊ. 'no:, ʃɪ dɪd ʃɪ ʃɪ bɪn ˌadmɪtɪd an ˌdɪstʃardzd, ˌbifo:r 'sʌndi.
A. admɪtɪd fʊ 'wʊ.
B. blʌd 'prɛʃʌ. ʃɪ prɛʃʌ, 'ʌ:l ʌ dɛm prɛʃʌ laɪk dʊ aɪ ˌlaɪk ɪt 'ba:d ʃi 'gɔt ɪt mɪsᵗə pɛri, ʃi gɔt 'hɛvi a:m blʌd-prɛʃʌ. aɪ-ɪn 'sɛɪn ɪŋgrɪd ɛn ˌsɪk mɪstə pɛri bət ɪŋgrɪd 'do:nt ˌhav ˌblʌd — 'prɛʃʌ. ɪŋgrɪd mʌsi gɛtɪn 'fat ma:n.