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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 Romancisation of indigenous languages* (141-164) extends Stolz’s definition of Romancisation 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 Guaraní, 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, Ecuador 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 Romancisation* (377-398), describes the influence of Italian in its ex-colonies Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea, to be found in some noun borrowings in