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These two volumes—and a third one, Romancisation in Africa: Stolz & Bakker & Salas Palomo 2008, see below—edited by Thomas Stolz & Dik Bakker & Rosa Salas Palomo compile contributions presented on two conferences about language contact in Amsterdam 2004 and Bremen 2005. Both volumes open with a short preface emphasizing the extent of language contact phenomena around the world and presenting briefly the background of the volume. The aim of the conference was to initiate a large scale comparative work about processes in language contact in order to develop a more general theory of this matter.

Aspects of language contact. New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on romancisation processes.

The book is dedicated to more general issues than the two others. The book has been divided into two parts, six theoretical contributions are followed by eight contributions dealing with empirical findings from specific contact situations, four of these from the American continents.

Inspired from Johanson’s (2000) concept of ‘copying’, the first contribution, titled Romancisation worldwide (1-42) by Th. Stolz deals with the definition of what has to be taken into account as ‘Romancisation’—“all those processes which involve the copying of Romance features into a non-Romance recipient language” (4)—and illustrates the diversity of romancisation phenomena by examples from a literary parallel corpus. He comes to the conclusion that we need to gather data from all the (very numerous) Romance contact situations when having the objective to establish a general theory of contact-induced language change (CIC, from here on).

The aim of M. Haspelmath’s article Loanword typology: steps towards a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability (43-62) is to elaborate a general approach of borrowing, based on a revised version of the IDS word list. He compares the motivations, goals, types of loans and factors of lexical borrowing in different languages; Romancisation here is subordinated to general language dynamics. Haspelmath concludes that it would be wise to limit the concept of ‘loanword’ to more recent dynamics, in order to gather comparable data including those language that do not offer a long-existing reference grammar.

In Modelling contact-induced change in grammar, J. Sakel & A. Matras (63-88) present their model of comparative description of CIC in grammar. In order to ensure efficiency of comparison, a scale for data tagging including structural features of the language as well as information about the sociolinguistic contexte and the type of contact situation is worked out. Data from the Mosetén/Spanish (Bolivia) and from the Romani/Romanian (Romania) contact situations illustrate one of the central points of the argumentation, the matter (lexical borrowing) / pattern (partial copying: calques) distinction. From the fact that both Mosetén and Romani borrow mainly unbound
words, but no specific grammatical classes can be pointed out, the authors conclude that borrowing is a semantic-functional mechanism of fusion due to the speaker’s attempt ‘to process instances of potential tension’ (81) between the hearer and the speaker.

In their contribution titled Loan verbs in a typological perspective (89-122), S. Wichmann & J. Wohlgemuth claim that, first of all, verb borrowing is possible, and secondly, that in a wide range of (not only Romance) languages, it follows a general hierarchy of integration strategies: light verb strategy < indirect insertion < direct insertion < paradigm transfer. In about 90% of the studied languages only one of the four major strategies exists, which do not seem to be typologically determined. But precisely those languages where more than one strategy is attested seem to give evidence for this hierarchy – the less formal mechanisms are necessary to construct a verb in the target language, the more it is supposed to be integrated.

The two following contributions shed a constructivist light on CIC:

Stating the feeble yield of traditional models such as generative grammar in the field of contact linguistics, W. Wildgen (123-140) answers his question Why we need dynamic models for sociolinguistics and language contact studies by proposing a ‘dynamic systems theory’ of lexical borrowing. From the observation that language is concerned by different experience domains with specific kinds of dynamics, he concludes that an integrating model should involve the whole architecture of domains.

K. Zimmermann’s Constructivist theory of language contact and the Romanisation of indigenous languages (141-164) extends Stolz’s definition of Romanisation to the adoption of a Romance language by a non-Romance population, which leads to CIC by substrate influence. He gives evidence from some American Hispanisation processes to emphasize that rather than the mere extralinguistic factors such as power but their perception by the populations are relevant for CIC.

The second part, dedicated to empirical findings, starts with the contribution Spanish meets Guarani, Otomí and Quichua: A multilingual confrontation from D. Bakker & J. Gómez Rendón & E. Hekking (165-238), who delineate typological borrowing constraints in the three Amerindian languages quoted in the title, respectively from Mexico, Equador and Paraguay, when borrowing from Spanish.

P. Bakker & R. Papen’s article French influence on the native languages of Canada and adjacent USA (239-286) presents, beside the history and the state of affairs, some typical French borrowings that can be found in native American languages of this area.

S. Dienst’s Portuguese influence on Kulina (287-298) exposes the changes that this language from the Arawan family (Brazil) has undergone in contact with, successively, Nheengatu and Portuguese, although the speakers’ community has never counted a great number of bilinguals.

In his contribution Creolization and the fate of inflections (299-324), J. Holm aims to underline the survival of inflection in five Portuguese based creoles, contrary to the myth that creole languages are morphologically ‘poor’.

C. Moyse-Faurie’s article Borrowings from Romance languages in Oceanic languages (325-348) gives a survey on the contact history in Oceania, where several colonial powers succeeded and left different traces in the Polynesian languages; the author then presents two contemporary contact varieties of French, Tayo (creole) and Kayafou (urban Kanak).

F. Rose & G. Renault-Lescure (Contact-induced changes in Amerindian languages of French Guyana, 349-376) sketch the contact and francisation history of Kali’na (Carib family) and Emérillon (Tupí family) in French Guyana, where traditionally several creole languages were spoken.

The contribution of M. Tosco, A case of weak Romanisation (377-398), describes the influence of Italian in its ex-colonies Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea, to be found in some noun borrowings in
Somali and Tigrinya, and points out some pidginized features of Italian in that region.

Finally, Ch. Stolz (Loan word gender: A case of romanisation in Standard German and related enclave varieties, 399-440) works out the weight of different strategies for gender adaptation in noun-borrowing from French to German: Gender copying seems to be favoured in this constellation.

**Hispanisation. The impact of Spanish on the lexicon and grammar of the indigenous languages of Austronesia and the Americas.**

The book presents ten studies about the influence of Spanish on indigenous languages following a geographical run from North to South in the Americas, and then toward Austronesia.

The first three contributions deal with contact situations in Mexico. *Hispanisation in Colonial Nahuatl?* (3-25) by A. Jensen deals with typological change of Nahuatl through analyzing written sources from Spanish friars. She postulates four stages of development for this Uto-Aztecan language (Central Mexico) with polysynthetic, agglutinative morphology. The fact that nowadays' Nahuatl shares few features with other Uto-Aztecan languages is attributed to contact, first of all during the period of colonisation.

J.A. Flores Farfán’s contribution *The hispanisation of modern Nahuatl varieties* (27-48) presents an inventory of "lesser known facts" (voicing contrasts and vowel quantity, morphological neutralisation of oppositions such as causative or possessive, limitation of syntactic processes of composition and incorporation, semantic calques) in contact varieties of modern Nahuatl. Through discussing examples from other research works, he delineates the general dynamics of simplification, typological alignment with Spanish and shift (deliberate renunciation by the speakers) and states that Hispanised Nahuatl is more analytic. This 'syntagmatisation' of Nahuatl morphology is compared to an initial process of pidginisation, following the author, due to contact with Spanish.

*From language mixing to mixed language via purism? Spanish in contact with Zapotec* (Oaxaca/Mexico) by M. Schrader-Kniffki (49-76) outlines the linguistic effects of the diglossic situation (17 languages spoken in the state of Oaxaca, 85 in Mexico), namely language mixing and, as a consequence, puristic attitudes to control these contact phenomena.

Zapotec is an agglutinative, non-polysynthetic language from the Oto-Mangue family counting about 400.000 L1 speakers. Schrader-Kniffki argues that, in a general situation of maintenance, the language develops gradual contact varieties as a consequence of the exposure to Spanish (sustaining lexical, and under stronger influence, functional borrowing and code-switching). Furthermore, she argues that Zapotec shows tendencies to become a mixed language through public writings in Zapotec (corroborating the emergence of a written norm) on the one hand, and standardisation under puristic attitudes on the other.

In the article *Hispanisms in Kuna* (77-94), L. Giannelli & R. Zamponi delineate CIC in this agglutinative language from the Chibchan group, spoken in Panama by 50.000 L1 speakers, especially in the San Blas islands and in the cities of Pánama and Colón. Though the "ever greater numbers of bilingual speakers" (monolinguals : elders and children before scholarisation), the authors state a good maintenance of the language, subject to some little influence of Spanish in eastern (rural) Kuna, except some loanwords and code-switching in formal situations. Unfortunately, the explanations of the examples are slightly blurred: for example, if there are no voiced occlusives in Kuna, why should the borrowing mechanism replace voiceless occlusives by their voiced alternatives (ex. bonito > bunidu, 84)?

The following two contributions deal with the Quichua-Spanish contact in Equador. J. Gómez
Rendón devotes his contribution *Spanish lexical borrowing in Imbabura Quichua: In search of constraints on language contact* (95-119) to discuss the limits of adaptation of Spanish lexemes in this language from the Quechuan group with about 1000 speakers in the northern highlands of Ecuador, among them a relatively high percentage of bilinguals (3rd stage on Thomason & Kaufman’s 1988 borrowing scale). The data from a corpus of spontaneous speech reveal that lexical borrowing follows Hengeveld’s (1992) parts of speech hierarchy: given the verb/noun-opposition in Quichua, the loans reproduce prototypical functions, including flexible use of non verbal items.

The contribution of S. Dikker *Spanish prepositions in Media Lengua: Redefining relexification* (121-146) discusses typological characteristics of this bilingual mixed language resulting from the contact of Spanish and Imbabura Quichua. Media Lengua originally emerged as a contact L2 of Quichua L1-speaking workers, and nowadays has become the primary language for every-day purpose. A small corpus of oral primary data (interview with a leading figure of the local community) shows massive incorporation of Spanish prepositions to Media Lengua’s postpositional syntax, in their original position, alternating with Quichua’s suffixes. Consequently, the author argues against Muysken’s (1981) hypothesis of strict relexification, since structural characteristics such as word order determine lexical borrowing limits. The fact that functional gaps cannot explain these borrowings makes her conclude that Media Lengua is a social “in-between” language.

The last four contributions consider Austronesian language contact with Spanish. S.R. Fischer’s *Reversing Hispanisation on Rapa Nui* (149-165) outlines the situation for the 20% of the 4000 inhabitants of Easter Island who speak Rapanui as a L1. The language has been heavily hispanised since Chile’s annexation in the late 19th century and until the citizenship of Easter Islanders in 1966. From then on, offering resistance to Spanish becomes a real part of Polynesian identity in Rapa Nui: The author aims to explain the slowdown, even the reversal of the hispanisation process of Rapanui (that he supposed to be close to extinction some years before) in Easter Island, agreeing with Zimmermann’s (2001) postulate of a social equilibrium between languages in contact. Indeed, the present context of political autonomisation seems to favor positive ethnic representations which, in change, favor the decline of Spanish’s supremacy and the request for language domains in Rapanui.

The old, the new and the in-between: comparative aspects of Hispanisation on the Marianas and Easter Island (Rapa Nui) by S. Pagel (167-201) compares contact processes in Rapanui and Chamoru, both Polynesian languages with strong (mainly lexical) influence from Spanish in spoken and written data collected in Easter Island and Guam. Even if there is evidence for the strong influence of Spanish on Rapanui and Chamoru, the traditional labels do not apply to categorisation of these contact varieties: Due to demographic evolution and to mesticisation in a context of language maintenance, a new stage of the indigenous language and in-between varieties emerged in these two contact situations. Regrettably, the author does not offer any further hints about quantitative exploration of the data.

P. Steinkrüger sketches *Hispanisation processes in the Philippines* (203-236) by an inventory of various dynamics of influences of Spanish on the Philippine languages, from present-day CIC, through mixing (with Ilokano) to historic Creolisation. Discussing data from other authors, Steinkrüger aims to evaluate the stability of several contact varieties: Tagalog and Cebuano (Meso-Philippine, Austronesian), the most important languages in the Philippines (spoken by more than 50% of the population) show some CIC through the colonial contact with Spanish. Furthermore, Chabacano emerged as an endogenous Creole in the area; it is, with about 500000 speakers in the Manila Bay and Southern Mindanao the most important Spanish-based Creole. The origin of Chabacano is only partly elucidated: following Steinkrüger, it results from the Spanish relexification of an ancient Portuguese-based contact variety although the structural base seems to show significant influence of Tagalog substrate.

The last contribution *Pro or contra Hispanisms: Attitudes of native speakers of modern...*
Chamoru (237-267) is from R. Salas Palomo and Th Stolz: Since Guam is under US American domination, Chamoru is presently in contact with English. The Spanish influence goes back to the 17th century, when it was a colonial possession of Spain for more than 200 years. The authors collected evaluations of pairs of synonyms and sentences, and translations from English to Chamoru among L1-speakers from Guam. They point out that, in general, native speaker of Chamoru direct their language loyalty to Austronesian, while, in case of competition with a Spanish item, they would prefer the latter for its higher prestige. Nevertheless, the study shows a relative unawareness of the etymological source of the (generally well integrated) Hispanic loans among the speakers, and, in some cases, a semantic differentiation between the (supposedly synonym) pairs. Traditional sociolinguistic factors do not seem to explain the speakers’ attitudes.

Both volumes close with four indices (subjects, languages, toponyms, authors: 441-469) and a list of the contributors addresses (470-472).

It was the editors choice to limit their own part of the books to very brief prefaces, which are not even introductions. There is no attempt to link some widely shared concepts—such as ‘contact-induced language change’ or ‘borrowing’—in a common presentation. Nor do the editors propose a discussion of general theoretical issues. In this context, it does not seem surprising that no homogeneity seem to have been required for the morphological transpositions—which could have been usefully presented in a unique list of codings.

As to the Aspects volume, the reader deplores the absence of more profound explanations about the coherence of the volume; The reader misses a stronger cohesion between the contributions. One possible trait would have been to put together the contributions about specific constraints of contact (D. Bakker & Hekking & Gómez Rendón; Holm; Ch. Stolz), and, on the other hand, those who present more general descriptions of contact situations (P. Bakker & Papen, Dienst, Moyse-Faurie, Rose & Renault-Lescure, Tosco). Nevertheless, one of the most relevant questions in studies about CIC is illustrated here by a wide range of data: which factors of a given contact situation influence language future? One of the major assumption is that typological consistency is a valid hypothesis for the explanation of the observed dynamics. The empirical data from D. Bakker et al. seem, indeed, to underline different borrowing behavior following typological features of the involved languages. On the other hand, Sakel & Matras’s analysis shows consistency in processes of typologically different constellations of contact and Wichmann & Wohlgemuth provide an example of a universal scale of borrowability. Moyse-Faurie illustrates how different communicational (economic, i.e. external) objectives lead to different borrowing types. One provisional consequence might be to take into account, as Haspelmath (52f.) does, a wide range of internal (genealogical relatedness, structural compatibility) and external factors (intensity of contact, purism, geographical closeness), and another consequence, illustrated by Zimmermann (153ff.), to distinguish between individual processing in L2 acquisition and communicative (social) diffusion of new features. At the end, all contributions—from Wildgen’s theoretical claim to the specific case studies such as provided by Holm, Dienst or Rose & Renault-Lescure—seem to confirm the idea that CIC is much more complicated than one might expect and that this subject of study does not yet dispose of a sufficient degree of theorisation...

The Hispanisation volume also lacks unity, despite the welcome double focus on each of the contact situations (Nahuatl, Quechua, Rapanui, Chamoru): It would have been helpful to introduce it with general issues such as methods of gathering reliable data—spoken or written, primary or secondary, attested or elicited—or theoretical approaches adopted by the authors in order to qualify their findings. Moreover, we deplore that in some cases the representativeness of the discussed features is not clearly exposed (Steinkrüger), or the generalizations do not seem to be based on
empirical data (Fischer), in other cases the origin of data is not mentioned (Flores Farfán, Zamponi). As in the more theoretical volume, we miss a homogeneous presentation of the structural data; the reader also regrets some orthographic imperfections such as spelling mistakes, typing errors and inconsistency in the choice of the orthographic variety. In fact there is little guidance for the reader through the mass of information that the contributions furnish about language contact on three continents. But as the study of Romance languages seems to stay relatively marginal in general linguistics, the volume is a gold mine of structural processes and outcomes of language contact, presenting situations that are not so well known in linguistic literature.
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