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1. Rethinking the grammars and lexica of reification

“[… the majority’s monolingual mind-set can easily get foisted on minorities who traditionally regarded multilingualism as the norm.” (Evans 2010: 14)

Language use is shaped by complex interplay of genealogical, typological and social factors. For an understanding of the interaction between them, language contact plays a crucial role. Languages (here meaning constructed lexico-grammatical codes) that are genealogically related are or at least originally were often spoken in geographical proximity to each other. Their speakers are or were often multilingual in several languages of a particular area. Through their multilingual language use, convergences in lexica and structural patterns occur. The exact nature, scope and directionality of convergence phenomena depend on the kind of interactions speakers engage in. Language contact phenomena can become conventionalized even if speakers cease to be multilingual and then represent the sediments of former contact situations fossilized in a language system. However, it is often impossible to clearly differentiate contact-induced from typological or genealogical features, and this holds in particular for closely related languages. These languages already share an important number of properties through common inheritance from an ancestor language. They may further exhibit innovations that follow from common language-internal properties through independent yet parallel grammaticalization; and they may represent convergences created through the processing demands of the multilingual interactions of their speakers.

Contact linguistics as a discipline has come far in its understanding of many of the non-genealogical parameters at work in language change. Yet, a major conundrum remains, which is at the same time an invitation for future research. This conundrum has been aptly characterized by Trudgill (2011) as the “bewildering” conundrum that identical (or seemingly identical?) social settings can have opposite outcomes in terms of language structure. In the following it is referred to in shorthand as ‘Trudgill’s paradox’. The conundrum is not meant to entail that social factors are not relevant or too disparate to be taken into account in explaining contact phenomena. There is unanimity that social factors do play a key role in language change, just as there is unanimity that more empirical studies

1 My own collaborative research reported here and the development of a larger conceptual approach to multilingualism was made possible through a Research Leadership Award from the Leverhulme Trust for the project “At the crossroads – investigating the unexplored side of multilingualism”. I acknowledge this generous support with gratitude. I am deeply indebted to Crossroads team members Alain-Christian Bassène, Alexander Cobbinah, Abbie Hantgan, Samantha Goodchild, Chelsea Krajcik, Rachel Watson and Miriam Weidl, and to the Crossroads advisors Klaus Beyer, Dale Barr and Caroline Juillard for being such great companions on our journey. Additional thanks go to Pierpaolo di Carlo, Jeff Good, Ruth Singer and Kris Stenzel for their inspiring research and comments on a previous version of this paper. I thank Anne Storch for the opportunity of including the paper in this special issue and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful remarks.
are needed in order to reveal them and their exact role for a wide range of contact settings, and this is what the paradox alludes to. To Trudgill’s conundrum, we can add a second puzzle – the one that although there seems to be no limitation to possible contact phenomena (e.g. Thomason and Kaufman 1988), not every possible contact-induced influence actually happens in a given contact situation (Aikhenvald 2007 among others). This observation will be referred to as the ‘(not) anything goes’ paradox.

This paper is motivated by the challenges posed by Trudgill’s conundrum and the (not) anything goes paradox. Their resolution are of utmost importance for linguistic typology, as they point to the crucial importance of more fine-grained accounts of the social settings and linguistic interactions in which language contact is produced – an importance that has been stressed by all recent works on language contact and sociolinguistic typology (Aikhenvald 2007; Aikhenvald and Dixon, Robert M W 2007; Matras 2009, 2012; Trudgill 2011; Winford 2007) and is confirmed through recent research in a number of fields, including psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, language ideology research and language documentation and description. Building on important recent empirical case studies and pulling together different strands of linguistics, this paper takes stock of factors at different levels of the individual and of communities of practice. From the study of important recent research on contact settings, a number of – necessarily preliminary – factors have been extracted. These social factors require a rethinking of language contact research in a number of crucial aspects, and particularly in that the settings themselves need to become a central subject of enquiry.

In the remainder of this introduction, I discuss approaches to language contact and multilingualism in different fields of linguistics and related disciplines and argue for such an integrated approach. I focus on small-scale multilingualism in non-polyglottic settings as the multilingual configuration of most relevance for contact linguistics, both in terms of the potential of these settings to advance theories of language contact and in terms of timeliness of study. In section 2, I explore some of these settings through a discussion of case studies situated in Africa, Melanesia, South America and Australia. Section 3 is dedicated to presenting methodologies apt at capturing multilingual language use, its dynamics and the ideologies underlying it. Section 4 offers a preliminary cline of parameters at work in small-scale multilingual settings as an outlook and invitation for future research.

1.2 Reconceptualising language contact

Works on language contact emphasize the importance of sociolinguistic profiles of individuals and groups in bilingual populations whose speech convergences depend on the intensity and type of bilingualism they practise. Yet, in the conceptualization of language contact, beginning with the concept itself and the image it evokes, research to date has focussed on studying the impact of language contact on lexica and grammatical structures of the languages involved in a more abstract and schematic fashion. Language contact remains conceptualized primarily as contact between languages or between schematic neighbouring groups. The roles of bilingual (and even more so multilingual) speakers as individual agents and of the dynamic configurations of the multilingual societies in which they are actors have not been systematically taken into account. There is unanimity in the acknowledgement of the importance of social factors, including type of language contact, for the typological profiles of languages (Winford 2007), and the determining power of existing models parameterizing these factors remains weak (see Trudgill (2011) for an in-depth
Therefore, it is time to turn to the more concrete instantiations of language contact as created in the language use of bi- and multilingual individuals. Their agentivity and creativity, and the social meaning they attach to language at an ideological level and at the level of linguistic practice, are crucial for an understanding of multilingual speech. Approaches that discount their intentions and situated practice must ultimately fail. Codes are not the impenetrable discrete entities that they are made to look by approaches that label elements of discourse as belonging unambiguously to one language or another, as also observed by Auer (1998b; 1999; 2007b). It may look as if this was the case for languages that are genealogically and typologically maximally apart, as they look recognizably different. But even in these cases, this does not tell us anything about the actual make-up of the speech in which they seem to occur. Even if we know the linguistic repertoire of a speaker and the speech context and interlocutors with their respective language repertoires, it is impossible to differentiate between nonce borrowings, more integrated loanwords and code-mixing (as undertaken by Myers-Scotton (1993), Poplack and Meechan (1995) *inter alia*) in the complex settings that are the subject of this paper. In these configurations, speakers have not been turned into two monolinguals in one by institutions of standard language culture that would also contribute to create and maintain language differentiation at all levels of lexicon and structure. While languages are differentiated at a metadiscursive level, their actual separability is called into question by the fluid nature of actual speech, even if misleadingly equipped with a language label. Volatile entities such as African French (Manessy 1994), Urban Wolof (Mc Laughlin 2008b, 2008a, 2001) and the many African youth languages (Kießling, Mous and Kiesenling 2004) illustrate the elusiveness of these constructs. For this reason, this paper investigates the ideologies and practices of bi- and multilingual speakers in different types of societies from the perspective of different subfields of linguistics and suggests a holistic approach to the study of their language use in interaction. An integrated look at individuals in these societies is crucial for advancing typologies of language contact and for interpreting and predicting particular contact patterns.

1.3 Investigating individual language practices and their societal embeddedness

The practices of individuals are more ephemeral and dynamic than a look from the perspective of language systems suggests (Matras 2012; Lüpke and Storch 2013). Although typology necessarily reduces the wealth of variation within and between individuals, research on sociolinguistic typology and sociolinguistic parameters in language contact draws attention to the centrality of the composition of speaker communities. The degree of intensity of contact with other languages and the degree of childhood bilingualism vs. adult language learning are factors correlated with different consequences for language structure that require a detailed investigation of different groups within a given population. In addition, different patterns of language acquisition and socialization, individual movement and migration patterns and different types of social networks in an individual’s life span are all known to have a strong impact on the nature of multilingual language use, leaving different traces in language structure. This is not only the case in modern, globalized scenarios of super-diversity induced by unlimited and highly individual migration patterns (Vertovec 2007, 2011; Blommaert, Rampton and Spotti 2011). All these factors are at work worldwide and contribute to shape dynamic repertoires. In Western societies, the prevailing standard language culture is based on fictional monolingualism and maximal language separation and on prestigious standard varieties enforced through powerful language management mechanisms. These ideologies and practices produce an imaginary native speaker ideal that is far removed from being native in the literal sense. It requires intensive schooling and exposure to a particular set of language ideologies in order to
come into being (Bonfiglio 2010; van der Horst, Joop 2008; Harris 2013). Even in standard language contexts that aim at minimising the impact of individual language practices on the systems involved, social factors counteracting standardization are present. These factors surface in officially invisible and/or inaudible grassroots practices in migrant communities, in dialect variation and colloquial registers, in the language classroom or in officially not recognized bilingual activities. Standard languages as reifications are always abstract constructs without a direct equivalent in speech. The limits of reification become even more crucial in contexts where no standard language culture reigns in language use. In these contexts, speech becomes so fluid and ephemeral that it is misleading to talk about language contact or even trans- or polylinguaging (Blackledge and Creese 2010; García and Wei 2014), as this would presuppose two separate systems to start with. This observation entails that it is not feasible to generalize over entire communities without detailed sociolinguistic research; rather, the dynamic nature of language use requires us to account for the non-static nature of multilinguals’ language use, flanked by detailed demographic and sociolinguistic information on them. One particularly important point is to be made regarding systematic variation between individuals. Where variation occurs within one language, these differences have been extensively studied by variationist sociolinguistics. Where variation is expressed through different multilingual repertoires within one society, as for example in cases of linguistic exogamy, variation has not been studied in detail in the overwhelming majority of settings beyond the level of ideology and fleeting observations. Another, just as important, point regards the impact of different patterns of language socialization on the shape of multilingual repertoires. Language acquisition and socialization, for instance, is often not based on interaction in the nuclear family but in peer groups; child rearing practices are frequently linked to great mobility across language boundaries through fostering. Individual practices can be partly regulated by social conventions of the groups in which the speakers are members, so that a number of social factors relevant for individuals and their groups need to be taken into account. Aikhenvald (2007) lists the following sociolinguistic parameters relevant for understanding language contact as the ones best described in the literature:

- degrees of knowledge of each other’s language; with stable bi- or multilingualism being decisive in resulting in contact phenomena beyond lexical borrowing and extending to diverse types of structural convergences
- presence or absence of di- or polyglossia; with long-term stable multilingual situations often characterized by balanced, or non-polyglossic, relationships between languages
- kinds of contacts with other groups as regular or sporadic, ongoing or completed
- type of community as externally open vs. relatively closed and tightly knit
- language attitudes towards forms recognized as non-native or foreign and forms seen as emblematic
- community size and interactions between rural and urban communities
- patterns of marriage, trade and warfare and occupational lifestyle of speakers
- division of labour and socialization patterns of sexes and generations
- social organization and kinship systems
- religious mythology (Aikhenvald 2007: 37-42)

None of these factors can be described globally for an entire configuration or imaginary speech community. We need to recognize that these patterns can vary substantially within one geographic
setting or community, and therefore it is of prime importance to study them in great detail. A focus on small-scale settings allows such a nuanced look.

1.4 Studying small-scale, non-Western settings

The multilingual settings of the Old World, with their tiered bilingual configurations and division of labour of codes in them gave rise to the dominant model of bilingualism based on hierarchical relationships holding between languages and functional differentiations for them. These societies lend themselves to a description in terms of di- and polyglossia and domain specialization for particular codes (Ferguson 1959), at least to the extent that language ideologies and official policies are concerned. Since these settings have received ample attention in the literature, I will not dwell on them here but focus on settings that result from different sociocultural motivations for multilingualism and constitute a particular type of situation: small-scale multilingualism. Small scale multilingualism is meant here, following Evans’ (2010) description of locally confined societies applied to multilingualism by Singer and Harris (forthcoming), to designate balanced multilingualism practised in them. It is attested mainly in areas not or only recently exposed to Western settlements and Western ideas of nation states and standard language ideologies. Most of these settings – the Amazon being a notable exception – have not been studied in great detail. Their importance for an understanding of the parameters that determine the type and frequency of contact phenomena in them cannot be underrated, especially in the light of the fact that many of them are changing rapidly as pre-colonial cultural practices disappear, or are endangered because the local multilingual configurations are being overlaid with regional as well as more recent global and superdiverse patterns.

The social make up of small-scale multilingual situations, although attested across the globe and in all likelihood constituting “the primal human condition” (Evans 2013), has received relatively little attention in the field of contact linguistics, typology and multilingualism research. They are those settings that pre-date colonization of and Western influx to the Americas, Oceania, Australia, and Africa, and in parts of these areas continue to thrive despite added layers of polyglossic multilingualism in these areas. Matras (2009: 48ff.) and Trudgill (2011: 185ff.) attribute utmost importance to these settings and the necessity to study these multilingual societies, which they see as endangered. At the same time, their constellations still receive a scant treatment in these overview works and are erroneously portrayed as settings in which isolated tribal communities with one native village-based language coexist with other such groups (as in Matras (2009: 49). Rather than as a critique, this observation is meant to illustrate how very little is known about small-scale multilingual settings outside the regional linguistic subfields in which they are studied. Detailed knowledge of all aspects of these settings is crucial for advancing all fields concerned with the interaction of languages in speakers’ brains and interactions and in conventionalized practices in their societies. Since the languages spoken in them, together with their social context, are rapidly changing or vanishing, they deserve to be subject of detailed investigations.

1.4 Integrating diverse approaches to language contact

Recent research on all things multilingual is situated in a number of separate fields. Multilingualism research investigating the profiles and practices of individuals tends to look at maximally bilingual individuals in Western settings. There is a growing body of research investigating trilingual individuals, but this research focusses mainly on immigrant populations (for instance Hoffmann and
Ytsma 2004; Lanza and Svendsen 2007; Quay 2001), with the exception of Matsumoto (1999) and Matsumoto and Britain (2009). There is strong evidence that multilingual interaction is dramatically different from bilingual interaction (Cenoz and Hoffmann 2003; Hoffmann and Ytsma 2004; Quay 2001; Lanza and Svendsen 2007; Matsumoto and Britain 2009), and the urgent necessity of more research in this domain is stressed by researchers. Language contact studies are generally orthogonal to multilingualism research, as they investigate system interaction abstracted from individual language use, mainly in order to understand quirks of synchronic languages in order to trace diachronic development of languages where it does not appear to follow from shared ancestry and typologically motivated principles of language change. Multilingualism research, in contrast, puts emphasis on the idiosyncratic characteristics of multilingual speakers, who are differentiated through so many individual factors that generalizations over entire groups become difficult, if not impossible. Importantly, these studies often highlight the dynamicity of multilingual repertoires over individuals’ life span by looking at linguistic biographies and migrational histories. The fields of psycho- and neurolinguistics and cognitive psychology investigate the cognitive processes in the brains of multilinguals in language production and comprehension. The findings from these fields forcefully point to the fact that it is no longer possible to conceive of discrete language systems, where one system leaves an impact on the other depending exclusively on social factors such as prestige, dominance relations, etc. In most multilingual acquisition scenarios, speakers rapidly develop a language-neutral mental lexicon where one concept is tied to several forms (Green 1998). Weinreich’s (1953) original types of co-ordinate, subordinate and compound bilinguals seem to disappear quickly as language learners progress, and compound bilinguals are now accepted as being the norm. This is the case even in those far from universal scenarios where both languages are ideologically maximally separated and have clearly recognisable roles as L1 or mother tongue on the one and L2 or foreign language on the other hand. All language systems are continuously in shift and affected by each other. Chang (2012; 2013) shows how the L1 phonetic inventory is affected from the earliest stages of L2 acquisition onwards. Gullberg’s (2012; 2013) research demonstrates how gesture repertoires in two languages merge quickly to give rise to one unified system in L2 acquisition contexts. These findings characterize language systems as highly adaptive to context. Convergences occur in particular configurations and may be continuously altered in others, and hence a great tolerance to variation is built into the comprehension module (Ernestus 2009; Poellmann et al. 2014). Therefore, it is of prime relevance to investigate patterns of situated multilingual speech and the convergence processes that do occur in them or not.

Indeed, there is growing evidence from psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic research that the behavioural ecologies in which speakers use multiple languages have a strong impact on language control processes in both speech production and comprehension (Green and Abutalebi 2013). This research on bilingual interaction reveals systematic contrasts between communities and speakers in single-language contexts, dual-language contexts and intense code-switching contexts that are correlated with differences in eight cognitive control processes. Single-language contexts are those where languages are used in very distinct environments – such as English at work and German in the home, and where very little code-mixing occurs (or no code-mixing at all if the language of one context is not a part of the repertoire of speech act participants in another context). Dual-language contexts are those where two languages are used, but in Green and Abutalebi’s example by a
speaker with two different interlocutors who each speak one of them, so that en bloc switching, but no intrasentential mixing of codes occurs. Finally, intense code-switching contexts are present in the interaction of bilingual speakers mastering the same codes and drawing on all their linguistic resources.

Variation in the shape of multilingual repertoires and interactions is not only influenced by cognitive demands in different settings; it is also culturally mediated. Studies in social psychology that focus on accommodation in conversation uncover great cultural differences in the extent to which speakers converge with each other or diverge from each other in interaction both in inter-group and interpersonal contexts (Harwood and Giles 2005; Giles, Coupland and Coupland 1991). Thus, a cognitively motivated tendency towards convergence can be counteracted by cultural requirements governing politeness and accommodation (or its absence) as well as norms and indexicalities of using languages in interaction. Models of code-mixing and code-switching also investigate the make-up of (mainly bilingual) discourse. In this field, some models regard the roles of languages in interaction as set (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002; Fishman 1965). Under this view, each code in a repertoire evokes a different set of rights and obligation (in Myers-Scotton's matrix language frame model) or pertains to a different domain of language use (in Fishman's model). In other models the role of codes is seen as flexible and either incrementally arising out of conversation (Auer 1998b, 2007a, 1988, 1998a; Wei 2002) or governed by the already mentioned socially mediated tendencies to accommodate or not different interlocutors in different contexts by using the same or different codes (Giles, Coupland and Coupland 1991). Metapragmatic awareness of speakers and its limits (Eckert 2008; Silverstein 1976, 2003) are crucial in understanding the scope of speakers’ agentivity in making conscious indexical use of (parts of) their multilingual repertoires for identity construction purposes.

Studies on perspective taking and common ground—so far exclusively conducted in monolingual contexts—initially reveal that individuals appear to be driven more by egocentric factors and memory routines than by concerns for interlocutors’ perspectives. The results of these studies are of great relevance for multilingualism and code-mixing research, since language choice in multilingual settings where (parts of) repertoires are shared might be seen as an expression of taking the interlocutor’s perspective into account. A first study with Chinese subjects demonstrates that in the later stages of planning an interaction, they modify their initial egocentrically motivated planning and take the interlocutor’s perspective, whereas English subjects remain anchored in an egocentric perspective. The later repairs towards perspective-taking of Chinese subjects appear to be culturally mediated (Keysar, Barr and Horton 1998; Keysar et al. 2000; Wu and Keysar 2007; Wu, Shali, Barr, Dale J. Gann, T.M. and Keysar, B. 2013).

Since cultural conventions and culturally motivated profiles of communities and individuals emerge as crucial for types and intensity of multilingual interaction, detailed ethnographic studies need to inform research on language contact and multilingualism. Social anthropological research can reveal the culturally mediated exchange and mobility patterns that create the interwoven fabrics of

---

2 Note that Green and Abutalebi do not appear to make a distinction between code-switching and code-mixing. Following Auer (1999) and Muysken (2000), I prefer to use the term code-mixing for cases where codes co-occur within an utterance and reserve code-switching for cases of larger blocks of monolingual speech that alternate between two or more languages.
multilingual societies through marriage exchange networks and their patterns, regulated mobility of children, ritual multilingual communication, (language) socialization in age grades as opposed to the nuclear family, etc. These patterns have an impact on how societies and individuals conceptualize themselves and how they construe others, or in other words, what their ideologies and attitudes to languages and identity are. From the influential works of in this area (Irvine and Gal 2000; Kroskrity 2007; Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity 1998; Silverstein 1979) stems an awareness of the centrality of linguistic ideologies for creating languages and groups and their boundaries and conceptualising their interaction. Existing research on language ideologies in non-Western settings (see the case studies in section 2 below for examples) reveals how different from Western language ideologies these can be. Further, and importantly, this research draws attention to systematic mismatches between language ideologies and actual communicative practices – parts of repertoires can be erased or downplayed on ideological grounds or be emphasized according to context-dependent motivations when reported. In particular in multilingual contexts, these mismatches are of prime importance and entail that any surveys or investigation of self-reported repertoires or language ideologies always need to be complemented with studies of actual language use in naturalistic (not self-censored) settings.

Crucial for advances in contact linguistics is that many of the social and cognitive factors governing multilingual interaction are not motivated by hierarchical relationships holding between languages. Along with degrees of bilingualism and intensity of language contact, the prestige and dominance of codes in a multilingual space have been taken as central for understanding directions of borrowing and source languages for structural convergences. Diglossia (Ferguson 1959; Fishman 1967) (and, in societies with more than two languages, polyglossia) is a situation in which the languages in a given society exhibit a clear division of labour going hand in hand with difference in prestige based on official literacy standards for the high varieties and the absence of (prestigious) writing cultures for the low varieties. Polyglossia and its hierarchies undeniably play a role in shaping languages in contact. However, they need to be flanked by parameters taking the full multimodal scope of language use into account. Studies focussing exclusively on particular settings (common are studies in formal language learning settings) and only the spoken or the written modality (for instance through corpus studies of written texts) cannot do justice to the complex interplay of all modalities, which are often governed by completely motivations. In many multilingual settings world-wide, polyglossia has been recently introduced through colonial languages and their role in official contexts. For examples from West Africa, see Lüpke (forthcoming) and Mc Laughlin (2015; forthcoming (2017)). In these situations, other, more fluid, multilingual configurations continue to exist and remain largely undescribed.

2. A focus on non-polyglossic multilingualism in small-scale societies

“Small-scale societies […] are economically self-sufficient, and proudly form the center of their own social universe without needing to defer unduly to more powerful outside groups. Their constructive fostering of variegation – which holds social groupings to a small and manageable size, and keeps outsiders at a suitable distance – is not offset by the need to align their language with large numbers of other people in the world.” (Evans 2010: 14)

Non-polyglossic multilingual settings persist world-wide where small-scale pre-industrial societies at the margins of globalization and survive in the shadow of those settings and languages regulated by
standard language culture. These small-scale societies are sometimes described as practising “egalitarian multilingualism” (François 2012), “balanced multilingualism” (Aikhenvald 2007) or “traditional multilingualism” (Di Carlo in press (2016)). When attempting a characterization of different settings of this kind, it appears that a useful preliminary generalization might be to group together all those configurations here where multilingual language use is not primarily motivated by power relations or prestige accorded to particular codes. This does not entail these societies are necessarily egalitarian or traditional; rather, it means that they have remained of the margin of those processes that create officially monolingual societies with enforced standard language cultures or stratified multilingual settings as produced in all settlement colonies (Vigouroux and Mufwene 2008). There are many of such societies still thriving across the globe, in particular in Africa, parts of South America and Australia and Oceania. Their vast majority remains undescribed, and the existing case studies on them leave many questions open. In this chapter, I concentrate on a selection of pioneering case studies that allow a preliminary differentiation of power- and prestige-insensitive multilingual settings, at least at the level of language ideologies practised in them. An understanding of actual language use will require much more in depth research. The examples included here are situated in the Amazon area of South America, where I look at the Upper Xingu and Vaupés basin areas, in West Africa, where I inspect the Casamance area of Senegal and the Lower Fungom area of Cameroon; in the Melanesian archipelago of Northern Vanuatu; and in the Northwest Arnhem Land in Australia. At the ideological level, these settings are maximally distinct regarding the conceptualization of communities and of linguistic interaction; less is known about actual communicative practices in most of them. In the following section, I set out to distinguish them according to the degree and type of multilingual competence evoked in the language ideologies.

According to the degree of self-reported or assumed community-typical competence, I distinguish four different settings according to the traits of these societies reported in the literature. The distinctions are based on the reported nature of exchanges involving reciprocal, receptive, passive or ritual multilingualism. Rather than as characterizations of language use in these societies, these have to be taken as ideologically motivated idealizations. For all of them, it will be an important endeavour of current and future research to document and analyse the actual multilingual communication in these settings. Such research is needed so that the (mis)matches between ideologies and language use can be assessed.

2.1 Reciprocal multilingualism

Three of the multilingual settings presented in this paper appear to be driven by egalitarian and (at least to some extent) reciprocal ideologies of multilingualism. The societies in question are several language ecologies in Lower Casamance region of Senegal in West Africa (Cobbinah et al. 3
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forthcoming (2016); Cobbinah 2010; Lüpke 2010, forthcoming (2016), in press (2016); Lüpke and Storch 2013) and the Lower Fungom area in the Grassfields area of North Western Cameroon (Di Carlo in press (2016); Di Carlo and Good 2014; Good 2013), and a multilingual area of Northern Vanuatu (Good 2012; François 2012).

The Lower Casamance area of Senegal is a highly multilingual area where individuals report speaking 5 to 10+ languages. Research on Bainounk communities has revealed that being extremely multilingual and proud of it is deeply anchored in the collective identities of these communities. Their members are highly multilingual in self-reported and observed repertoires and assume accommodating language practices that appear totally self-effacing to outside observers (who for this reason often conclude that these are oppressed minorities speaking endangered languages). However, as argued in detail elsewhere, the main motivation for a highly versatile linguistic behaviour in which identity languages such as the different Bainounk varieties constitute insider codes in a very complex repertoire lies in the need of assuming changing identities in order to create manifold alliances with other small groups in the area.⁴ In the Bainounk language areas languages do not express identity in essentialist fashion, as in Western language ideologies. Rather, languages are used in indexical fashion and multilingualism is a social strategy that enables speakers to index different identities to different stakeholders. In Casamance, indexical multilingual settings arose out of the need of the small, decentralized groups that could not grow in size because of the topography of the area to constantly break up, migrate and create ties with each other for survival and exchange (see Hawthorne 2003 for the historical dynamics of this process and Lüpke (in press) for a detailed description of the language ecology of Agnack). Frontier processes like this are widespread on the African continent and beyond (Kopytoff 1987) in creating continuously on-going processes of identity formation. Members of the patrivirilocal groups that settle in small hamlets or larger village have identity languages based on patrilineal descent, and villages have nominal language based on the identity language of the founding clan. I have describe this practice as ‘patrimonial deixis’ (Lüpke forthcoming a). Claiming the patrimonial language in Casamance conveys first comer status and control over land, and hence many villages have their own patrimonial language. To what extent these languages are actually fully reified remains unclear. Some closely related patrimonial languages in the area are only kept separate for the purpose of patrimonial deixis, with some emblematic areas of language fully differentiated, for instance in the domain of greetings. In contrast, language use in less emblematic domains is fluid and based not on code-switching or code-mixing but constant code-creation of speakers with great metapragmatic and metalinguistic awareness who use this intricate knowledge to sound appropriate according to context and interlocutor based on these skills (see Cobbinah et al forthcoming). In Casamance, is not necessary to speak the patrimonial language in order to maintain the link to a space of origin and belonging, although many people who have spent their childhood there will do speak it. Therefore, people claiming this identity will speak the associated patrimonial language to different degrees, if at all, depending on where they were brought up and have lived. It is definitely not the case, nor was it in the past, that a patrimonial language was used by monolingual and homogeneous communities.

⁴ Identical patterns are reported by Harnischfeger, Leger and Storch (2014) for indexical identities of groups in a complex North-eastern Nigerian convergence area (in Storch, Harnischfeger and Leger (2014). This important volume contains a number of case studies on multilingual settings that are in constant flux in this area that is too complex to be covered here.
Men and women participate in long-distance trade and labour migration, and settled outside their village of origin for extended periods of time. Captives were integrated into communities. Widespread exogynous marriage practices, aiming at creating strategic bonds between clans and villages, often necessitate that women at least nominally speak different languages in order to be eligible marriage partners. Their integration into their husbands’ compounds and villages at the same time creates heterogeneous and multilingual communities that are distinct more at the ideological level than in language practices. Children were and remain very mobile and are fostered for a variety of social reasons, likewise resulting in every single household in Casamance being factually multilingual. While multilingualism is never completely symmetrical, many settings in the area are characterized by a large degree of reciprocity the exact scope of which depends on the trajectories and concomitant linguistic biographies of individuals as created by societal exchange mechanisms and individual initiative. In other settings, recent immigration of members of numerically larger groups has resulted in new asymmetrical patterns. There is preliminary evidence from on-going research on the linguistic convergences in this area (Cobbinah, Hantgan, Lüpke and Watson forthcoming, Cobbinah forthcoming; Watson and Cobbinah forthcoming; Lüpke forthcoming b) that different language ecologies in Casamance condition convergences or facilitate particular types of language change – presumably because overall, not language-individual frequency of certain linguistic features in all the codes of the repertoire of an individual plays a role in strengthening vs. weakening them. Currently, we are comparing two language ecologies: the Crossroads area, a triangle formed by a cluster of villages with three nominal languages, and an ecology where speakers of Casamance languages interact with speakers of Mandinka. In the Crossroads area, an ecology in which the majority of languages spoken exhibit complex noun class systems, the semantics of these systems have become more aligned, and they remain more conservative than outside of this particular area in an area where Mandinka, a language without noun classes, is frequently spoken. Crucially, one innovation attested outside this area does not occur there: animate agreement (Cobbinah forthcoming b). The innovation of animate agreement appears to be linked to a language ecology in which considerable fewer languages with noun class systems are spoken, so that the overall frequency of similar paradigms is much lower and the system more prone to innovations. The two ecologies are also very different regarding attitudes to multilingualism and language socialization at their interior. Speakers at the Crossroads are extremely accommodating and see multilingualism as an integral part of their identity, and these traits are shared by many speakers of Casamance languages. This mutually shared ideology fosters reciprocal repertoires. Mandinka speakers belong to a numerically strong group concomitant with a strong monolingual identity. Mandinka speakers do not share these attitudes and multilingual skills. Therefore, the accommodating step of Casamance
speakers to add Mandinka to their multilingual repertoires is not reciprocated by most speakers of Mandinka, resulting in asymmetrical repertoires.\(^5\)

Map 1: two language ecologies in the Lower Casamance

The Lower Fungom area of North-western Cameroon is situated in one of the linguistically most diverse settings of Africa: the data currently at hand allow distinguishing eight languages spoken in thirteen villages occupying an area of about 240 km\(^2\). However, like in Casamance, according to local ideologies villages are nominally associated with one language. This picture of homogeneity is counteracted at the level of linguistic praxis. Individual multilingualism is widespread, and an initial sociolinguistic survey (Di Carlo in press (2016)) has found that individuals report speaking 5-6 languages and 8-10 lects (or varieties of languages associated with a village). Cameroonian Pidgin English is used as a lingua franca at the regional level, whereas English and, to a lesser extent, French, the two official languages of the country, are only used in formal contexts. These two codes are the only ones associated with prestige. In the Lower Fungom area, exogamy at the level of the village is very common, and children issued from marriages of men with in-married women receive a dual identity based both on the identity of the father and of the mother’s father. This complex identity is reflected in the names that children receive both from their fathers and their mothers’ fathers and matched by linguistic socialization, where they are expected to use their patrilect with their paternal kin and their matrilect with their maternal kin. An additional level of indexicality is

\(^5\)Aikhenvald (2002) reports similar tendencies for the Tariana and notes that in this Amazonian group as well a more accommodating language habitus among them which ultimately resulted in language shift because it was not reciprocated by speakers of the numerically stronger Tukano language.
present in expressing affinities to a village by speaking its nominal language. This multiple indexicality is of paramount social significance because it offers the possibility for one to symbolize affiliation with one or the other village or network of solidarity when needed. Furthermore, the fact that in local cultures the village constitutes a unit only in linguistic and ritual terms, where the village chief is to be seen as a form of sacred king, has left room to hypothesize that the possibility for one to index multiple identities through use of village-specific languages may be connected with a preoccupation for maximal protection against a number of invisible threats. Village chiefs are held responsible for their fellow villagers’ prosperity and this ultimately depends on how they deploy their agency in the invisible world of spirits. The overwhelming majority of the population has no agency in the spiritual world and chiefs of Lower Fungom villages are widely considered not to be “big chiefs”, that is, they have control over relatively few people (village population rarely goes beyond 800 people) and are perceived as not being very powerful. In this context, the only resource commoners have in order to maximize their chances of getting enough spiritual protection is to differentiate and multiply the sources of such protection. This can be seen as lying at the roots of the motivations that drive people to become multilingual in local languages: by so doing, they represent themselves as members of many villages, which in its turn means that they are under the (potential) protection of as many village chiefs. Research on the linguistic aspects of this type of multilingualism is currently under way and is very timely, since multilingual competence of this locally confined type is becoming rarer in younger generations. While children still learn some of the individual languages of their environment, they do not acquire all the codes of the ecology anymore. This is facilitated by the spread of Cameroonian Pidgin English, a Creole that serves as a national language of wider communication, from the 1960s onwards. As in many other small-scale settings, the introduction of a *lingua franca* alters the existing multilingual patterns that relied on sharing a number of languages rather than on sharing one common code.

---

6 Kin-based patrivirilocal “quarters”, instead, constitute the building blocks of these societies as far as economy and, to a lesser extent, politics are concerned.
Map 2: The Lower Fungom area (Di Carlo in press (2016))
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The two African settings introduced so far use multilingualism as a social strategy that maximizes alliances and protective networks through linguistic differences providing the necessary indexes. Such motivations have also been reported for the next setting under scrutiny: the Torres and Banks islands of northern Vanuatu. These small archipelagos are characterized by high linguistic diversity typical for precolonial Melanesia (Mühlhäusler 1996), with their ca. 9,000 inhabitants speaking 17 distinct languages. As in the African settings reported, languages are nominally associated with villages, as visualized in map 3, but many individuals speak four or more languages. François (2012) describes a language ideology culturally at work in this ecology that creates an ideological bias towards diversification. Just as we have seen in Casamance and Lower Fungom, linguistic divergence is an important social construct upheld in linguistic practice. Exogamy is widespread for both sexes, with about 30% of unions leading one spouse away from their area of origin. In exogamous unions, couples practise reciprocal multilingualism, with the most frequently used language mainly depending on the location of the household. In about 60% of unions, women relocate to their husbands’ villages; in about 40% the reverse is the case. Children issued of bilingual marriages are raised bilingually. Linguistic differences appear to offer the possibility of multiple alliances, but whether the language ideologies are as indexical as in the African settings reported remains unclear. While there are manifold structural convergences between the languages, their lexica are surprisingly dissimilar, testifying of the important role of language ideologies and attitudes in influencing those parts of the language system that can be consciously controlled and creating a complex interplay between what François calls centripetal and centrifugal forces.

There is yet another parallel to the two African settings described above: François states that the pattern of egalitarian multilingualism is rapidly changing. Two factors are causing its perturbation: for once, demographic shifts and downturns and relocation of large parts of the population of the archipelagos happened in the wake of contact with the Western world since the 19th century and went hand in hand with a decrease in linguistic diversity in the resulting larger settlement. Independently of these resettlements there are also some prosperous communities that grow numerically and exhibit tendencies towards a greater monolingualism. The result is asymmetrical bilingualism of speakers of smaller languages who include these larger languages like Mwotlao and Vurës in their repertoires, while the inverse does not hold, and a tendency to language shift to these languages as a long-term outcome. More interactions with foreigners due to large-scale social networks also facilitate the spread of Bislama, an English-based language used both as a Pidgin and as a Creole that is also the national language of Vanuatu. Bislama is gaining more and more ground.
2.2 Reciprocal and receptive multilingualism

The ecologies of Australian multilingualism widespread prior to White settlement have been dramatically disturbed, with most small-scale multilingual settings giving way to diglossic bilingual settings, where Indigenous languages survive at all. The ecology of Warruwi Community in Northern Arnhem Land described by Singer and Harris (Singer and Harris forthcoming) constitutes a notable exception. Although current settlement and multilingualism patterns were created with the recent establishment of a Methodist mission on South Goulburn Island in 1916, they can be seen to instantiate patterns of linguistic interaction typical of pre-contact Indigenous Australia.

Three main languages, Mawng, Bininj-Gun-wok (Kunwinjku) and Yolŋu-matha, are recognized as the languages of a significant proportion of the inhabitants of Warruwi Community, a settlement of ca. 400 individuals. Most speakers have at least one of these three languages in their repertoire and have knowledge of English, but it is only used as a last resort, when no other communication strategy can be found. Other languages are spoken by smaller sets of speakers, and passive competence in two or three of them is the norm. The factors driving the maintenance of multilingualism in this setting lie in the diversity of individual repertoires, in the wide-spread practice of receptive multilingualism and in the presence of language ideologies supporting the use of smaller languages.

However, the actual number of named languages in Warruwi is higher than three: in all, nine different languages are spoken in Warruwi Community, with individual repertoires shaped by trajectories and networks. Since not all repertoires are shared, the maintenance of this diversity is
facilitated by receptive multilingualism (ten Thije, Jan D. and Zeevaert 2007). This term describes “a communicative practice characterized by different languages used by the different discourse participants” (Zeevaert 2007). According to Singer and Harris, the prevalence of this practice has resulted in the absence of a *lingua franca*, in minimal code-mixing and extremely low levels of lexical diffusion among the languages at Warruwi community as evident from conversation. In fact, Singer (p.c.) suggests that receptive multilingualism might be regarded as a special instance of Green and Abutalebi’s (2013) dual language context. As in the dual language mode as suggested by these authors, two languages are used, but not with two different interlocutors who each speak one of them, but by interlocutors who each have passive competence in the other’s language. Two of the languages spoken at Warruwi, Mawng and Kununinjku, belong to closely related language families and have been spoken in adjacent areas for about thousand years. Yet, they share only ca. 10% of their basic lexicon. Singer and Harris see receptive multilingualism, which results in the avoidance of code-switching, as an explanation for these extremely low levels of lexical borrowing at Warruwi Community and in contexts where these languages were historically spoken.

Language use at Warruwi Community is regulated by ideologies about land ownership (as in many Australian contexts concomitant with “owning”, but not necessarily speaking, a particular Indigenous language, see Merlan (1981). Crucially, these language ideologies are not aligned with current multilingual patterns (Yolŋu-matha as a ‘newcomer’ is erased from them) but reflect both pre-contact ideologies about language ownership and language-‘tribe’ associations as identified by the missionaries and early settlers in the area. Pre-contact, one or several estates were owned by patrilineal clans who were also said to have ownership of the languages associated with it by the ancestors. These clans entered changeable alliances, and social structure and exchanges are not based on shared languages. Likewise, the ideologies do not reflect the languages used by an individual, but the languages they claim ownership of.

This image of language use and language ownership at Warruwi is very similar to the one painted by Heath (1981) for Ngandi and Ritharnu in South-eastern Arnhem land, where small groups with extensive bilingualism and intermarriage relations in a non-polyglossic linguistic ecology lived prior to White settlement. That the differences in the proportion of lexical diffusion between these two areas are nevertheless so dramatic makes them an instance of Trudgill’s paradox. The contrast must be due to other social factors influencing language interaction – possibly the existence of a special ‘dual language mode’ (Green and Abutalebi 2013), that of receptive multilingualism, in one of them. Unfortunately, the scarce ethnographic knowledge on pre-contact south-eastern Arnhem Land cannot be enriched because this ecology has been totally altered; this sad fact points once more to the urgent need to study those small-scale settings that continue to flourish.

2.3 Passive multilingualism

At the borderland between Brazil and Colombia lies the small-scale linguistic setting that probably has received most the most attention from linguists and anthropologists. This area is constituted by the Vaupés river basin in the Upper Rio Negro region of north-western Amazonia (Sorensen, Arthur P, Jr. 1967, Epps and Stenzel 2013b, 2013a; Chernela 2013; Aikhenvald 2002). In this multilingual space, language loyalty and identity is based on the father’s language. Patrivirilocal settlement patterns mean that men remain *in situ*, whereas a high percentage of women move when they marry. These women bring their own matri- and patrilect into the dwellings where they reside with
their husbands and their husbands’ brothers and speak it to their young children and other in-marrying wives with whom they share the same origin. However, they are not expected to use their patrilect in public, and children are likewise expected to grow out of their matrilects (which in fact are their mothers’ patrilects) into their own patrilects. Code-mixing and lexical borrowing are discouraged, as the language ideologies (or ‘language etiquette’, Aikhenvald (2002) rely on a maximal separation of codes which is to a large extent motivated by the strict linguistic exogamy practised in the area. Linguistic exogamy is motivated by the desire to avoid marrying agnates – in the classificatory system practiced in the region, these are all males and females of one generation in a given group, since they are classified as brothers and sisters. Therefore, it is necessary to marry somebody unrelated who must have a different patrivirilocally determined identity (which remains intact even if actual linguistic practice changes). Linguistic exogamy therefore prevents the spread of larger languages such as Tukano, at least to some extent – the difference necessary in order to be an eligible spouse is indexed through linguistic identity, though not necessarily linguistic repertoire. It cannot be stressed enough that this difference resides at the level of language ideology, not at the level of actual linguistic practice: regardless of their actual language repertoires, speakers derive their identity from their patrilect and actively claim it, while they only admit to passive use of the other four to five additional languages in their repertoires. Exogamic bonds do not exist between any groups in the Vaupés area but between phratries, i.e. between groups claiming descendence from a single set of mythical brothers, and phratric relationships tend to coincide with geographic proximity. Therefore, a systematic pattern of multilingualism is maintained through the exogamic marriage patterns: Stenzel (2005) and Chernela (2013) report a preference for (classificatory) cross-cousin marriages that often results in women marrying into villages where their matrilect is spoken, since they return to their mothers’ villages of origin by marrying a son of their mothers’ brothers (but not of their fathers’ sisters). Since even ‘non-returning’ wives are not drawn from anywhere but from marriage communities defined by phratric bonds, the additional languages present in any patrivirilocal group tend to be languages that children hear from other in-married wives, learn when playing with children who have them as their matrilect, or are exposed to on visits to the villages of relatives. While the ruling language ideologies require loyalty to the patrilect, in practice, code-mixing and speaking of the matrilect (for women) or the wife’s patrilect (for men) do occur (Chernela 2013). Structurally, the area is characterized by what Aikhenvald (2002) terms “multilingual diffusion” of features; what is noteworthy, though, is that according to Stenzel (2005), it is not the languages of phratric groups that are the most similar, but the languages of groups linked by alliances, i.e. exogamous unions between phratric groups. Motivated by population movements in the wake of the slave trade, resettlements and missionary activities, a shift to larger languages, in particular Tukano and Portuguese, is in the course of happening in many areas in the Vaupés basin. Even in communities where exogamous marriage patterns have remained intact, the linguistic ecology can be dramatically altered, as the identities are not necessarily aligned with language use. Stenzel (2005) describes this contrast for the phratrically related Kotiria (Wanano) and Wa’ikhana. For the Kotiria, the ‘traditional’ Vaupés system has been upheld, doubtlessly facilitated by their remote location. Since the Wa’ikhana practice exogamy with groups who have almost entirely shifted to Tukano, such as the Tariana and Desana, the maintenance of linguistic exogamy does not recreate the delicate balance in which diversity can be managed and reproduced but in fact results in the massive introduction of Tukano through bringing in women whose patrivirilocally motivated identity is not matched anymore by their linguistic repertoires. In language use, the multilingualism in the Vaupés
area may be much closer to reciprocal multilingualism described for the African contexts, as first explored by Stenzel and Khoo (this volume).

Map 4: map of the Upper Rio Negro region and the Vaupés river basin (Epps and Stenzel 2013a: 10)

2.4 Ritual multilingualism

The Upper Xingu River region in the Brazilian state of Mato Grosso is home to 10 different languages of three different families and an isolate (Franchetto 2011a, 2011b). It is fascinating to look at the Upper Xingu area in contrast with the Vaupés basin, because at first hand they appear to be a case of Trudgill’s paradox: like groups in the Vaupés, the inhabitants of the Upper Xingu river area share a cultural system grounded in a common cosmology and shared ceremonial exchanges. Just as the Vaupés, Upper Xingu exhibits linguistic differentiation while linguistically different groups also share myths, live in geographically adjacent areas and exhibit occupational specializations that result in economic exchange. In both areas, languages are construed as and kept maximally separate, with great respect for their integrity. What is radically different in Upper Xingu is the prevalent language etiquette. Some ceremonial multilingual contexts notwithstanding, this space can be characterized as a multilingual space inhabited by monolingual individuals, at least at the level of ideology. While groups in both areas share many cultural patterns, they have entirely different marriage preferences based on diverging ideas of group identities. These differences have resulted in completely contrastive patterns of multilingualism at the individual and societal level. In the Vaupés area, multilingualism is buttressed through language ideologies that foreground one language as the
identity language of an individual but where the fabric of society relies on creating relationships with individuals who need to have a different identity language – a monolingual ideology creates a regulated multilingual society with imagined monolingual inhabitants. In Upper Xingu, there is a very low level of bilingualism, and no widely shared lingua franca. Although there are sustained contacts between groups, these do not extend to exogamous marriage patterns. Franchetto (2011b) remarks that exogamous marriages are dispreferred, because they result in muddled identities and practices. Unlike in the Vaupés, there are no clear patrivirilocally motivated identities established that would automatically determine the ethnolinguistic identity of children from exogamous unions, and their undetermined status is seen as problematic in a society that sees language as emblematic for identity. Despite endogamous groups living relatively autonomously, it can be argued that Upper Xingu constitutes a language ecology – as Ball (2011) describes, a set of shared pragmatic principles of interaction enables communication between groups at different levels of the ecology, privileging exchanges between groups sharing a language family. These principles are based on a common calendar for the occurrence of cultural events and ritual exchanges, which constitute communicative events, played out following scripts of complaints and demonstrations of respect.

Map 5: map of the Upper Xingu area (http://dobes.mpi.nl/projects/kuikuro/geography/)

3. Methodologies for investigating small-scale multilingualism

“[..] in a phenomenological approach the corpus will be theorized according to criteria of representativeness of the whole array of possible linguistic practices allowed to happen in a given community. Documenters, that is, are expected to operate a selection of what is to be included in their documentations not on the basis of what language is recorded [...] but, rather, on the basis of the language ecology of the target speaker community or of the portions of this ecology that they have identified as particularly important. [...] To know a given “communicative ecology” means having a clear view not only of the different languages or varieties present in the repertoire of the targeted speaker community, but also of the registers and the genres through which this discourse is
articulated as well as of the language ideology permeating the community’s communicative behaviors [...]. As consequence, anyone adopting the phenomenological approach should accord ethnographic data a primary role.” (Di Carlo in press (2016))

Researchers working on small-scale multilingual settings are unanimous in calling for holistic and interdisciplinary approaches to reveal the complex patterns of social and linguistic interaction that create and sustain these configurations. The concept of the speech community as a potentially multilingual and always polylectal or internally diverse one is not new but has been advanced by Hymes (1972) and Gumperz (1962) and has since given rise to important problematizations and developments of this concept in sociolinguistics, leading to the alternative concept of “community of practice” (Wenger 2000; Eckert and Rickford 2001) which does away with the idea of a homogenous group, as at the interior of every group, different sets of members will share different and only partly overlapping practices that shape their linguistic interactions. In order to understand communities of practice, detailed sociolinguistic and ethnographic investigations need to precede and flank linguistic research in phenomenological (Di Carlo in press (2016)) or geographically based (Lüpke in press (2016)) approaches, which are opposed to reductionist approaches focusing on one code or imaginary homogeneous group sharing it. These approaches are needed in order to understand the complex language ideologies at work in different interactions, including those with an outsider linguist. As Merlan (1981) forcefully reminds us, repertoires are not objective givens but can vary according to context and intent of [complete]. These answers may vary considerably depending on how the information is obtained.” This observation can be extended to settings world-wide. While the interplay of language ideologies is itself a highly relevant object of study that is often neglected in descriptive linguistics, language ideologies need to be compared with language practices. A detailed study of individual practices through biography interviews (Busch 2006) and participant observation is instrumental in achieving this comparison, as advocated by Singer and Harris (forthcoming). Language documentation based on the sampling of language use in meaningful geographical units in such an approach, as proposed by Himmelmann (1998), Good (2013), Di Carlo (in press (2016), Lüpke), Storch, Harnischfeger and Leger (2014) and Lüpke and Storch (2013) offers a methodology facilitates discovery of actual practices and limits the danger of relying on a priori judgments of group composition. These areas can be understood as hosting language ecologies (Haugen 1972; Mühlhäusler 1996; Mufwene 2001). Co-ordinated ethnographic, sociolinguistic and corpus-linguistic and documentary approaches need to occupy centre stage in contact linguistics, in order to create an empirical basis for the investigation of contact phenomena as produced by speakers in complex ecologies so that we can resolve those puzzles that appear to be the greatest barrier to the development of predictive models of language contact: the (not) anything goes puzzle and Trudgill’s paradox. Where possible, they should be accompanied by investigations of language use in the social networks (Milroy 1980) and communities of practice (Wenger 2000) so that direct empirical

---

7 The topography of an area is important for settlement structure and social and linguistic organisation, as also remarked by Aikhenvald (2008) and Epps and Stenzel (2013a) among many others, and therefore offers important cues as to which units to select.

8 The “monolingual bias” Auer (2007b) caused by Western language ideologies is all too often present in descriptive, typological and historical-comparative research, where communities are conceptualised as “isolated tribes” engaging in exchanges with “neighbouring communities”, despite their internal heterogeneity.
evidence of how change spreads in them can be obtained (Beyer 2010; see Beyer and Schreiber 2013 for a pioneering social network study in a non-Western bilingual setting)).

4. Outlook

“To make claims about the relationship between linguistic complexity, language size, social structure and multilingualism, we need to know what configurations of linguistic diversity, complexity and social structure exist. There has been very little detailed study of language use in communities practising small-scale multilingualism and this research needs to be done now, using the best methods from the fields of linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics and language documentation before language practices in these communities shift.” (Singer and Harris forthcoming)

World-wide, linguistic equilibria (Dixon, Robert M W 1997) that have recreated the dynamics of small-scale multilingualism over millennia are being punctuated by the forces of large-scale processes altering social networks and shifting balances towards monolingualism in numerically larger languages. There is great urgency for documenting those small-scale multilingual settings that have not yet been absorbed into larger planes with nationalist monolingual language ideologies and more fragmented and individual patterns of multilingualism. Their study is not only crucial for the development of better models of language contact, it also has the potential for offering solutions to multilingualism management in the West, where it is often only perceived as a problem.

The few case studies presented here have already shown that the parameters suggested by Trudgill (2011) to explain maintenance vs. reduction of linguistic complexity – community size, social network structure, social stability, contact with other communities, and shared information – are not sufficient to explain patterns of individual and societal multilingualism. They need to be complemented with those parameters listed by Aikhenvald (2007) and quoted at the beginning of this chapter that rely on an intimate and nuanced knowledge of the social dynamics of a given setting, of the cultural norms underlying individual behaviour in it, of its historical development, and of the relationships between language ideologies and actual language use. A deep understanding of these parameters and their interaction is not only of great relevance for contact linguistics; investigating the interaction of codes in societies with very different language etiquette regarding code-mixing and borrowing will also advance code-mixing and multilingualism research both in sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic fields. All the small-scale settings introduced here share a number of characteristics. These are:

- confined geographic settings
- many shared cultural traits in the entire setting making it a meaningful geographic entity
- complex exchange dynamics relying on dialectic relationships between similarity and alterity
- extensive multilingualism instead of or alongside a lingua franca

Despite these shared social characteristics, the spaces studied exhibit great differences in language ideologies and, where known, patterns of multilingual interaction and ensuing convergence phenomena. While much of the research on actual multilingual language use is still on-going, striking differences in the amount of attested code-mixing and lexical diffusion emerge already and warrant detailed investigation of language use in all settings. What materializes as well are a number of factors at play in all of these configurations. Therefore I end this chapter with a preliminary set of
parameters that emerge from the literature of small-scale multilingual settings and locate them a cline between two poles in table 1: The cline starts with what can be conceptualized as the least multilingual settings – sporadic contact between groups that construe themselves as monolingual and homogeneous – and ends with the most multilingual one – a society with multilingual individuals whose language ideologies lend visibility to all the codes in their repertoires. Another level of differentiation is present in the context-sensitivity of language ideologies. Extreme cases are those where speakers assume one monolithic and totalising language ideology that essentializes one code as “theirs” vs. where they use languages to index different identities based on context. Intermediate cases would be constituted by societies or where individuals can have dual identities as in Northern Vanuatu contexts where children of exogamous marriages have the identities of mother and father. Although this is also the case in the Lower Fungom, identities there are more context-dependent and can be seen as occupying the extreme end of the cline.

Table 1: Parameters and values for a heuristic approach to multilingual settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension and production of codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal multilingualism</td>
<td>No monolingualism practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolingualism practised by many group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pervasive intrasentential code-mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little code-mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No code-mixing, mainly code-switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive multilingualism</td>
<td>Monolingualism practised by all/most group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No code-mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual ideologies</td>
<td>Partly erasing ideologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexical identities</td>
<td>Dual identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essentialist identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope of identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orthogonal to this cline for now appears ritual multilingualism – based on shared pragmatic principles, it appears to function best in contexts where languages are genetically closely related. How closely related languages are genetically and typologically, and in which areas and as how close they are perceived by speakers and outsiders is an issue related to this that requires in-depth research and needs to be correlated with the social factors at work in the language ecologies and language use in different contexts. Social factors create the discourse contexts that result in different cognitive demands and consequent frequencies and patterns of convergence phenomena. Convergence phenomena and frequencies of patterns and lexical matter in turn are likely to have an impact on discourse organisation beneath the threshold of consciously held metapragmatic principles.
High degree of multilingualism

Low degree of multilingualism

The past decades have seen a growing concern for linguistic diversity and its maintenance and study in order to advance our knowledge of the extent and limits of variation of human language. It is time to extend this concern to the diversity of multilingual settings. Their study, in that of particular in the dramatically under-researched and under-represented non-polyglossic settings presented in this chapter, is equally of prime importance, as also compellingly argued by Trudgill (2011: 185) who rightly characterizes these “societies of intimates” as endangered. It is exactly in these settings that linguistic diversity has thrived and the architecture of language has been shaped for much of the human past.
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