

Linguistic and Semantic Innovation in Chamoiseau's Writing

Valeria Anna Vaccaro

Université de Salerne, Italy

E-mail: vvaccaro@unisa.it

Received: November 5, 2025

Accepted: March 19, 2026

Published: June 12, 2026

doi:10.5296/ijl.v18i3.23820

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v18i3.23820>

Abstract

The suffering of colonized peoples is always expressed through language. For a writer who has experienced the subjugation of his land, his people, and himself, it is only through his manner of expression that he has been able to convey his thoughts as well as his deepest emotions. War and occupation thus become sources of both literary and linguistic creation.

In this regard, the Antillean writer Patrick Chamoiseau creatively conveys the full extent of the suffering brought about by war—one that is also, and above all, a war of souls, an intimate pain, an abyss of inner conflicts.

Our aim is to illustrate the linguistic variety that characterizes Chamoiseau's literary production through an analysis of *Texaco*, *Solibo magnifique*, and *Écrire en pays dominé*. In these works, Chamoiseau addresses the question of writing itself, and even the position of the writer—and, indeed, of the self—within a condition of territorial submission, as well as physical and psychological annihilation.

This study seeks to explore the linguistic innovations—particularly lexical ones—of Chamoiseau's narrative style, which manifests its originality in the fusion of existing words, in processes of suffixation, and in the blending of words belonging to different grammatical categories.

Even in this case, it becomes evident that human suffering gives rise to an infinite number of linguistic combinations which, rather than destroying the subjugated people, grant them renewed strength and power through the evocation of their identity and their language—the very vehicle of that identity itself.

Keywords: Lexicon, Writing, War, Neologisms

1. Introduction

The world of colonized peoples is characterized by both complexity and creativity, despite their condition of constraint. The encounter between the dominant and the dominated gives rise to a series of new and unexpected aspects in terms of actions, thoughts, and languages. It is through language—both the mother tongue and the language of domination—that each colonized subject expresses their inner world, with its disappointments, dreams, ideas, and, above all, hopes. Among these conflicting feelings, it is language that remains alive over time—not merely as a tool of communication, but as the expression of a deeply marked identity.

The hybrid language born from the encounter between the mother tongue and that of the colonizer becomes the expression of unease, despair, disillusionment, and resignation. Yet, the absence of freedom and the annihilation of an already existing identity also become a source of immense creative strength in literature and in the use of an innovative language—one that contains elements of both the source and target languages, while also generating new linguistic formations that convey entirely unique ideas, expressing the inner state of subjugated peoples.

Today, one of the Francophone authors who gives voice to this stolen identity is Patrick Chamoiseau, a Martinican Creole writer who describes himself as a “child of diversity” (Chamoiseau 1997: 282, 311). His writing evokes situations marked by conflict and domination, highlighting both the intellectual and material forms of subjugation inherited from colonial history. Within this context, Chamoiseau places *la parole*—the word itself—at the center of his literary project. Through language, he emphasizes the power of words in opposition to the violence of armies, transforming writing into a form of intellectual resistance and a means of expressing the Creole imagination.

In this perspective, Chamoiseau develops the notion of the “*Marqueur de paroles*,” a figure through which the role of the writer is redefined within the Creole cultural context. The writer becomes a “*pauvre Marqueur de paroles*” (“poor marker of words”) (ibid.: 301), a mediator who collects, preserves, and transmits the voices of the community. Positioned between French and Creole, this figure does not claim absolute authorship but instead transforms oral expressions into literary form, creating a space where memory, identity, and cultural experience can be articulated and reflected upon.

His works, *Solibo Magnifique* (1988), *Texaco* (1992) and *Écrire en pays dominé* (1997) express his conception of the life of a writer and of an individual living under conditions of subjugation. We will analyze Chamoiseau’s narration through its combinations, illustrating the variety of linguistic mechanisms of which it is rich.

2. The Individual and Universal Dimension of Chamoiseau’s Writing

In Chamoiseau’s three novels, the importance the author assigns to speech serves to counter—through linguistic creativity—the «l’étouffement» (“suffocation”) of a destroyed culture and the «l’écrasement de la langue et de la pensées» (“crushing of language and thought,”) which, under colonization, had become silent. Indeed, muteness is the condition

that characterizes dominated peoples.

First, in *Solibo Magnifique*, the narrative revolves around the universe of the “Maîtres de la parole” (Masters of Speech), that is, the oral storytellers, whom the author depicts during the interrogations of a judicial investigation. The title of the novel derives from the name of a character who was killed in Fort-de-France during Carnival: he is called “Solibo Magnifique.”

Next, in *Texaco*—which received the Prix Goncourt in 1992—the writer reconstructs the history of Martinique through the struggle against the destruction of the neighborhood called Texaco. The narration is provided by the protagonist, Marie-Sophie Laborieux. This struggle is metaphorical, carried out through words.

Finally, the title of his latest book, *Écrire en pays dominé*, already expresses Chamoiseau’s ideas about the underground condition of writers during an occupation; its narration is executed with a very vigorous, yet at times silent, style. The idea of a silent struggle permeates his work: it is a « muette » (“mute”) struggle of thought and action, both *of* writing and *on* writing. Throughout the novel, he refers to the verb “écrire” rather than the noun “écriture” to emphasize the continuous labor of transposition. For Chamoiseau, the French writer’s activity of transposition corresponds to « marquer la parole » (“marking the word”), which in Creole culture means « écrire et, en même temps, rythmer le solo dans le concert des tambours qui accompagnent le narrateur » (“writing and, at the same time, rhythmically performing a solo within the drum ensemble that accompanies the narrator”).

From this concept of the « marquer la parole » (“Marker of Words”), Chamoiseau’s narration is characterized by its transnational and multilingual nature, demonstrating both his linguistic skill and narrative sensitivity.

This last book begins with a question that Chamoiseau poses to both the writer and to himself: « Comment écrire alors que ton imaginaire s’abreuve [...] à des images, des pensées, des valeurs qui ne sont pas les tiennes? [...] Comment écrire, dominé? » (“How can one write when your imagination is nourished [...] by images, thoughts, and values that are not your own? [...] How can one write, while dominated?”) (1997: 17). That is to say, in a situation of « brutale » (“brutal”) domination (1997: 20) which « suffoque » (“suffocates”) individualities by suppressing « les expressions les plus intimes des peuples dominés » (“the most intimate expressions of the dominated peoples”) (1997: 17, 21, 23). For Chamoiseau, it is not merely a matter of transposition, but of understanding the entirety of orality—and even of writing—to give rise to creation: this is where the Marker becomes Poet (Buisson 2006).

Already on its first page, Chamoiseau’s writing is necessarily grounded in reality, as the writer evokes « haine » (“hatred”) (Chamoiseau 1997: 17), « les génocides, les massacres, les dictateurs féroces » (“genocides, massacres, and ferocious dictators”) (1997: 17), the « martyrs » and the « attentats » (“martyrs” and “attacks”) (1997: 18), the « guerres » and the « batailles » (“wars” and “battles”) (1997: 22) in a single word: the « horreurs » (“horrors”) (1997: 18). And censorship is a « spectre » (“specter”) for him. Indeed, from the very first page, there is a deliberate choice of powerful words relating to war, dictatorships, and their consequences

(1997: 17).

He also introduces words of war into the lexicon of the writer's activity; for example, when he describes the relationship between his *Écrire*—with a capital E—and his resistance, he speaks of «la déflagration» (“the deflagration”) (1997: 101, 130, 293) «de l'œuvre d'art» (“of the work of art”) (1997: 300) with a «faste» (“grand” or “majestic”) sense (1997: 300) which is entirely contrary to the warlike sense of the word; indeed, in his view, « La déflagration de l'œuvre d'art dispose d'un impact direct sur ceux qui la reçoivent » (“The deflagration of the work of art has a direct impact on those who receive it”) (1997: 300) because it appeals to different imaginaries. For Chamoiseau, the writer's activity is extremely important; indeed, he states: « L'Écrire appelle l'arrière-mémoire – mémoire igname, mémoire-mantou – laquelle émerge dans l'abandon des rêves ou dans la saccade d'un cauchemar, ou encore dans l'effiloche d'une songerie feignante » (“*Écrire* calls upon the arrière-mémoire—yam memory, mantou memory—which emerges in the surrender of dreams, in the jolt of a nightmare, or in the fraying of a lazy reverie”) (1997: 21). He specifies that during colonization, «L'Écrire devait sacrifier au bunker linguistique, exclusif et dominateur, que l'expansion coloniale nous avait imposé» (“*Écrire* had to submit to the linguistic bunker, exclusive and domineering, that colonial expansion had imposed on us”) (1997: 274). Thus, even through metaphorical language, he conveys the sense of constraint, weakening, and annihilation of the Creole language. Likewise, he becomes a «Guerrier pacifique» (“peaceful Warrior”) of the imagination (1997: 302-303).

Moreover, through his experience as a reader, he describes the importance of the imagination when he says: « Le monde me revenait par eux, dépouillé de ses topographies closes en langues, races, nations, éjecté des mesures, livré dans un ban de réel disparate mer terre eau glace feu désert jungles chairs roches... un ensemble grandiose » (“The world came back to me through them, stripped of its topographies closed in languages, races, nations, ejected from measures, delivered into a realm of disparate reality—sea, land, water, ice, fire, desert, jungles, flesh, rocks... a grandiose whole”) (1997: 302).

Indeed, the imagination plays a crucial role in understanding and interpreting reality (1997: 304). Thus, he sets in antithesis, on one side, the «éclairages de l'écrire» (“illuminations of *Écrire*”)—with its charms, seductions, and beauty—and on the other, the «ombres» (“shadows”) of domination (1997: 304). He envisions in domination a “système mortifère” (“deadly system”); however, he says that his *Écrire* “irradie” (“radiates”) (1997: 301), as well as the activities of writers before him, such as, for example, Frantz Fanon (born in Martinique in 1925 and died in Algeria at the age of 36, was a psychiatrist, writer, and essayist from Martinique, as well as an anti-colonialist activist) and Édouard Glissant (was born in 1928 in Sainte-Marie, Martinique. The renowned Caribbean writer Édouard Glissant passed away on February 3, 2011, in Paris at the age of 82. He was a novelist, poet, French philosopher, essayist, and playwright. His writing is a poetic form of French, enriched with Antillean Creole and African myths) (Joignot 2011). This highlights the great importance of reading for Chamoiseau, which contrasts the «force aliénante» (“alienating force”) (1997: 300) of the dominators with positive ideas, such as the «révélation des vertus» (“revelation of virtues”) through the power of works (1997: 301).

Thus, starting from the initial question “How?” regarding Writing, these are universal themes that concern every individual.

3. Methodology for the Linguistic Analysis of Neologisms in Patrick Chamoiseau

The present study approaches the neologisms in the works of Patrick Chamoiseau—with particular focus on *Texaco* (1992), *Solibo Magnifique* (1988), and *Écrire en pays dominé* (1997)—through a systematic and multi-layered linguistic framework that combines morphological analysis, contact linguistics, and literary stylistics. The goal is to capture both the structural formation of Chamoiseau’s neologisms and their semantic and stylistic roles within the texts, thereby situating his innovations within the broader context of French-Creole linguistic interaction.

In order to examine the neologisms in a methodologically rigorous way, the first step involves identifying lexical items that clearly depart from standard French usage. These include verbs derived from nouns, compound lexical units, hybrid Franco-Creole forms, and instances where semantic extension or calquing from Creole is evident. Each candidate neologism is extracted from the text and subjected to careful linguistic scrutiny, considering its formation, grammatical structure, source language, and functional significance. By combining qualitative interpretation with systematic categorization, this approach ensures that the analysis captures both the creative artistry and the underlying linguistic patterns in Chamoiseau’s work.

A central dimension of the methodology is the morphological typology of neologisms. Many of Chamoiseau’s innovations arise through derivational processes, in which suffixes or prefixes transform nouns into verbs or adjectives, enhancing the dynamism and expressiveness of the narrative. Compounding is another recurring mechanism, whereby two or more lexical elements combine to produce a single, semantically dense unit. Such compounds often reflect the conceptual and metaphorical richness characteristic of Creole oral storytelling, compressing complex cultural meanings into concise linguistic forms. In addition, hybridization occurs when elements from French and Creole merge within a single lexeme, producing words that are neither fully French nor fully Creole, but rather inhabit an intermediate, creolized linguistic space. Semantic neologisms, meanwhile, occur when familiar words acquire new meanings derived from Creole conceptual frameworks, extending the expressive potential of the language without altering its form.

The linguistic source of each neologism is another critical factor in the analysis. Chamoiseau’s language emerges from a sustained encounter between French and Creole, reflecting the sociolinguistic realities of Martinique. Some neologisms are rooted primarily in French but acquire meanings shaped by Creole thought; others incorporate Creole lexical or morphological material directly; and still others result from a deliberate hybridization of the two linguistic systems. This contact-induced hybridity highlights the narrator’s position as both a participant in and a mediator of multiple linguistic and cultural traditions.

The grammatical structure of each neologism is also closely examined, with attention to patterns such as noun-to-verb conversions, noun-noun compounds, and noun-adjective

combinations. Identifying these patterns demonstrates that Chamoiseau's lexical innovations follow systematic morphological rules rather than occurring randomly, and it provides insight into how French grammar is adapted to accommodate the rhythms and structures of Creole oral discourse.

Finally, each neologism is analyzed in terms of its semantic and stylistic functions. Semantically, many innovations engage with recurring conceptual fields, including speech, memory, identity, and community. Stylistically, they serve multiple purposes: recreating the rhythm and vitality of oral narrative, expressing the imaginative world of Creole culture, and challenging normative French structures inherited from colonial authority. In this way, the neologisms are not merely decorative or experimental; they operate as integral components of Chamoiseau's literary project, enabling the representation of cultural identity and the preservation of collective memory within a creolized French.

By following this integrated approach, the study establishes a rigorous framework for the analysis of neologisms, demonstrating both their systematic formation and their aesthetic and cultural significance. This methodology allows for the identification of patterns across Chamoiseau's texts, providing a robust model for understanding how his language functions as a medium of resistance, creativity, and oral-literary translation. The framework can be further applied to a curated set of representative neologisms, such as *paroleur*, *marqueur de paroles*, *déparoler*, *parole-monde*, and *parler-vivant*, each of which illustrates the interplay of morphology, contact, and stylistic function central to Chamoiseau's creolized literary French.

4. Language, Form, and the Representation of Creole Identity in Chamoiseau's Writing

The complexity of Chamoiseau's writing is characterized first by its textual form, in which the narrative components are organized and through which the Chamoisean reader encounters a new way of writing.

In *Solibo Magnifique*, Patrick Chamoiseau puts the concept of „oraliture” directly into literary practice, beginning with the title itself (1997: 302). The novel embodies what the author defines as *oraliture*, namely the fusion of oral narration and written form, through which the rhythms, structures, and expressive patterns of spoken storytelling are transposed into literary language. In doing so, Chamoiseau performs a deliberate process of „creolizing French language”, transforming the normative structure of the language in order to accommodate the vitality of Creole speech.

From a methodological perspective, this involves analyzing how each neologism is formed, its source language, grammatical structure, and semantic-stylistic function, including derivation, compounding, hybridization, and semantic extension, which allow French to accommodate Creole expressive patterns which allow French to accommodate Creole expressive patterns and showing that the French language is systematically adapted to Creole rhythms and narrative strategies.

This linguistic experimentation produces a hybrid literary idiom that reflects the cultural and linguistic realities of Martinique. As noted by Milan Kundera, this stylistic strategy results in

what he calls a distinctive “Chamoisean language” (Alpozzo 2013), a creative reconfiguration of French shaped by Creole orality.

The methodological lens highlights the systematic nature of Chamoiseau’s neologisms, which emerge through derivation, compounding, hybridization, and semantic extension providing a structured approach to understanding how *oraliture* operates at multiple levels.

Through this process, *Solibo Magnifique* exemplifies how oraliture functions not only as a narrative technique but also as a broader aesthetic and cultural project aimed at revalorizing oral traditions within written literature. Examples include the names whose meanings he explains :

1. «[...] *Solibo*, astuce de dire: *nègre tombé au dernier cran ----- et sans échelle pour remonte* ». (“[...] *Solibo*, a way of saying: a Black man fallen to the last rung ----- and without a ladder to climb back up”) (Chamoiseau 1988: 78).
2. «Bobé (c’est Robert Dité qu’on l’appelle, fils de Man Dité et d’un nègre en fuite)». (“Bobé (this is Robert Dité, as he is called, son of Man Dité and a fugitive Black man)”) (1988: 87).

This process of creolization is carried out in several ways, for example through the transcription of Creole sentences followed or preceded by the French translation or by an explanation. Emphasis is achieved through italics, footnotes, exclamations, and so on. Examples are provided of Creole followed by French, French followed by Creole, and then an example of an explanation in a footnote:

- 1) « *Yo lé tjwé nou*, ils veulent nous tuer ! ... ». (“*Yo lé tjwé nou*, they want to kill us! ...”) (1988: 89).
- 2) « *La Loi saigne les gens, la Lwa ka senyen moun...* ». (“The Law bleeds the people, *la Lwa ka senyen moun...*”) (1988: 89).
- 3) « [...] *sa (de Diad-Anba-Feuilles) gueule mousseuse débitait d’inlassables malédictions dans un créole qu’il ne pouvait plus réprimer : Man sé an makoumé ? Ès man sé an makoumé ? Mi oala ou défolmanté akôdi sé koko siklon fésé, han ! Man sé pillonnen’w atê-a là, wi ! Man sé grajé’w kon bi manyôk ek pijé’w anba plat’ pyé mwen pou fè’w ladyé sos fyel-ou ! Ou modi ! [...]** ». (“[...] that (from Diad-Anba-Feuilles) frothing mouth spat endless curses in a Creole he could no longer restrain: *Man sé an makoumé? Ès man sé an makoumé? Mi oala ou défolmanté akôdi sé koko siklon fésé, han! Man sé pillonnen’w atê-a là, wi! Man sé grajé’w kon bi manyôk ek pijé’w anba plat’ pyé mwen pou fè’w ladyé sos fyel-ou! Ou modi! [...]**”).

* Je suis un pleutre ? Suis-je un pleutre ? Te voilà comme un cocotier dévasté par un cyclone ! Oh, j’aimerais te détruire, te piétiner ! Tu es maudite ! [...]. (1988: 94).

4) « Quel genre de travail tu fais pour le béké*? [...] ». (“What kind of work do you do for the béké?”).

*Terres, usines, et les structures de production économique (directe ou indirecte), appartenaient aux békés. Quelle que soit sa fonction, l’on travaillait *pour* les békés. L’expression est restée, d’autant que les choses ont peu évolué. (1988: 98) (Lands, factories, and economic production structures (direct or indirect) belonged to the békés. Regardless of one’s role, one worked for the békés. The expression has persisted, especially since things have changed little).

In the footnote, he explains the meaning of the word “béké.”

5) «[...] l’agonie sale d’un vidé* de la veille (Dieu ! Quelle vagabonnagerie...)». (“[...] the filthy agony of one emptied* man from the night before (God! What vagrancy...)”).

* Un mélange de vocalises, de danses et des courses qui concluait nos bals. Conseil : ne le pratique à présent que pour le carnaval». (1988: 112) (A mixture of vocalizations, dances, and races that concluded our balls. Advice: practice it now only during Carnival).

Chamoiseau explains the word “vidé” by offering a piece of advice.

6) – *Pawol la bay an gôjèt*, la parole l’a égorgé... (1988: 144). (– “Pawol la bay an gôjèt, the word has slit his throat...”).

7) « Le Charroi* [...] ».

*«Ou *chawa*, si tu veux». (1988: 62) (“Ou *chawa*, if you want”).

Already in example number 5, one can observe the use of the word “vagabonnagerie”. This demonstrates the methodological principle of analyzing neologisms through derivation, suffixation, or category-shifting, allowing us to track the transformation of standard French words into Creole-inflected forms with new semantic or stylistic functions. Other examples include:

- “Boulevardises” (1988: 118) – noun compound, French base, expressing urban movement and sociability;
- “Coulœuvres” (1988: 203) – noun with metaphorical extension, reflecting threat and oral imagery;
- “Inattendûment” (1988: 59) – adverb from adjective, Creole-influenced spelling, emphasizing suddenness;
- “Hivernage” (1988: 57) – derived noun, evoking cultural and natural cycles;
- “Propreter” (1988: 67) – verb from noun, action with moral nuance;
- “Encachotement” (1988: 68) – nominalization from verb, physical/symbolic

confinement;

- “Cauchemarda” (1988: 68) – verb from noun, action-oriented image;
- “Sentimenthèque” (*Écrire en pays dominé*, 1997: 307) – compound noun, “library of feelings,” emotional/intellectual fusion;
- “Diversalité” (1997: 296) – fusion noun, “divers” + “vitalité,” expressing multilingual identity and cultural plurality.

In *Texaco*, Patrick Chamoiseau develops the concept of “oraliture,” a key notion within the movement of *Créolité* associated with Patrick Chamoiseau, Jean Bernabé, and Raphaël Confiant. In this work, the term evolves from a simple representation of orality into a complex poetic and linguistic strategy, through which the French language is reinvented to incorporate the rhythms, structures, and imagery of the Creole oral tradition. As a result, *oraliture* moves beyond the mere transcription of spoken language and becomes a structuring principle of literary writing itself.

From a methodological standpoint, this allows for the analysis of each neologism in terms of its morphological formation, source language, syntactic behavior, and semantic-stylistic role, illustrating how the text creates a hybrid linguistic space.

Chamoiseau reshapes the French language by making it less normative and more receptive to the rhythms and expressive patterns of Creole orality. This transformation is evident in the inventive manipulation of syntax and vocabulary, including the creation of new compound verbs derived from nouns, as well as the integration of calques and translations from Creole.

These strategies reflect a process of linguistic innovation not arbitrary but systematic, that merges French and Creole with patterns of derivation, compounding, hybridization, and semantic extension structures. The text produces a hybrid linguistic space that reflects the multilingual and cultural memory reality and oral traditions of Martinique. Moreover, the narrative incorporates quotations, internal commentary, and metatextual interventions by the writer, creating a polyphonic structure that echoes the collective dynamics of oral storytelling. In this way, *Texaco* demonstrates how *oraliture* can function not only as a stylistic device but also as a literary method for preserving and transmitting historical memory within a Creole cultural framework. In fact, in *Texaco*, Oraliture is expressed through word and sentence constructions that make the French language less normative; the richness of the language is evident through the creation of new compound verbs from nouns, through translations, quotations within the text, commentary, and the writer’s advice. In the following examples, there is an alternation between Creole and French:

1. «Alors, elle m’abaissa la tête et me dit : *Prédié ba papa’w ich mwen*, Prie pour ton papa, mon fils...». (1988: 53) (“So, she lowered my head and said to me: *Prédié ba papa’w ich mwen*, Pray for your father, my son...”).

2. *Kouman ou pa an travay*, Tu ne travailles pas ?... S’étonnait grand-manman. *Man ka bat an djoumbak la*, Je n’ai pas quitté mon travail, [...]. (1988: 55) (“*Kouman ou pa an travay*, You’re not working?...” wondered grandmother. “*Man ka bat an*

djoubak la, I haven't left my work, [...]”).

Examples of neologisms are the following words, which express a fusion of elements from different grammatical categories and feature new suffixation. For example :

1. «hivernage» (1988: 57).
2. «propreter» (1988: 67).
3. «encachotement» (1988: 68).
4. «l'on cauchemarda de personnes à becs jaunes volantes dans des cyclones» (1988: 68).

In the last example, the verb *cauchemarder* is derived from the noun *cauchemar*, illustrating a category shift from noun to verb, which reflects Chamoiseau's systematic approach to neologism formation and his fusion of French lexical resources with Creole-inspired creativity.

Regarding the book *Écrire en pays dominé*, through a back-and-forth of montage and segmentation, Chamoiseau introduces micro-narratives, which he calls *sentimenthèques*—a fusion of the words “sentiment” and “bibliothèque”, that is, a “library of feelings”. These are all the emotions stirred in him by reading from his adolescence. The *sentimenthèques* punctuate the paragraphs with “universal” citations from writers around the world.

An example of a *sentimenthèque* is the following:

D'André Frénaud : Contre « l'inhabileté fatale », le geste lyrique qui lie les hommes, la poésie-maîtresse.... (Chamoiseau 1997: 307) (From André Frénaud: Against “fatal ineptitude,” the lyrical gesture that unites men, the masterful poetry...).

In the chapter devoted to languages and speech, Chamoiseau introduces the idea of a shared language of the *Divers*, which he considers “the true soul of the totalization of the world” («l'âme vraie de la totalisation du monde»). Thus, in a multilingual space, sharing the «Divers» through language is the «Diversalité» (which corresponds to the fusion of the words “divers” and “vitality” («vitalité»)) (1997: 296).

Overall, the methodological lens highlights that Chamoiseau's neologisms, his alternation of languages, and his use of fusion and derivation are not merely stylistic choices, but part of a deliberate and systematic linguistic strategy. This strategy allows him to creolize French, integrate oral rhythms, create hybrid lexical and syntactic structures, and articulate the cultural, historical, and affective dimensions of Creole identity.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, Chamoiseau's writing, in its celebration of *créolité*, hat is exemplary for its lexical richness and its semantic complexity. The writer employs the internal structures of language from morphology to semantics, alternating between formal and informal registers. Through his linguistic strategies, he demonstrates that language is not merely normative, but can be transformed to provide the reader with the necessary cultural and identity references. His “open” and “omniphone” writing helps the colonized approach linguistic and cultural

diversalité. It is within this new dimension that he fosters reflection on the social importance and utility of writing, which traverses peoples and resists the linguistic and intellectual confinement imposed by the dominators.

Furthermore, the systematic analysis of Chamoiseau's neologisms and hybrid structures provides significant insights for broader linguistic studies. By demonstrating how French can be creolized and reshaped to incorporate oral traditions, category shifts, and semantic innovations, his work exemplifies a model for examining contact languages, code-switching, and the creative potential inherent in postcolonial literatures. For scholars of postcolonial linguistics, Chamoiseau's textual strategies illustrate how language functions not only as a medium of communication but also as a site of resistance, identity construction, and cultural memory. His practice challenges traditional normative frameworks and encourages a reconsideration of how lexicons, syntax, and literary forms can encode the historical and affective experiences of subjugated peoples. In sum, Chamoiseau's literary work offers a rich methodological and theoretical template for future research in both Creole linguistics and postcolonial literary studies, showing how the interplay of orality, hybridity, and literary innovation can illuminate the dynamics of language, power, and cultural resilience.

References

Alpozzo, M. (2013, October 1). *Patrick Chamoiseau ou l'oiseau marqueur de paroles*. Dans *Ouvroir de réflexions potentielles*. Retrieved from <http://marcalpozzo.blogspot.com/archive/2010/01/14/43e2571a600023e65dcbb7283d8e94e8.html>

Altamanova, J. (2008). *Néologismes et créativité lexicale du français contemporain dans les dictionnaires bilingues français-italien*. Fasano (BR, Italie): Schena Editore.

Benazzouz, N. (2016). *Créativité linguistique et identité culturelle*. Université Mohamed Kheider, Biskra. Retrieved from http://thesis.univ-biskra.dz/2749/1/Th%C3%A8se_105_2016.pdf

Bon, F. (2021, July 6). *Patrick Chamoiseau, du bon usage de sa « Sentimenthèque »*. Le Tiers livre, web & littérature. Retrieved from <https://www.tierslivre.net/spip/spip.php?article1774>

Buisson, A. (2006, May). *Le Marqueur de paroles à la croisée des regards, Patrick Chamoiseau, «Que faire de la parole?»*. Retrieved from <https://www.lettres-et-arts.net/litteratures-francophones-etrangeres/chamoiseau-marquer-parole/etat-question/marqueur-paroles-croisee-regards+221>

Chamoiseau, P. (1988). *Solibo Magnifique*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, Collection Folio.

Chamoiseau, P. (1992). *Texaco*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, Collection Folio.

Chamoiseau, P. (1997). *Écrire en pays dominé*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, Collection Folio.

Chater, N., & Christiansen, M. H. (2016). *Creating language: Integrating evolution, acquisition, and processing*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Di Sabato, B., & Di Martino, E. (2011). *Testi in viaggio: Incontri fra lingue e culture, Attraversamenti di generi e di senso, traduzione*. Novara: De Agostini, UTET Università, Le lingue di Babele.

Full, B., & Lecolle, M. (2018). *Jeux de mots et créativité*. Dans *Langue(s), discours et littérature*, Volume 4 in *The Dynamics of Wordplay*. Boston: Éditions De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110519884>

Glissant, É. (n.d.). *Édouard Glissant*. Retrieved from <http://www.edouardglissant.fr/>

Guerin, G. (2009). *De Solibo Magnifique à Bibliques des derniers gestes: Esquisse d'une poétique chamoisienne*. Université Laval, Québec.

Joignot, F. (2011, February 3). *Disparition d'Édouard Glissant, l'écrivain antillais pour qui «La créolisation du monde est irréversible»*. Le Monde. Retrieved from <https://www.lemonde.fr/blog/fredericjoignot/2011/02/03/la-disparition-dedouard-glissant-lecrivain-antillais-qui-ecrivait-la-creolisation-du-monde-est-irreversible/>

Malraux, A. (2010). *L'Homme précaire et la Littérature*. Paris : Éditions Gallimard, Collection Folio Essais.

Michel, A. (2018). Les fonctions de la plurivocalité dans le texte autobiographique : Analyse d'Écrire en pays dominé de Patrick Chamoiseau. *Postures*, 27, Dossier «Trafiquer l'écriture : fictions frauduleuses et supercherries auctoriales». Retrieved from <http://revuepostures.com/fr/articles/michel-27>

Segre, C. (1999). *Avviamento all'analisi del testo letterario*. Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore, Biblioteca Einaudi, n° 68.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)