

**Claudine Chamoreau & Isabelle Léglise (eds). 2012.**  
***Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change.***  
Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.

Language contact, though labeled with a single term, is a rather complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Besides the internal changes which take place in a given language at all times, there are also sociolinguistic and extralinguistic, mostly historical and (im)migrational, dynamics to be taken into consideration. But even in the full light of diachronic linguistic documentation it is sometimes difficult to judge whether a given change could be contact-induced or internally motivated, especially if we are dealing with morphosyntactic replications without the borrowing of recognizable matter from the model language. Quite often internal and contact-induced change proceed simultaneously. The volume under review takes up the task to scrutinize the dynamics of contact-induced language change setting a special focus on morphosyntactic structures. The editors repeatedly emphasize the “fine-grained approach” pursued by the contributors of the volume, who, besides following different methodologies and approaches, all take a typological perspective as their starting point.

As the two editors expose in their introduction “*A multi-model approach to contact-induced language change*” three main perspectives, corresponding to three possible approaches, are presented in the volume. In the following we will present these three parts, which have not been adapted in the index of the book, by exposing the main features of each contribution according to the order in the volume.

### **1. The role of multilingual speakers in contact-induced language change**

**Yaron Matras** presents “*an activity-oriented approach to contact-induced language change*”. He argues that asymmetries in the social roles and the prestige of the contact languages may influence the direction of language change, but they do not explain nor determine the motivation for structural change. Thus his main goal is to find out how borrowing comes about and how it is linked to other contact phenomena, i.e. he explores the link between social context, conversational pressure, communicative intent and structural factors in contact-induced change. Matras’ point of departure is that contact-induced change begins with innovations introduced by an individual multilingual speaker as part of his/her communicative interaction. According to his assumption, these innovations are not arbitrary, but pursue specific communicative goals, i.e. they are function-driven. In his approach Matras analyzes multilingual conversation

as repertoire negotiation proposing a continuum of contact phenomena according to the speaker's consciousness and creativity:

non-conscious	conscious
selection malfunctions > pattern replication > lexical insertion > speech manipulation	
no special effect	special effect

He concludes that the speaker's creativity results in innovations which in turn may or may not lead to actual language change through replication by other speakers. Speaker's creativity is a function-driven strategy that involves negotiation of two opposing pressures: on the one hand only those constructions which are appropriate in the context of the ongoing conversation are selected; on the other hand the speakers fully exploit all the options available in their linguistic repertoire, and as far as multilingual speakers are concerned, it is impossible for them to completely deactivate one of the languages of their repertoire. After the initial innovation has been made by a single speaker, social as well as structural factors facilitate and constrain its diffusion and acceptance within the speech community. Among the social factors the role of the speaker in the local community is of utmost importance. Thus the spreading of linguistic innovations among peers or from older to younger generation is more likely than from a child to the parents.

Linguistic innovation is the main topic of **Claudine Chamoreau's** article "*Contact-induced change as innovation*". In this context the term 'innovation' is used to describe the attribution of a new function to a borrowed matter, usually by internal motivation, not attested in the model language. This rather rare phenomenon can be observed in comparative constructions in Purhepecha (isolate; Michoacán, Mexico). Here, four construction types can be found, all of which are contact-induced from Spanish since the analysis of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> c. missionary grammars and texts reveals a completely different internal inherited comparative construction. Among these four contact-induced types pure borrowings (e.g. *mas...ke* o *mas...ke...de*), replications (e.g. *sániteru...efka*) and mixed forms (*sániteru...ke*) can be found. In addition to these, the data collected by Chamoreau during field work uncovers that the Spanish preposition *entre* has been borrowed in one particular village attributing to it a new function not attested in the model language, i.e. in the comparative construction *mas...ke...entre*. *Entre* is only used in this structure and like in the *mas...ke...de* construction we are dealing with a comparative construction expressed by a locative type which, cross-linguistically, is very common and which can also be found in other Mesoamerican languages. Nevertheless the use of *entre* is exclusive to one village which together with three other neighbor villages sticks

out by its great Purhepecha vitality as compared to the general tendency of the Michoacán region to neglect the indigenous in favor of the dominant Spanish language. The innovation attested is, according to Chamoreau, a strategy by which the speakers of that particular village exhibit their distinctiveness.

## **2. Differences between ordinary contact-induced language change and change in endangered languages**

**Sandra Aikhenvald** examines several language contact situations in her contribution “*Language contact in language obsolescence*” where languages are about to vanish or have already disappeared due to language shift of the whole language community, local groups or individuals. The last two are usually found among those speakers living away from the community of their mother tongue. Linguistic consequences of language obsolescence include simplification and reduction of grammar and lexicon, with those features especially endangered which are absent in the dominant language. Moreover, stylistic reduction, dialect mixing and speakers’ insecurity are symptoms of ongoing language death. Furthermore the endangered languages experience heavy or unusual influx of foreign elements. Subsequently Aikhenvald puts forward a number of obsolescent languages exemplifying the linguistic results. In Manambu (Ndu; Papua New Guinea) obsolescent speakers exhibit considerably more foreign influx than fluent speakers, and in Bare (North Arawakan; Venezuela and Brazil) more than historical records suggest. Aikhenvald’s field work results demonstrate an abundance of borrowed forms from Tok Pisin or Spanish/Portuguese respectively, such as function words and lexical items, but also pattern replication. At the same time the author emphasizes that “borrowing conjunctions and discourse markers in itself is not a symptom of impending language death”, since many other “healthy” languages also exhibit similar influx. Nevertheless, in situations of language shift the tendencies which can also be seen in non-endangered languages are enhanced. Especially in Bare ‘the quantity of change’ can be interpreted as a symptom of language obsolescence. Bare also experiences suffix simplification and loss of those suffixes without equivalent in the contact languages Spanish and Portuguese. Among the unusual, i.e. very rare, borrowings Aikhenvald mentions the cases of Mawayana (North Arawakan; Suriname) and Resígaro (North Arawakan; northeastern Peru) which adopted the inclusive-exclusive distinction in the first person plural, nonexistent in their language family, due to contact with Waiwai (Carib language) and Bora (Bora-Witotoan) respectively. Both obsolescent languages introduced the pronoun for the first person exclusive from the dominant language while reinterpreting the inherited form of the first person as the inclusive one. This rare case of borrowing a pronoun, i.e. an element of a closed class, could be the result of heavy influx of foreign elements, to the extent that

pre-obsolescent Resígaro was more Arawak-like in its lexicon and grammar. In this context, the author points out that massive borrowing may obscure the genetic affiliation of languages, especially if all the data we have is based on a handful of obsolescent speakers with no older historical stages documented for comparative studies. Finally, the example of Tariana (Arawakan, NW Amazonia, Brazil and Colombia) is intended to show that the influx of foreign forms is not a universal result of language obsolescence. The speakers of this particular language participate in exogamous marriages with the result of obligatory multilingualism and a certain inhibition against phonologically recognizable loan forms. Nevertheless obsolescent Tariana speakers attribute semantic extensions to an inherited morpheme under the influence of a phonologically similar morpheme of the Tucanoan contact language. In her concluding remarks Aikhenvald emphasizes that “before passing into extinction, an obsolescent language may become a “carbon copy” of the dominant idiom”, a fact that typologists and historical linguists need to be aware of when they find unusual features of borrowed matter and pattern in obsolescent languages.

**Ana Fernández Garay** examines the change of the morphosyntactic alignment system in Tehuelche (Chon; Patagonia, Argentina) from an ergative-absolutive system to a marked-nominative system (“*The emergence of a marked-nominative system in Tehuelche or Aonek’o ʔaʔjen: a contact-induced change?*”). Proto-Chon probably exhibited an ergative-absolutive system with S and P indexation on the verb and no marking of A at all. However, in Modern Tehuelche, which is almost extinct, two subsystems can be distinguished: one tracing back to the Proto-Chon ergative-absolutive system but limiting itself to gender agreement of S and P indexed on the verb. The second subsystem is nominative-accusative where the A- and S-NPs are marked by adpositions, usually when they are located preverbally, while P does not receive any case-marking. According to Fernández Garay the postpositions  $\check{s} \sim n \sim r$  used to mark a circumstantial in the past, from where they spread to mark the A of a transitive clause, i.e. the ergative. In the next step of evolution the marking also extended to the single argument of an intransitive clause, i.e. the S-NP, thus creating a marked-nominative system. The former postpositions  $\check{s} \sim n \sim r$  can now occur as postpositions as well as prepositions. This realignment process by extension of adpositions could be due to internal changes but Fernández Garay attributes it to the contact with first Mapudungun (Araucanian; Chile, Argentina; 300 to 400 years until the 19<sup>th</sup> c.) and later Spanish (especially since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c.), both languages of the nominative-accusative type. Moreover, Mapudungun has prepositions and postpositions, a feature which could also have influenced Tehuelche during the centuries of intensive contact of the two languages, since other Chon languages such as Selkam (Isla Grande de Tierra del Fuego), which

did not experience the same contact situation, only have postpositions. The use of preposition was certainly also triggered by the influence of Spanish, the dominant language to which the former Tehuelche speakers shifted during the 20<sup>th</sup> c. The process of alignment change, according to the hypothesis of Fernández Garay, has never been fully completed due to this language shift to Spanish.

### 3. The relationship between contact-induced change and internal change

**Bernd Heine**, in his article “*On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact*”, asks the question whether grammatical replication is an act of polysemy copying or if it is constrained by universal principles of grammaticalization. Therefore he examines three examples of grammatical replication: articles, possessive perfects, and the auxiliatation of ‘threaten’-verbs across a variety of European languages. Just limiting ourselves to the case of articles, it can be said that the replication of the definite article in Upper Sorbian (Slavic; Germany), following the German model, and the replication of the indefinite article in Upper Sorbian and Molisean (Slavic; southeastern Italy), following the German and the Italian models respectively, cannot be interpreted as polysemy copying, since they are not full replicas of the model languages. The articles in the replica languages have not reached the same advanced stage of grammaticalization as the model languages. Thus speakers did not replicate the whole set of functions of the contact language but rather copied the initial stages of grammaticalization. Subsequently, depending on the length and intensity of contact, the grammaticalization advanced along universal pathways to the point where it actually can reach the same stage as displayed in the model language. These pathways are unidirectional, i.e. any subsequent stage implicates the existence of the preceding one, but not vice versa. At the same time, the replication would never start with an advanced stage of grammaticalization lacking the preceding ones. According to Heine, the term ‘polysemy copying’ is more suitable for the abrupt process of lexical borrowing of polysemic words, but less for the gradual evolutionary process of grammatical replication. Nevertheless, Heine does not discuss, just as Manterola in his article, the possibility of internal grammaticalization after the initial contact-induced replication and after a possible break-up of the contact languages (cf. Stolz for such an approach).

**Thomas Stolz** examines “*The attraction of definite articles*”, more specifically “*the borrowing of Spanish un in Chamorro*”. This Malayo-Polynesian language of Guam and of some other Mariana Islands experienced intensive contact with Spanish for over 200 years up to 1898, i.e. the end of the Spanish colonies in the Pacific. Since then the contact-induced features have been maintained in the language. Besides the heavy borrowing of lexical items

and the incorporation of function words, there is also the numeral *unu* ‘one’ which has been introduced into the otherwise inherited Austronesian set of articles. Departing from the grammaticalization scale of the cardinal number ‘one’ (five stages altogether) postulated by Heine (1997 and subsequent studies) Stolz analyzes the use of *unu* in Modern Chamorro coming to the conclusion that the grammaticalization of the borrowed matter *unu* has not exceeded stage 3 thus being only a partial replication of the Spanish indefinite article. This is partly due to the fact that the Spanish-derived *unu* still has to compete with pre-Hispanic morphosyntactic strategies such as the antipassive and zero article. On the other hand, there are uses of *unu* attested in Modern Chamorro, e.g. with temporal adverbials or in combination with the preposition *gi* ‘in’ which are not accounted for in Heine’s scale. Out of all of this Stolz draws the conclusion among several possible scenarios that *un* was borrowed from Spanish with part of the functions of the indefinite article, but not at the same grammaticalized stage as today. After this contact-induced introduction of *un* into Chamorro the further development was strictly language internal, but according to known principals. Thus the Spanish indefinite article *un* has not been adopted with the total set of functions available, despite the more than two centuries of intensive contact. The borrowing of functional categories was limited to a low level of grammaticalization in Chamorro. Nowadays Chamorro exhibits an indefinite article of its own which has diverged in some aspects from the Spanish model, at least since 1898.

In her article “*On form and function in language contact: a case study from the Amazonian Vaupés region*” **Patience Epps** explores the cross-linguistically unusual tendencies of the Vaupés region also mentioned by Aikhenvald in this volume. She asks the question how deep the resistance to borrowing actually goes and what role is played by similarities of form in limiting or promoting the diffusion of grammatical categories and structures. Therefore she analyzes the forms and functions of *ni* across three different language families (Tucanoan, Arawakan and Nadahup) with special attention to the Nadahup branch. Only the Tucanoan and Arawakan people of the Vaupés region practice linguistic exogamy leading to multilingualism. The Hup’s multilingualism, mostly with Tucano, is due to the socioeconomic relations with other peoples. Nevertheless, the negative attitude towards language mixing and the resistance to the adaption of phonologically foreign forms has also spread to Hup speakers and is thus present in peoples of all three language families. On the other hand, grammatical categories and structures (including lexical calques) are widely shared, to the point where we can speak of a “grammaticalization area”, i.e. “a region where several languages have undergone (and are currently undergoing) similar processes of grammaticalization.” Tariana and Hup are both influenced by

Tucanoan, whereas Hup and Tariana are not in contact at the moment, so that shared features of the two languages must be due to their respective contact with Tucanoan. As far as the verb *ni* is concerned, Hup displays more functional similarities with Tucanoan than the more distant relatives Dâw and Nadëb. Epps concludes out of this that at least part of the functions of *ni* in Hup have been modeled under the influence of East Tucanoan. Since *ni* was probably already existent in Hup as an inherited lexical and grammatical element, embedded within morphologically complex grammatical constructions, the speakers did not evaluate Tucanoan *ni* as a foreign element, thus opening the pathway for the spread of non-native grammatical functions. So the shared form and function preceded and then enabled the borrowing of grammatical structures among the languages of the Vaupés region. Also in this case it remains hard to determine exactly what is due to internal change and what to language contact, but it seems suitable to suggest that language contact has played a major role in spreading the shared form *ni* across the Vaupés region.

**Julen Manterola** analyzes the diachronic development of Basque definite and indefinite articles in the light of recent contact theories coming to the following interim conclusions: the Basque definite article has certainly been introduced through contact with Spanish or other Romance languages north of the Pyrenees belonging thus to the areal phenomenon of evolving definite articles in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. Its grammaticalization path, however, has advanced beyond the stage of the model language. This could be due to the spreading of the overt marking of singular and plural which is only indicated in the definite article. This spreading of the definite article presumably affected the further grammaticalization of the indefinite article *bat*. In this case historical evidence does not reveal the age of the indefinite article but it is assumed to be a replication of the Romance one (also mentioned by Stolz in the same volume). These results are mainly based on his criticism concerning Heine and Kuteva's contact-induced grammaticalization thesis (2003, 2005, 2006, 2007) (cf. above Heine's contribution). Manterola points out how the use of inappropriate language data and analysis, which neglect the overall dialectal and diachronic situation, will most certainly lead to wrong assumptions. He emphasizes the importance of the consideration of any available data, modern and historical, in order to be able to draw conclusions whether a language change is contact-induced or internally motivated, rather than fitting an available reduced data set in a given theory. Thus, in Manterola's opinion, the hypothesis postulated by Heine and Kuteva (and Stolz for Chamorro *unu* in this volume) that the replica language exhibits a lower degree of grammaticalization as the model language in a particular feature cannot be held for the Basque article, since the singular and plural marking function of the definite article certainly

interfered with the more typical pathway of grammaticalization. Manterola does not discuss the possibility of internal development of the replicated definite article in Basque as for example Stolz for the borrowed indefinite article in Chamorro (cf. above). Once again we are faced with the problem that in the case of replicated patterns without matter borrowing we are always left in doubt whether the language change is contact-induced or internal. Nevertheless, as far as the origin and the evolution of the Basque articles are concerned much more studies need to be undertaken.

**Sibylle Kriegel's** article "*Contact phenomena/code copying in Indian Ocean Creoles: the post-abolition period*" scrutinizes the origin of the ablative marking adposition *depi* in Modern Mauritian Creole and the complementizer *pourdir* in Modern Seychelles Creole. Mauritian Creole was imported to the Seychelles before the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> c. when the islands were populated by the French. Both Creoles, which have been well maintained over the centuries, are mutually intelligible until today. Thus the variant history, and most importantly contact history, from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> are taken into consideration in order to explain the diverging elements in the two Modern Creole languages. In the case of Mauritian Creole Kriegel points out the function word *depi*, nonexistent in Seychelles Creole. She finds a parallel construction in Bhojpuri, the Indic language spoken until today by (descendants of) labor immigrants from India, who were much needed after the abolition of slavery. This way, she interprets the function word as a replication of the Bhojpuri model thus shedding new light on the indeterminacy related to dating the copy of replicated elements which are derived from the base language of the Creole. In the case of the complementizer *pourdir* in Seychelles Creole the situation is less clear. A parallel construction can be found in Bantu languages, such as Swahili. However, we have to distinguish two stages of contact with Bantu languages: first, the period of the constitution of the Creole languages when oral varieties of French and Bantu languages were involved (before 1773); second, the time after the abolition of slavery in 1835 when large numbers of Bantu speakers immigrated exclusively to the Seychelles, but not to Mauritius, in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. The lack of historical language data from the period of constitution of the Creoles and of the scarce data on later evolutionary stages make it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the exact period or date of introduction of a replicated pattern with matter from its own base language, i.e. the time of creolization or later.

**Zarina Estrada-Fernández** addresses in her article "*Grammaticalization of modal auxiliary verbs in Pima Bajo: an internal or a contact-induced change*" the problem of internal change vs. contact-induced change, especially in those cases where diachronic language data are absent. Therefore she undertakes a comparative approach within the Uto-Aztecan language family by analyzing the

modal auxiliary verb constructions in Uto-Aztecan languages of northwestern Mexico and the United States considering historical changes and typological properties of the language family. According to her analysis the typology of verbal complements can only be explained as different stages on the grammaticalization paths available in these languages. Two possible directions in the evolution of auxiliary verbs can be identified as internal preferences: one in languages with a strong tendency to be polysynthetic, like Yaqui; and another one in languages with a strong tendency to be analytical, like Pima Bajo. Still, the question arises why bare modal auxiliary verbs can only be found in those languages which have evidently been in close contact with Spanish for the past couple of centuries, such as Pima Bajo. Fernández-Estrada does not opt for either exclusively internal or contact-induced change. She rather takes a middle position following Heine and Kuteva postulating a “language-contact phenomenon[on] working in conspiracy with grammaticalization” (2008:218).

**Anthony P. Grant** in his article “*Contact, convergence, and conjunctions: a cross-linguistic study of borrowing correlations among certain kinds of discourse, phasal adverbial, and dependent clause markers*” makes a different empirical approach comparing function words (discourse markers, phrasal adverbs, and coordinating and subordinating conjunctions) across a sample of 22 different languages and varieties of various language families. His main goal is to determine the validity of frequency hierarchies and implicational hierarchies concerning the borrowability, i.e. the likelihood of borrowing, of these function words. The hierarchies and claims under discussion are mainly based on the studies of Matras (1998). Relying on data found in grammars, dictionaries and specialized studies on single languages Grant is well aware of the methodological weakness of his data set in some points, especially in the case of less documented languages where some equivalences could simply not be found in the data available, which does not mean at all that the respective function word does not exist. Nevertheless the particular languages were chosen because they all exhibit a considerable degree of borrowing in the 207-items Swadesh-list. The effects of contact-induced change, i.e. the borrowing of function words, is quite considerable in the language set examined. Yet the overall picture of borrowing is not as rule-driven as the established hierarchies suggest. Thus, in agreement with many scholars nowadays, Grant prefers the notion of empirical “tendencies” instead of universal hierarchies, since counterexamples can be found for every implicational hierarchy, as for example for ‘but’ > ‘or’ > ‘and’. As an implicational hierarchy it implies that the borrowing of one category is a pre-condition for the borrowing of the subsequent element in the hierarchy. However, the data set reveals examples like Livonian (Balto-Finnic) and Garifuna (Arawakan) where the term for ‘and’ is borrowed, but the one for ‘or’ not. Among Grant’s

numerous concluding remarks and results some extra-linguistic determining factors are also mentioned, such as the degree and the length of contact, the attitude of speakers of the recipient language towards the donor language, and the degree of knowledge of and literacy in the donor language, admitting, though, that these parameters are more difficult to discover.

In the case of **Carla Bruno**'s contribution "*On a Latin-Greek diachronic convergence: the perfects with Latin habeo/Greek échō and a participle*" we are dealing with two well documented languages from Antiquity through to Romance languages and Modern Greek. Even this fortunate situation, as demonstrated by Bruno, does not prevent us from the necessary precautionary proceeding in order to avoid misleading conclusions. The Romance languages and Modern Greek both share the feature of periphrastic perfects derived from a "possessive" verb form (Lat. habeo, Gr. échō) plus the "passive" perfect participle (agreeing with the direct object), which appeared together in transitive structures. In the past this parallel construction in Latin has been interpreted as a replica of the Greek model. Nevertheless, we are lacking the respective linguistic evidence in Classical Greek since this construction appeared briefly in the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BCE, vanished afterwards in order to reappear in the late 1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE, but in texts which were evidently close to the Latin world. Out of this and the fact that structural similarities due to the genetic relationship of Greek and Latin may have facilitated the replication of patterns, Bruno concludes that a possible contact scenario reveals Greek as the replica language that followed an external, i.e. Latin, model. Here again, as in many other cases scrutinized in the volume, contact-induced language change is only accepted where it agrees with the internal evolutionary trends and the possibilities provided by the system of a language.

Summarizing the main points addressed in this volume we would like to start with a topic which, according to our opinion, is the principal resource for any typological, diachronic or dialectal study: the data source. Most of the contributors work with their own data collected during field work, mainly from their languages of expertise. However, they recognize and realize the weakness of their own data, especially if diachronic data are not extensive, nor reliable or simply nonexistent. Thus their hypothesis are kept within the limits of the linguistic evidence and do not go beyond. As Manterola's article exemplifies: using data which cannot be relied on may lead to wrong assumptions. At the same time it emphasizes the need to consider all the available and methodologically necessary data. The morphosyntactic contact phenomena examined in the volume partly constitute new aspects never studied before.

Thus the contributors of the volume practice a precautionary principle. This is fundamental when dealing with the decision whether a language change is to be interpreted as contact-induced or internally motivated, especially in the case of grammatical replications where a foreign structure is copied using inherited forms. In many cases we cannot know for sure which kind of change it is, the reason why Fernández-Estrada, considering her linguistic evidence, chooses a middle way solution. Heine also suggests a continuous contact-induced grammaticalization following universal pathways. However, the detection of foreign forms in a given language always points to contact-induced change, at least in an early stage. In Stolz' case the initial borrowing of a grammatical category together with the foreign form is followed by an internal grammaticalization pathway. All the contributors agree on the general tendency of the replica languages to build the new structures upon already existing patterns, constructions or internal evolutionary tendencies. Thus it is not surprising that most of the articles of the 3<sup>rd</sup> section discuss Heine and Kuteva's principle of "contact-induced grammaticalization" (2003, 2005) which criticizes and advances their hypothesis as new data is studied in the light of these recent theories (cf. especially Heine, Stolz and Manterola for the grammaticalization of articles). This multi-causal perspective can be detected throughout the whole volume and certainly represents an up-to-date approach which leads to new promising results as can be seen above.

Once more the precautionary principle pursued by the contributors and the general layout of the volume has demonstrated how linguistic universals, or better cross-linguistic tendencies, cannot be determined without the consideration of individual characteristics of single languages and language contact situations. As Manterola has shown for the Basque articles it is even possible that language-specific functional necessities felt by the speakers can overrule the universal pathways of grammaticalization. Thus most of the articles presented in this volume deal with very concrete language contact situations pointing out the typological peculiarities of the involved languages as well as the special linguistic attitude of the speakers together with their historical and sociolinguistic background. Moreover, universals and particularities and their interactions have to be considered at the same time in order to do justice to the multi-causal and multi-factorial language contact situations and phenomena.

Lastly, throughout the volume we are continuously reminded of the fact that there are no linguistic constraints in language change, be it internal or contact-induced, and that change is unpredictable. This emphasizes the importance of the speakers' attitude and linguistic initiative since it is them who can finally decide whether they want to incorporate a certain change or not. This is especially valid in Matras' contribution where any linguistic act of creativity by

any individual speaker is said to be function-driven pursuing certain communicative goals. Also in Chamoreau's article the speakers' wish to exhibit their linguistic identity leads to unusual innovations. Last not least, the Amazonian Vaupés region demonstrates impressively how bio-social pressure turns the general cross-linguistic tendency that lexical items are more frequently borrowed than grammatical structures into the opposite situation.

Hans-Jörg Döhla

(CNRS, Paris (SeDyL) and SNF (Switzerland))

doehlahj@gmx.de

## References

- Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2003. On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27(3): 529-572.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2007. *The Genesis of Grammar. A Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2008. The explanatory value of grammaticalization. In *Linguistic Universals and Language Change*, Good, Jeff (ed.), 215-230. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36: 281-331.