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Outline of this talk

• A zoom on small-scale multilingualism in the Casamance area in the Upper Guinea Coast of Africa:
  - Settings
  - History
  - Ideologies
  - Language use

From the perspectives of different frameworks, researchers and research participants on conceptualisation of language and language change

Frame: reification vs. fluidity

The non-diglossic bilingualism name game

Indigenous multilingualism
(Singer to appear)

Non-polyglossic multilingualism
(Aikhenvald 2007)

Rural multilingualism
(Di Carlo 2015, Good & Di Carlo in prep.)

Organic multilingualism
(Lüpke in prep.)

Small-scale multilingualism
(Singer & Harris forthcoming, Lüpke 2016b)

Traditional multilingualism
(Di Carlo forthcoming)

Egalitarian
multilingualism
(François 2012)

Endogenous
multilingualism
(di Carlo in prep.)

The functions of small-scale multilingualism

• Frontier contexts require multiple and flexible alliances between groups conceptualised as distinct.
• Social exchange and mobility (of husbands, wives, children, captives, labourers…) creates intensely multilingual societies.
• Different languages index sameness or difference according to context to enable these exchanges and make them adaptive.

Small-scale multilingualism is motivated by changing social needs and not regulated by top-down processes.
Small-scale multilingualism in the Lower Casamance

A multilingual area

- No large centralised polities or state formations
- Some small polities (grouping around 10 villages)
- Refuge zone at the fringes of states (marshlands, climatic conditions, geographical isolation through rivers...)
- High linguistic diversity
- At the epicentre of globalisation since the 15th century and the beginning of the transatlantic slave trade
- High extent of micro-migration, but great ethnolinguistic stability since the 15th century

A prototypical Frontier society (Kopytoff 1987)

Multilingual and mobile individuals

- Between 3 and 10 named languages spoken
- Repertoires are dynamic because of:
  - Fostering
  - Marrying in/out
  - Economic, religious and ritual mobility
- Old and new mobility patterns co-exist
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**Shared cultural practices**

- Initiation rites
- Masked dances
- Fertility rituals (*kanyalen/gubos*)
- Exogyny
- Wet rice cultivation
- Religion (*path of the forebears*, Christianity and Islam)
- Many rituals are timed across the area and involve all groups, although they have ethnic labels

Sacred grove & mask dance performance in Niamone.

**Languages from a genetic perspective**

- Woleif (*mboi lubu*)
- Mankon (Kourouma, Gyilkoi, Gubus)
- Sene-Kon (Gofin, Senegalese)
- Tengu (Sengalese, Wolof, Manga, Gubus)
- IAAD Bafouls, Balafonser
- Fula-Serreer (Fula, Palae, Fula-Serere, Serer)
- Pulaar (Koy, Wolof, Halass, Senegalese)
- Balante (Girko, Kandi, Konja, Macina, Sengalese)
- Jola
- Malinko, Malinkoi (Gbanilay, Gubu, Bubalay, ...) 
- Biollo (Korom, Kollu, Kinkop, Jola)

French (Romance)
- Kristl (Portuguese-based)

- Many rituals are named (e.g., Gubanjanay, Gusilay...)

- Jóola Banjal can be used as a hyponym for the languages of the kingdom of Mov Avvi or as a glossonym for the variety of Banjal.
- Within the kingdom, varieties for all the villages it contains can be named (e.g., Gubanjanay, Gusilay...)

Pozdniakov & Segerer (forthcoming)
What’s in a name?

Places as ideological home bases for languages

- Its affiliation with an (ethnic) group and/or a code
  - Baïnounk-Jóola
    - Its language
      - Gu-bëeher
      - Ji-bëeher
  - Baïnounk
    - U-/Ñan-bëeher

Territorialising a language (Blommaert 2010)

- Ancestral language (Woodbury 2005)
- Language of the ancestors of present-day inhabitants
- Ideological home base
- Patrimonial language (Lüpke forthcoming)
- Language of the (remembered) founding clan

Patrimonial identity and language in the Lower Casamance

- Landlords: descendants of the (remembered) founding clan
- Patrimonial language associated with landlords of a place; strangers don’t claim this language, even if they speak it. Over time, strangers can become landlords of their new dwellings.

Landlords have land rights and can receive strangers

Landlords

Strangers

Brooks 1993; Lüpke 2016, forthcoming
Territorialised languages based on selective ideologies

Many inhabitants of a place are ideologically erased from representing it; others are iconized (Irvine & Gal 2000, Gal 2016, Irvine 2016)

Different scales and perspectives reflected in language names

Endoglossonyms

Fulup (historical Portuguese sources)
Kuibanjalay (Kujireray speakers)
Diola (French sources from 18th century onwards)
Endungo (Bayot speakers)
Gurin (Baïnounk Guibeher speakers)
Guriat (Baïnounk Gujiaher speakers)

Exoglossonyms

Fulup (present day use)
(Jóola) Gubanjalay
(Jóola) Gubjarjlay
(Egima)

Endoglossonyms

Village/ward
Polity
Ethnolinguistic group

Lack of differentiated perspectives and notions of scale and historicity often characterize linguists notions of glossonyms (e.g. Haspelmath 2017)

Speakers getting it wrong?

"Obviously Isambakon, Koelle’s informant, used Fulup in the general sense employed by the Portuguese. This would be a reasonable assumption on two counts. First, as we shall see, Isambakon’s speech places him in the Banjal area, where neither the term Fulup nor its variants apply. Secondly, his residence of five or more years in the Portuguese town of Cacheu and Bissau would have surely accustomed him, despite the inaccuracy, to calling his own ethnic subgroup the Fulup." (Sapir 1971: 187)

Isambakon’s Jóola

Language Cognates with Isambakon’s Fulup in %

- Her 57
- Kasolo 59
- Tenduk 62
- Samatit 62
- Guslay 63
- Fogny 67
- Carabane 68
- Kasa 70
- Huluf 71
- Banjal 87

Banjal and Guslay v. all Jóolas: loss of root-initial l
Banjal v. all Jóolas: g ~ k
Lexico-grammatical features unique to Banjal
What does it mean to speak a “Jóola”:
discourse participants’ and transcribers’ perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Prominent vernacular language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurent Manga (LM)</td>
<td>Baloonk Gubeleh (Cjibonker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Bertrand (PB)</td>
<td>Jòola Banjal (Mof Avvi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cissé Mbaye (CB)</td>
<td>Jòola Kasa (Guinea Bissau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Sagna (DS)</td>
<td>Jòola Kasa (Oussuaye)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Denis Manga (JM)</td>
<td>Jòola Kasa (Oussuaye)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting: natural speech recorded at the Catholic seminary in Brin with the central participant (Laurent Manga) wearing a clip-on microphone

Majority of utterances tagged as Jóola Kasa by transcribers, language also identified in debriefing of LM.

Watson in prep.

Features associated with codes: the linguist’s perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Jóola Kasa</th>
<th>Jóola Kujireray</th>
<th>Jóola Banjal</th>
<th>Jóola Fogny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ah</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVV</td>
<td>VVV</td>
<td>VVV</td>
<td>VVV</td>
<td>VVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di ‘1SG.S’</td>
<td>ni ‘1SG.S’</td>
<td>ni ‘1SG.S’</td>
<td>ni ‘1SG.S’</td>
<td>ni ‘1SG.S’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jak ‘well’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The linguist is Rachel Watson who has worked on Jóola Kujireray since 2009, is very familiar with Jóola Banjal and knows the literature on Jóola Fogny and Kasa. When working with this text, she is particularly interested in finding out why it was tagged as Kasa.

What is Kasa in the conversation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance and translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS (veh)</td>
<td>Ande kaaju, dënojimo àyëmë Jëmëji.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (veh)</td>
<td>Ah inti huken ni jokut. It's your name that escapes me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB (veh)</td>
<td>Taatú tji naka kum. It's like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS (veh)</td>
<td>Wòjë niitu, naka kasa kúja. That's why they know him well, Casa, they know well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified as Kasa by the linguist

Different ‘Joolas’ in the conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance and translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB (veh)</td>
<td>Muña nokor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (veh)</td>
<td>Ah inti huken ni jokut, it's your name that escapes me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (veh)</td>
<td>Muña nokor. It's like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (veh)</td>
<td>Wòjë niitu, naka kum. When I saw you I said 'hop!'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which code is the remaining text in?
Languages as prototypes

Depending on their language socialisation and repertoires, linguistic speakers and listeners have different prototypes.

Kujireray

Gubëeher

Gubanjalay

Overlaps between prototypes and degree of reification

Perspective and scale determine which features are seen as prototypical and how non-prototypical features are classified.

Divergence area is where a code is reified and develops indexical potential.

Emblematic areas in phonology and lexicon are differentiated, other areas converge.

Jóola

Kujireray

Jóola

Gubanjalay

Through different styles (Eckert 2008), speakers index (patrimonial) identities according to context (Silverstein 2003).

Fluid writing in the conventions of a lead language

The writing does not distinguish codes, using French orthography as a lead (Lüpke & Bao Diop 2014).

Gay can be analysed as Wolof ‘lion’ (Mia Weidl), or as English guy (Friederike Lüpke). The speaker in question has been noted by Rachel Watson to use a lot of English in his speech.

Fluid and bounded writing
Boundaries evoked by standard language culture

“No, mélangé ak olof barewul de. Mélangé ak français, moo bare, mo gëna bare. Mélangé ak olof? No no no no.”

‘No, there is not a lot of mixture [of Casamance languages] with Wolof. The mixture with French, it is a lot, it is more. A mixture with Wolof? No no no no.’

Data and photo: Mia Weidl

Standard writing has great symbolic power...

Standard writing creates an ethnolinguistic group for the national polyglottic market place.

... but can’t reify the language itself

Like the other languages that transcription has liberated forever from the anaathema cast on them since always by the written languages, for the BOREPAB, the transcription of the Bainounk language will be a necessary complement, allowing it to be codified, stabilised, to enrich itself in the contact with other languages or be enriched by them.

Extract from the statutes of the Bainounk lobby organisation BOREPAB (1982)

Leaflet and T -shirt produced by the BOREPAB
Perspectives on mobility and multilingualism

Sagna (forthcoming) states that there are no gender differences in repertoires and describes "gañaleen," a fertility ritual that causes women to move out of the kingdom (Sagna & Bassène 2016). He notes the existence of in-married women and describes it as "Jóola Banjal" in his notes, thus obliterating an emic perspective.

Goodchild notes that she initially translated "Jóola" in responses into "Jóola Banjal" in her notes, thus obliterating an emic perspective.

Decreasing monolingualism in self-reported repertoires of male Eegimaa speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Interview text</th>
<th>Language repertoires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Um! Et... vous parlez quelles langues?</td>
<td>Jóola Banjal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Wéy!</td>
<td>Jóola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>C'est le jóola d'ici?</td>
<td>Jóola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Wéy!</td>
<td>Jóola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Les autres jóola?</td>
<td>Any other Joolas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Wéy!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Lesquels?</td>
<td>Which ones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Toi tu comprends un jóola?</td>
<td>Yes, do you understand a Joola?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Um?</td>
<td>Um?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Non?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Um?</td>
<td>Um?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Tu comprends?</td>
<td>Do you understand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Non, pas encore, je vais apprendre.</td>
<td>No, not yet I will learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sagna (forthcoming) notes that there are more individual multilingual speakers than monolinguals. Monolingual villages in the Casamance are, like the Eegimaa homeland, typically mono-ethnic. Most Jóola villages are of this type (Sagna 2016) (Sagna forthcoming: 3)

"(...) the language is threatened by the growing decrease in intergenerational transmission among migrants who constitute the majority of Eegimaa speakers." (Sagna forthcoming: 4)

Immigrant families may initially use their language at home, but eventually learn the dominant local language to communicate with other villagers. Women who marry into those villages also eventually learn the local languages. Even if their children have some exposure to their languages, exogamy has an extremely marginal explanatory power on individual multilingualism among Eegimaa speakers. (Sagna forthcoming: 3)
Activation of parts repertoires in different sociolinguistic spaces

Clashing perspectives and competing predictions

In a multilingual and polylectal society, a perspective on bounded codes can only ever see them as threatened. Crucially, it is actual language use that is endangered these codes.

A perspective on social functions of variation for indexicality focuses on the importance of polylectality and multilingualism in a language ecology. Crucially, it is actual, fluid language use that is strengthening complex language ecologies.

Contested spaces and indexical misunderstandings

Bainounk as autochthones. Mixture signals decline.
Settlement history of Djifanghor

• Village founded at the beginning of the 20th century by migrants from Tobor.
• Original settlement close to the river Casamance and the rice fields.
• Ca. 50 years ago village moved close to the road, founding new wards to both sides of it.
• Some districts seen as exclusively or mainly Guñun; others as Jóola and Mankanya.

Depending on how Djifanghor is conceptualised as a space, it will be associated with different patrimonial languages.

Settlement history of Agnack

• Agnack Petit:
  – Is composed of an older Bainounk settlement called Guriñol and a newer street village
  – Street village attracts a cosmopolitan population

• Agnack Grand:
  – Founded by the great-grandfather of the current village chief
  – Founder moved from Sangaj, a now abandoned village ca. 20km south-west of Agnack

Marriage exchange between Gujaher and Gugëcer communities
Known facets of multilingualism in Gujaher and Gugècer villages

- First Portuguese sources (late 15th century) already mention bond between Gujaher and Gugècer populations.
- Oral history remembers Gugècer as givers of women to the Gujaher.
- Marriage exchange is still in place.
- Speakers of Gugècer state being bilingual in Gujaher, while the inverse doesn’t hold.

Creole is a widespread lingua franca in Guinea Bissau and the eastern part of Lower Casamance, and also an identity language for many Gujaher.

Places where Casamance Creole is “traditionally” spoken, although hardly any “true monolingual speakers”

Categorical vs. relational indexicality

Scope and limits of indexicality of languages and of linguistic features
Indexing and plural without gender exponece in Baïnounk Gujaher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allitative</td>
<td>di-toomi di-buni</td>
<td>bu-toomi bu-buni</td>
<td>j-toomi j-buni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phono-logical</td>
<td>karaaf-aj ka-buni</td>
<td>karaaf-aj ka-buni</td>
<td>karaaf-aj ka-buni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate</td>
<td>ji-fek a-buni</td>
<td>ji-fek a-buni</td>
<td>ji-fek a-buni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default</td>
<td>caabi a-buni</td>
<td>caabi a-buni</td>
<td>caabi a-buni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definite article in Baïnounk Guñaamolo and Guñun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>si-deen</td>
<td>mu’-deen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>si-deen-o</td>
<td>mu’-deen-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: Guñaamolo

Consonant mutation in Gugëcer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-din a-reme</td>
<td>ga-lin ga-naandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-kur to-teena</td>
<td>ja-kur ja-naandi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definite marker -o
Suffixed plurals -e(ŋ) and default indexing
Animate indexing
Initial consonant mutation
Indexing a place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnack Grand</td>
<td>ji-jëk a-büni NCJigAgRo-good</td>
<td>ji-jëk-en i-büni NCJig-pig-PL AGRo-good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnack Petit</td>
<td>ji-jëk a-büni NCJigAgRo-good</td>
<td>ji-jëk-en a-büni NCJig-pig-PL AGRo-good-PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Animate vs. default agreement has become a second order index in Agnack Grand and Agnack Petit. Local speakers have metapragmatic awareness of the contrast.

It is unclear whether this metapragmatic awareness is shared with people from Djifanghor (“second linguistic relativity” (Hymes 1966)).

Extent and patterns of variation

- Paired prefixes, alliterative indexing in singular and plural, animate indexing in the collective
- Paired prefixes, alliterative indexing, plural suffix and 0-indexing in the collective
- Singular and collective prefixes, alliterative indexing in the collective, plural suffix, default indexing in singular and plural
- Plural suffix in plural and collective, ke-indexing in the singular, animate indexing in the plural, 0-indexing in the collective

Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Mané, 25/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux a-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux r-nak</td>
<td>ba-gux barumuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Mané, 28/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux ran-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux ya-nak</td>
<td>ræ-gux-ŋy rummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierrot Mané, 28/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux ran-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux ya-nak</td>
<td>ba-gux ba-rumuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierrot Mané, 28/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux a-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux r-nak</td>
<td>ba-gux ba-rumuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortensia Diandy, 28/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux ran-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux ya-nak</td>
<td>ræ-gux-ŋy rummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naby Mané, 28/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux a-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux ya-nak</td>
<td>ba-gux ba-rumuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léon Mané, 30/1/12</td>
<td>ræ-gux kaduka</td>
<td>ræ-gux-ŋy i-nak</td>
<td>ræ-gux-ŋy jemb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortensia Diandy</td>
<td>ræ-gux a-duka</td>
<td>ræ-gux ya-nak</td>
<td>ræ-gux-ŋy rummi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation as a function of the speakers’ social networks

- Paired prefixes, alliterative and animate indexing in the plural
- Paired prefixes, alliterative and animate indexing in the plural
- Plural suffix and animate indexing in the plural
- Members of the same household

Indexing social networks

- Consultant
- Singular
- Plural
- Collective
Outlook

Perspectives on codes privilege boundaries. Variation is conceptualised through an increased inventory of codes that is not apt at describing language use.

Perspectives on repertoires privilege fluidity. Language use becomes difficult to describe without reference points.

Perspectives on features privilege the study of variation. Without investigating how features are conceptualised as belonging to a named language, their social functions can’t be understood.

Holistic perspectives are needed

We need to allow for polycentric viewpoints (Mbembe 2015) and respect the perspectives of research participants.