

To appear in the *Annual Review of Anthropology* 2004.

LANGUAGE BIRTH AND DEATH

Salikoko S. Mufwene

Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago, 1010 East 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637
s-mufwene@uchicago.edu

KEY WORDS: *ecology, exploitation colony, settlement colony, language endangerment, langue minorée*

1. INTRODUCTION

Linguistics publications on language endangerment and death have increased since Dorian's (1989) *Investigating obsolescence* and more so since the publication of a special issue of *Language* (the journal of the Linguistic Society of America) on the subject matter in 1992. Books alone include the following: Fishman (1991), Robins & Uhlenbeck (1991), Brenzinger (1992, 1998), Hagège (1992, 2000), Mühlhäusler (1996), Cantoni (1997), Dixon (1997), Grenoble & Whaley (1998), Hazaël-Massieux (1999), Reyhner et al (1999), Crystal (2000), Nettle & Romaine (2000), Skutnab-Kangas (2000), Hinton & Hale (2001), Maffi (2001), Mufwene (2001), Swaan (2001), Dalby (2002), Harmon (2002), Joseph et al (2003), Maurais & Morris (2003), and Phillipson (2003). Experts will undoubtedly notice some omissions, but one cannot help noticing the strong interest the subject matter has aroused among linguists over the past two decades.

Research and publications on new language varieties have interested linguists in a less dramatic way, despite the high visibility of Bickerton (1981, 1984), Thomason & Kaufman (1988), and Chaudenson (1992, 2001). This asymmetry may reflect the concern among

linguists – stated in numerous publications – about the increasing loss of linguistic materials that should inform us about typological variation. It may also be due to the following: although genetic linguistics has always been about speciation, researchers have typically focused on whether or not particular language varieties descend from the same ancestor and can thus be claimed to be genetically related – hence the central methodological role accorded to the comparative method. Research on the development of creoles, pidgins, and indigenized varieties – which is obviously on the birth of new language varieties – has hardly been connected to genetic linguistics. Thus, because of the way contact is thought to have exerted an unusually major influence on these cases of language divergence, Thomason & Kaufman (1988), for instance, seem to have been more interested in showing how the development of creoles, pidgins, and the like deviates from what they take to be the “normal” or “usual” kind of language change and speciation than in explaining the process of language birth itself.

Overall, the way that scholarship on language loss and birth has developed reflects in some ways the fact that genetic linguistics has assumed scenarios in which language contact has played an incidental, rather than catalytic, role. Such scenarios seem so artificial when one recognizes, for instance, that the diversification of Indo-European languages has been concurrent with the gradual dispersal of Indo-European populations in Europe and parts of Asia. This was a long migratory process during which they came in contact with non-Indo-European populations. Because they did not relocate at the same pace nor along the same routes, they often came subsequently in contact with each other. For instance, the Romans, speaking an Italic language, came in contact with the Celts, as would the Germanics some

centuries later, though most of the Celts would already be Latinizing during that time. Little has been said about how languages vanished in Europe while Indo-European was speciating into so many modern languages.

Since the late 1980s, research on language loss has focused primarily on the indigenous languages of European ex-colonies and to some extent on minority languages of the European Union – such as Breton, Occitan, Basque, Sami, and Gaelic, which are still endangered by the official and dominant languages of their nations. The almost exclusive association of language death and birth either with the emergence of modern European nation states united by single national languages or with the colonization of most of the world by Europe since the 16th century has led to the illusion that both processes might be recent developments in the history of mankind.¹ The over-emphasis on world-wide economic globalization as the primary cause of language loss has prevented any fruitful comparisons between, on the one hand, recent and current evolutions and, on the other, what must have occurred during the earliest political and economic hegemonies in the history of mankind. The closest thing to what I suggest can be found in Hagège (2000).

Although current research on language birth and loss is well grounded in population contacts, the relevant literature has hardly highlighted the fact that these processes have

¹ There have indeed been attempts to compare with “creolization” the development of Romance languages (e.g. Schlieben-Lange 1977) or that of Middle English (e.g. Bailey & Maroldt 1977), but such studies have been negatively criticized for good and bad reasons (e.g. Thomason & Kaufman 1988, regarding English).

usually occurred under the same, or related, socio-economic conditions identified by Mufwene (2001) as “ecological.” For instance, the birth of creoles in the plantation settlement colonies of the Atlantic and Indian Ocean is a concomitant of language shift among the African populations who developed them. Likewise, the emergence of American English(es), is a concomitant of both the gradual loss of especially continental European languages that came in contact with English in North America and of the restructuring of English varieties brought over from England (regardless of whether influence from the other languages is factored in).

Below, I elaborate on the above observations, focusing especially on the concern that scholars such as Nettle & Romaine (2000), Skutnab-Kangas (2000), and Maffi (2001) have expressed about loss of “biodiversity” applied to the coexistence of languages. I historicize both colonization and economic globalization to show how they are related and provide differential ecologies for language birth and death. I highlight speakers as the unwitting agents of these phenomena, while also questioning the adequacy of terms such as *language war*, *killer language* and *linguicide*.

My approach is generally the same as in Mufwene (2001),² largely inspired by population genetics, with languages considered as populations of idiolects and, in respect to their

² Readers familiar with Harmon (1996, which I was not aware of until after completing this essay) will notice quite a few differences in our conceptions of the ‘linguistic species’ and how we apply it to language evolution, as complementary as our positions are. For instance, my justifications here, as in Mufwene (2001) are quite different from his (which are also repeated in Harmon 2002).

evolutionary characteristics, as analogous to parasitic, viral species. Space limitations make it unnecessary to justify this position here. Suffice it to note the following assumptions that are central to most of the discussion in the rest of this essay: 1) languages are internally variable (between idiolects and between dialects); 2) they do not evolve in uniform ways, as changes may proceed faster or differently in one segment of a population of its speakers than in another; 3) the same language may thrive in one ecology but do poorly in another; 4) like biological species, their vitality depends on the ecology of their existence or usage; and 5) like viruses, their features may change several times in their lifetime. But we should start by articulating the meanings of language ‘birth’ and ‘death’ more explicitly.

2. THE MEANINGS OF ‘BIRTH’ AND ‘DEATH’ APPLIED TO LANGUAGES

The notions ‘birth’ and ‘death’ actually provide more arguments for treating languages as species. Languages are unlike organisms in the way they are born or die. As well noted by Chaudenson (1992, 2001, 2003) in the case of creoles, and Szulmajster (2000) regarding Yiddish, languages as communal phenomena cannot be issued birth or death certificates. The relevant processes are protracted, spanning several generations. The concept of ‘language birth’ is in fact a misnomer of some sort. The birth involves no pregnancy and delivery stages, and the term refers to a stage (not a point in time!) in a divergence process during which a variety is acknowledged *post facto* as structurally different from its ancestor. For instance, there is no particular point in time that can be associated with the emergence of creoles as separate vernaculars from the colonial European languages they have evolved from. Unlike

in the case of organisms, but like in the case of species, language birth cannot be predicted. The recognition of separateness is made possible by a cumulative accretion of divergence features relative to an ancestor language, regardless of whether or not contact with other languages is factored in the account.

Language death is likewise a protracted change of state.³ Used to describe community-level loss of competence in a language, it denotes a process that does not affect all speakers at the same time nor to the same extent. Under one conception of the process, it has to do with the statistical assessment of the maintenance versus loss of competence in a language variety among its speakers. Total death is declared when there are no speakers left of a particular language variety in a population that had used it.⁴

An important question nowadays has also been whether Latin – whose standard variety (Classical Latin) is still the lingua franca of the Vatican and whose vernacular, nonstandard variety (Vulgar Latin) has evolved into the Romance languages – is really a dead language

³ To be sure, cases of sudden language death by genocide have been attested (see, e.g., Hagège 2000 and Nettle & Romaine 2000) but they are rare compared to the other cases most commonly discussed in the literature. They are not really part of natural evolution by competition and selection, as explained in Part 5, and they will not be discussed below.

⁴ It is less clear whether a language is still alive, just moribund, or just “in poor health” when it is used by *semi-speakers*, individuals who claim they speak it but mix its vocabulary and grammar with the system of another language. Dorian’s (1981) discussion of Scottish Gaelic has made such cases an important part of understanding language “obsolescence.”

(Hagège 2000)? If so, what is the most critical criterion in identifying a language as dead? Is language death predicated on the presence of native speakers and on its transmission from one generation of speakers to another without the mediacy of the scholastic medium?⁵ And in the case of the evolution of a language into a new variety, what is the relationship between language death and language birth? Can these processes be considered as two facets of the same process? Needless to say these are aspects of death that are untypical of organisms. More benefits from conceiving of languages as species or populations of idiolects become obvious below.

3. QUESTIONING SOME USUAL ACCOUNTS OF LANGUAGE BIRTH AND DEATH

As noted above, the birth of new language varieties has been central to creolistics, to the study of indigenized varieties of European languages, and to historical dialectology.⁶ The list

⁵ Space limitations prevent us from pursuing this issue here. Assessing the vitality of a language variety in relation to its association with native speakers would, for instance, entail questioning the legitimacy of identifying pidgins as languages. The status of makeshift languages such as Esperanto would also become into problematic. Independence of transmission from teaching a particular language in schools would call for a reassessment of the status of Irish in Ireland.

⁶ The foci have been different in these research areas. Most creolists have sought to demonstrate that creoles (and pidgins) are natural and as rule-governed as other languages, whereas students of indigenized varieties have argued that these varieties are as legitimate offspring of English as the varieties that are said to be “native” and are spoken in former settlement colonies such as the Americas

of titles is too long to want to include here and any choice of a representative list would be biased. Consistent with the tradition in genetic linguistics, there has been little interest in the birth process itself, except that in the case of creoles and indigenized varieties, language contact and the influence of non-European languages on the European targets have been acknowledged as important ecological factors.

As in the case of creoles, the emergence of new dialects in former settlement colonies has hardly been correlated with the concurrent erosion and death of other European languages that did not become the official languages of the specific colonies, for instance, French, Dutch, Danish, Norwegian, and German, among a host of others in the United States. Works such as Haugen (1953) and Clyne (2003) – to cite two chronological extremes – are more on language obsolescence than on the emergence of new varieties of the dominant language. The fact that language contact is seldom invoked to account for the divergence of these new, colonial dialects of European languages – which has implicitly contributed to making the development of creoles so curious – remains an intriguing matter. The topic of their birth itself, which can very well be discussed in relation to that of indigenized varieties of the same languages, has generally been overlooked (see, e.g., Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason

or Australia, where populations of European descent are now majorities. (Creoles are associated primarily with coastal plantation settlement colonies of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, where populations of non-European descent and now majorities.) Historical dialectology has focused mostly on the non-standard vernaculars of former settlement colonies, almost overlooking the fact that the varieties spoken today in their European metropolises are just as new.

2001, and Winford 2003). One important exception to the above bias insofar as the evolution of English is concerned is the growing literature on Hiberno-English, as represented, for example, by Kallen (1997).

Putting things in a longer perspective, Thomason (2001) correctly notes that history provides several instances of language death. However, the linguistics literature of the past two decades on language endangerment has done little to enrich discussions with comparisons with older cases in human history. As noted above, the growing scholarship on the subject matter has focused on the recent and ongoing attrition of the indigenous languages of former European colonies. In the vast majority of cases, these languages (especially the indigenous languages of the Americas and Australia) have certainly played a marginal role in the evolution of the European varieties that either have driven them to extinction or are threatening them. It would thus be unjustified to expect the relevant literature to have related the topic of language death with that of language birth. It is yet justified to expect similar scholarship about Europe to have related these processes with the experience of several European languages that have become *langues minorées*.⁷ As I show below, capturing these

⁷ Hazaël-Massieux (2000) reports an important distinction made by French sociolinguists between *langue minoritaire* ‘minority language’ and *langue minorée* ‘undervalued language’. The latter need not be spoken by a minority population. Like Haitian Creole, it may be spoken by the majority population of a polity but is relegated to ethnographically “low” communicative functions. If this view is taken literally, most indigenous languages in former European colonies fall in this category, as they are not associated with the “high(er)” communicative functions of their polities. (See Pandaharipande

parallel evolutions would have enabled us to better understand why languages have been dying so rapidly since the 19th century.

The literature has generally also invoked globalization to account for the loss or endangerment of several non-European languages. Unfortunately it has seldom articulated what *globalization* means. As a matter of fact, this phenomenon has too often been confused with what is identified as *McDonaldization*, i.e., the spread of McDonald stores around the world (see, e.g., Nettle & Romaine 2000). Likewise, the literature says nothing about whether globalization is novel and how it is related to colonization. This is quite critical because the related applied literature on the revitalization of endangered languages seldom refers to the ecology that would be the most favorable to the revitalization process. Would commitment on the part of the relevant linguistic communities alone do? Or would any conditions other than the precolonial ones, under which most of these languages thrived, be supportive of the revitalization efforts?

The vitality of languages cannot be dissociated from the socio-economic interests and

2003 regarding such situations in India.) Consistent with seemingly precocious predictions that 50 % - 90 % of the world's languages will have vanished by the end of the twenty-first century, the approach misleadingly suggests the same outlook onto the coexistence of languages of the powerless and of the powerful everywhere. However, the history of the world shows languages of the powerless have often been more resilient, or demonstrated more vitality, than those of the powerful. *Pace* Fishman (2003), there is much more ecological complexity and variability that must be factored in on this subject matter, as attempted, for instance, by Pandharipande (2003).

activities of their speakers. It is not true that Native Americans have been shifting from their native vernaculars to those of the European colonists because they have lost pride in their traditions – not any more than the Celts did in giving up their indigenous languages in favor of Vulgar Latin – and later, the Romance languages – or in favor of English. The reasons for these shifts cannot be (so) different from those that led numerous Europeans to give up their heritage languages in favor of the dominant ones in the Americas and Australia.

Since language loss and endangerment have to date not been uniformly catastrophic in different parts of the world, it is relevant to ask whether globalization has been uniform. Why are Native American languages more endangered in North America, where English has been so dominant, than in Latin America? Is there any correlation between this discrepancy and the fact that in the Americas creoles have developed more in former French and English plantation colonies than in Portuguese and Spanish ones? Are the reasons for all these cases of language loss different from those that led to the loss of African languages in the New World?

Like other populations, language shift among Native Americans seems to be an adaptive response to changing socio-economic conditions, under which their heritage languages have been undervalued. Native Americans have recognized the economic value of the European colonial languages supported by the new, global-economy world order. This explanation is also consistent with why indigenous languages in former exploitation colonies of Africa and Asia have been losing grounds not to European colonial languages but to (new) indigenous vernaculars (former *lingua francas*) that are associated with new indigenous urban life, such

as Swahili in much of East Africa, Town Bemba in Zambia, Lingala in parts of the Democratic Republic of Congo and of the Republic of Congo, Wolof in Senegal, Malay in Indonesia and Malaysia, and Hindi in India. Globalization has not affected former exploitation colonies in the same way it has former settlement colonies. Several factors have contributed to making these new indigenous languages more realistic targets than the European colonial ones, for instance, the high rate of illiteracy, the scarcity of jobs requiring command of European languages, the fact that other jobs are accessible with command of an indigenous lingua franca (which is acquired by oral interaction with speakers of the language), and the fact that an inspiring urban culture is also expressed in the same non-European lingua franca. I return to this topic below.

Invoking lack of pride or prestige to account for the loss of minority languages and of the *langues minorées* fails to explain why the Romance languages have evolved from Vulgar Latin (the nonstandard variety) rather than from Classical Latin; why, where Latin prevailed, it was not offset by Ancient Greek, despite the higher prestige of the latter even among the Roman elite; and why Sanskrit is dead, or dying, despite all the prestige it has carried relative to other Indic languages. There are also other ecological factors that we should endeavor to identify, for instance, why part of the western Roman Empire romanized but most of the eastern part did not, despite the extended presence of the Romans in the territory;⁸ or why in

⁸ To be sure, Romanian is an important exception, to which must be added Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, spoken by the Vlah minorities of Albania, Macedonia, and Greece (Friedman 2001). As the names suggest, they are related to Romanian.

parts of the same eastern part of the Roman Empire Arabic managed to impose itself as an important language (at the expense of both Greek and Latin) but nothing like this happened in the western part of the Empire. Answers to such questions should help us understand what ecological factors are particularly conducive to language endangerment and death.

Efforts to revitalize some of the endangered languages have devoted a lot of energy to developing writing systems for them and generating written literature. Noble as they are, most of these endeavors have also confused *revitalization*, which promotes usage of a language in its community, with *preservation*, which does not do more than preserving texts in (and accounts of) a language more or less as museum artifacts. Classical Latin and Ancient Greek, among others, are cited as dead languages, despite the abundant literature that is available in them. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the absence of a writing system has not led to the extinction of nonstandard varieties of the same European languages that have endangered non-European languages, as stigmatized as the nonstandard varieties have been for centuries now.⁹ It is in fact from the contact of many of these varieties among themselves – not of standard varieties – that the new Indo-European vernaculars spoken in European settlement colonies of the Americas and Australia have developed. Such evolutions shows that lack of

⁹ One should remember here that terms such as *patois* and *brogue* used in reference to nonstandard varieties of French and English, respectively – and the former also in reference to Celtic languages in rural France – have had negative connotations, in part because they are generally unwritten. Earlier uses of *jargon*, associated also with some contact language varieties, have similar negative connotations of ‘unintelligible’, ‘meaningless’, or ‘gibberish’.

prestige does not equate with lack of vitality. Likewise, despite numerous predictions of their imminent death, unwritten nonstandard vernaculars such as Gullah and African American Vernacular English have shown a lot of resilience (Mufwene 1994, 1997).¹⁰

4. A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE INTO LANGUAGE BIRTH AND DEATH

4.1. *The recent past*

The correlation of language death with globalization as an economic network of production and consumption interdependencies is partly correct. However, the whole world is not uniformly affected by it, especially when it is conceived of at the scale of multinational corporations that run the economies of the most industrial nations of North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, and some city states such as Singapore and Hong Kong. We should also bear in mind that globalization as explained here can be very local, as in the case of many aspects of American industry, such as food production. It often applies to regional organizations, like the European Union and the Association of South East Asian Nations, in

¹⁰ Since DeCamp (1971) – who repeats a hypothesis already conjectured by Schuchardt (1914) and Bloomfield (1933) – a number of creoles have been assumed to die by a process misidentified as *decreolization* (Mufwene 1994, 2001). However, varieties such as Jamaican Creole (ironically the focus of DeCamp’s own speculation) are not only still thriving but also developing more divergent varieties, such as “Dread Talk” (Pollard 2000). Mufwene (1997) argues that Gullah may be dying for a reason that is independent of “decreolization” qua debasilectalization, viz., the massive exodus of its speakers to the city, where the variety is given up not only because it is stigmatized but also because it is economically useless in the urban environment.

which partners set up privileged trade and/or production relations.

It is mostly at the local level that globalization seems to have exerted the greatest impact on languages, and the impact has been more disastrous to indigenous languages in former settlement than in exploitation colonies. This differential evolution is a reflection of the fact that the European colonists sought to create new Europes outside their metropolises (Crosby 1986), and inherited from them the ideology of nation states ideally unified by one single language. As the European populations became the majority in their new nations, they adopted a dominant or official language for branches of their government, in the emergent global industry, and in the school system. The chosen language gradually penetrated the private domains of citizens' lives to the point where it became almost everybody's vernaculars.

To be sure, the shift from other European languages to the dominant one was not sudden, nor did it affect all populations and their respective members at the same time. The slaves were everywhere the first to lose their ancestral languages, not so much because they were forbidden to speak them or were always put in situations so multilingual that they could not do so, but because of the way the plantation societies developed from earlier homesteads. As explained by Chaudenson (1992, 2001), the latter, farm-size dwellings, in which the slaves were the minority and well-integrated in family units did not favor the retention of African languages. The main reason for this outcome of language competition is that their creole children in these settings learned to speak the colonial European languages rather than their African parents'. Creole children were mixed and looked after together, regardless of race,

while all healthy the adults also worked together to develop the colonial economic infrastructure. Moreover, the African-born slaves did typically not form a critical mass to continue speaking their languages among themselves, if they were lucky enough to wind up with somebody else who spoke the same language in the same or a neighboring homestead.

As some of the homesteads grew into large plantations, in which African-born slaves would gradually become the majority, the creole and, later, the seasoned slaves speaking modified varieties of the colonial languages (be they creoles or other nonstandard varieties) became the linguistic models, just like city-born children in Africa have been the models for rural-born children. This ethnographic state of affairs played a central role in favoring language shift, and therefore loss, in the settlement colonies. By the founder principle, the newcomers simply found it more practical to learn the vernacular spoken by the slaves who preceded them, even if they were lucky enough to find somebody with whom they could speak a common African language in private. The same founder principle accounts for language shift and loss among post-Abolition indentured laborers from Africa and Asia who gradually assimilated to the creole ex-slaves. Neither their initial social isolation nor their relative ethnolinguistic homogeneity could prevent the change of vernaculars. (See, e.g., Mohan & Zador 1986 and Bhatia 1988 regarding the Indian indentured laborers, Ferreira 1999 regarding the Portuguese, and Warner-Lewis 1996 regarding the Yoruba, all of these cases applying to Trinidad.) In fact, their stigmatization by the Creoles must have exerted more pressure on them for the shift, in addition to the basic necessity to use the local language in order to adapt to the new socio-economic world order.

For the same reason of adaptation to a changing socio-economic ecology, the European populations that spoke languages other than the dominant one gave up their ancestral vernaculars, quite gradually, in a process that would continue until the 20th century. (See, e.g., Haugen 1953 regarding the Scandinavians and Salmons 2003 regarding the Germans). The main reason is that the Europeans, especially those who did not come as indentured servants, were nationally segregated (see, e.g., Fischer 1989). American cities are nowadays not only still segregated into white and black neighborhoods but have also inherited from the pre-World War II names such as Irish, Italian, and German neighborhoods as the legacy of the way Europeans were also segregated among themselves. While they lasted, the maintenance of these national identities and the ability within the relevant communities to run local business in their ancestral vernaculars (Salmons 2003)¹¹ only slowed down the language shift process.

These developments suggest that in losing their indigenous languages Native Americans have followed the evolutionary trajectory already taken by the immigrants to their land, who were developing an economic system that made their indigenous one obsolete. Thus, ecological pressures for survival forced Native Americans to adapt to the new world order, which entailed some command of the local dominant European language in order to earn one's living. The language shift proceeded faster where miscegenation with the newcomers was allowed. It was otherwise made possible by exodus to the city and other places for jobs.

¹¹ Salmons reports that the Germans in Wisconsin owned parochial schools and published newspapers and other literature in their languages until when the readership waned, because more and more of the community members were attracted by the larger, urban American global economy.

Basically language loss among Native Americans has been a concomitant process of Americanization in the sense of departure from their ancestral socio-economic lifestyles to those of the European immigrants.

The fact that fewer Native American languages have vanished in Latin America than in North America suggests that globalization has not proceeded at the same speed in settlement colonies. The differential evolution seems to reflect the kind of economy that the European settlers developed and/or the kind of physical ecological challenges they faced in spreading from the Atlantic coast. For instance, the Amazon forest has been difficult and slow to penetrate, and that is precisely where the highest concentration of Native American languages is to be found today. It is not by accident that deforestation and the immediate impact of this exploitation on the indigenous population have awakened our awareness of language endangerment, on the model of species endangerment in macro-ecology. The deforestation has made it obvious that changes in the habitat and economic activities of a population bear on the vitality of its language and culture as its members adapt to their new lifestyle. More languages have died in North America because changes in its socio-economic ecology have been more advanced and have affected its populations more pervasively. More or less the same explanation applies to the extensive loss of indigenous languages in Australia. The less marginalized the Natives are from the local global economy system, the more likely they are to lose their heritage.

The above explanation does not apply to former exploitation colonies of Africa and Asia, where relatively fewer indigenous languages are threatened and where they are typically

endangered not by the European colonial languages but by other indigenous languages. As a matter of fact, the latter have sometimes stood in the way of the demographic expansion of their European competitors, as in the case of Lingala in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Swahili in Tanzania. There are numerous ecological reasons for this differential development: 1) the European colonizers hardly intended to settle permanently in these continents, although many of them wound up doing so; 2) the European exploitation colony system hardly intended to share its languages with the indigenous populations, preferring to teach them only to an elite class of auxiliaries that would serve as intermediaries between the colonizers and the colonized (see, e.g., Brutt-Griffler 2002a, 2002b); 3) unlike in the earlier cases that produced pidgins (such as in Nigeria, Cameroon, and Papua New Guinea), the European languages were introduced in the exploitation colonies in the 19th century as *lingua francas* based on scholastic inputs rather than as vernaculars naturalistically transmitted outside the school system; 4) despite the higher status they gained from western-style education and the association with the now indigenized varieties of the European colonial languages, most of the elite have not severed their ties with their ancestral traditions – they have continued to use their indigenous languages as their vernaculars and/or as necessary *lingua francas* for communication with their less affluent relatives and with the other members of their ethnic groups.

One must remember that while settlement colonization has gradually reduced – though it has not yet fully eliminated – ethnic identities and languages among populations of the new polities (especially among non-Europeans), exploitation colonization has retained them, thus

preserving the function of most indigenous languages as markers of ethnic identity. Only the city, in Africa at least, has come close to reducing them, acting like sugar cane plantations and rice fields of the Atlantic and Indian Ocean settlement colonies. The gradual obliteration of ethnic boundaries, caused in part by interethnic marriages, has been an important factor in the loss of ethnic languages.¹²

4.2. A dialogue between the recent and distant pasts

Languages have been dying since far back in human history (e.g., Haggège 2000, Mufwene 2001, Thomason 2001). Although linguists have correctly noted that it has proceeded at an unprecedented pace during the last century, they have still not fully explained why languages

¹² Students of “creolization” in Hawaii should remember that sugar cane cultivation did not proceed the same way as in the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean. It involved no slavery, the indentured laborers came at different times from only a handful of ethnic groups (Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Korean, and Philippino), and they were not mixed on the plantations, where they lived in ethnically segregated houses and continued to speak their ancestral languages as vernaculars. Unlike in the other plantation settlement colonies, Hawaiian Creole English developed in the city, where there was more cross-ethnic interaction, and Hawaiian Pidgin English developed concurrently (not before) on the plantations (Roberts 1998). According to Chaudenson (1992, 2001) and Mufwene (2001), plantation settlement colonies elsewhere produced no ecological conditions favorable to the development of Pidgin either prior to or concurrently with the emergence of Creole. It is thus clear why ethnic distinctions and the related languages have survived among descendants of the indentured laborers in Hawaii but not among descendants of slaves in other settlement colonies (Mufwene 2004).

die and what or who kills them. As shown above, language death has not been uniform in different parts of the world either. This may also have been the case in the distant past. It should thus be rewarding to establish a heuristic bridge between the distant and the recent pasts in order to learn what they can tell us about each other. As there is little space left, I will focus briefly on language evolution in the western side of the Roman Empire – about which there is ample information on language evolution – focusing on the Romance countries and the British Isles.

To be sure, the Romans do not seem to have colonized Europe and the rest of the Mediterranean world on the model of recent European exploitation or settlement colonies.¹³ If anything, it seems to have been a combination of both styles, if we take into account the army veterans who retired and became land owners in Gaul, for instance, though the economic exploitation of the colonies suggests more of the exploitation style (Bauer 1996). There is also little evidence that they claimed full nation-wide geographical spaces as their colonies. According to Polomé (1983), the Romans seem to have taken more interest in developing trade and military centers, a practice that leads him more or less to equate the Romanization of these colonies with urbanization. From the point of view of military and administrative domination, they created networks of towns interconnected by good road and

¹³ Trade colonization is not worth considering here, because the structure of the Empire seems to rule it out. The Roman presence in their Empire was permanent, not sporadic. In recent history, trade colonies generally evolved into settlement or exploitation colonies, suggesting that the same evolution must have happened during Roman colonization. (See also Bauer 1996.)

water transportation infrastructures, all ultimately leading to Rome.¹⁴ The Romans formed alliances with local rulers, whom they coaxed to administer their territories in the Roman style, assisted with their technical expertise (including military), and got to work in the economic interest of Rome (Garnsey & Saller 1987). These leaders were taught Classical Latin, their children were sent to Roman schools, they were granted Roman citizenship, and they could compete with the Romans themselves for offices as high as generalship, provincial governorship, and the Roman Senate. Some of them, such as Marcus Ulpius Traianus (born in Spain), Lucius Septimus Severus (born in North Africa), and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Caesar (born in Gaul) even rose to become emperors.¹⁵

Indirect evidence that the Romans did not colonize Europe on the settlement model comes from the fact that they left the Western Empire in the 5th century. However, the local rulers, who had Romanized already kept Latin as the language of their administration, while Vulgar

¹⁴ In a recent, still unpublished manuscript, Robert Chaudenson emphasizes the role of waterways before the invention of trains, planes, and telecommunication, in spreading languages outside their homelands. I return to the significance of geographical interconnectedness in economy below. Indeed, the Roman Empire's economic system instantiates some of the early stages of globalization.

¹⁵ One must realize that Rome was too small to provide all the legionaries needed in the Roman army and the manpower necessary to staff its colonial administration. Latin was spread outside Rome largely by the foreign mercenaries in the Roman legions, just like English is spreading today as a world lingua franca significantly by non-native speakers using and teaching it to others in their respective countries.

Latin continued to be spoken among those who had interacted regularly with the legionaries, whose children with indigenous women took advantage of their knowledge of the colonial language to access important offices. Latin would continue to be used by the missionaries and the intellectual elite, but the linguistic evidence suggests that this standard and scholastic variety had little, if anything at all, to do with the development of the Romance languages.

What is more significant is that Roman colonies were not fully Latinized in the 5th century. When the Romans left, Celtic languages continued to be spoken by the lower classes (the majority), especially in rural areas. According to Polomé (1983), the non-ruling classes were largely multilingual in a Celtic language, Latin, and sometimes also Greek. This explains to some extent why it would take up to the 20th century before the indigenous population of France, for instance, would become fully francophone. The process of language shift was protracted and did not affect all segments of the population at the same time.¹⁶

¹⁶ Bauer (1996:32) argues that Gaulish – her generic term for Celtic language varieties spoken in Gaul – was already extinct by the 7th century, being replaced by nascent Romance vernaculars similar to Provençal and Occitan. A similar view is presented by Lodge (1993). Breton, which was only moribund in the 20th century, was brought to France from England, around the 5th century. It is not clear why its fate would have been different from that of the indigenous Celtic languages. Thus, the term *patois* often used in the history of France in reference to varieties considered unintelligible, chiefly to Parisians, must have applied to many such rural Romance varieties. Regardless of whether the Celtic languages had died by the 7th century, their death was gradual and the evolution of French into its present-day form even more protracted. Latin was acquired by the masses of the population after

The fact that no Romance language developed at all in England – although Latin continued to be used there until the 18th century by the missionaries, by the intellectual elite, and in the Hanseatic trade – not only confirms the above hypothesis but also confirms indirectly that the real shift to Latin as a vernacular for the masses of the populations in today's Romance countries took place only after the Romans had left. The challenge is to articulate the specific post-Roman socio-economic dynamics that permitted the spread of Latin within the larger and overwhelming majority of population of commoners, the role of the growing number of towns and schools (noted by Bauer 1996 and Woolf 1998) notwithstanding. The protracted development of the Romance languages under the substrate influence of the Celtic languages is correlated with the gradual loss of the latter, as fewer and fewer children found it useful to acquire the Celtic languages and learned instead the derivatives of Latin now identified as Romance languages. Today the Celtic and other more indigenous languages similar to Basque formerly spoken in the same territories have vanished. If we wish to learn more about language vitality, more specifically how some languages die and some others survive, then it would help to figure out the particular socio-economic conditions that have helped Basque.

We could also now look into why England, whose native populations during the Roman rule were also Celtic, have Anglicized (i.e., Germanicized) instead. If the use of Latin during the Roman rule proceeded the same way in England as it did in continental Europe, then it

the Romans had left.

is justified to assume that the Germanic colonizers (Jutes, Angles, and Saxons) who replaced the Romans used their non-indigenous languages in their military and political institutions. It is at the same time difficult to avoid asking, for the sake of comparison, why Iberia and Gaul continued to Romanize despite the later colonization of the former by the Arabs from the 7th to the 15th centuries and that of the latter by the Franks from the 5th to the 9th centuries.

Space limitations prevent me from addressing this question and other related ones in detail here. Suffice it to note, however, that they underscore the need to distinguish between different colonization styles and the different ways in which the colonizers/colonists interacted with the indigenous populations. It now seems necessary to also distinguish between different styles of settlement colonization. After all, the Franks did settle in Gaul et eventually mixed with the Celtic populations. Could it be that the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons had less respect for the Roman legacy than the Franks did, as suggested by Lodge (1993) and Bauer (1996)? The fact that fewer than a handful of their indigenous languages (notably Welsh and Irish) are still spoken today confirms the hypothesis that the insular Celts have Germanicized culturally and linguistically. The linguistic evidence suggests that the gradual shift must have taken place mostly after the languages of the Germanic colonizers mixed to produce Old English (see, e.g., Vennemann 2001, 2002), which would ultimately evolve into modern English. On the other hand, the Franks gave up their Germanic traditions, embracing the language and religion of the indigenous rulers, Latin and Catholicism. More questions arise now than I can answer about these differences in the ways that the Germanics colonized the Celts west and east of the Channel. It is even less clear whether the Arabs colonized Iberia on the model of the

Franks or simply applied exploitation colonization. Future scholarship should address such questions in order for linguistics to be better informed about the ecology of language death.

The above cases also show that language birth and death often proceed concurrently, though the balance sheet in almost all these territories seems to have worked at the expense of the indigenous languages. This conclusion is plausible, especially when one does not factor in the fact that the languages that prevailed have evolved into several varieties and we know nothing about their future.¹⁷ The histories of England, France, and Iberia also show that the colonizers/colonists are not always successful in imposing their languages. Like the colonization of Gaul by the Franks, the colonization of England by the Norse, the Danes, and the Norman French did not produce language shifts of any consequence in the history of this territory, except that the Anglicization of the Normans (Lüdtke 1995) led to the development of a standard English, which is largely influenced by French – though the influence of Latin as a scholarly language cannot be overlooked either. No German is spoken as a vernacular in France outside Alsace, and no Arabic is spoken as a vernacular in Spain or Portugal today. And yet, Arabic is today the vernacular of North Africa, which was also colonized by the Arabs in the 7th century. Does this mean that the Arabs applied different colonization styles in different parts of the world, thus perhaps applying a Roman-to-Frankish kind of

¹⁷ At the world-wide scale we have no idea whether 1,000 years from today the different varieties of English, for instance, will still be considered the same language. The fact that some of them have already been disfranchised as “indigenized” raises the question of whether some day they may not be considered separate languages altogether in the same way that creoles already are.

exploitation colonization in Iberia, settlement colonization in North Africa, and some sort of trade colonization in South and East Asia? The linguistic consequences of Arabic colonization are clearly different in these different parts of the world, with Arabic functioning mostly as a religious language east of the Middle East.

5. BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

It is difficult to summarize this essay at this point without leaving out a number of other important considerations that are relevant to its subject matter. I use this section to survey some of them, connecting them indirectly to the above discussions. As noted in Mufwene (2001), there are some parallelisms between, on the one hand, language evolution in England since the Germanic colonization and, on the other, language evolution in North America since the European colonization. In both cases the invaders came to settle new homes (Crosby 1986). Oversimplifying things somewhat, note that in England the languages of the Germanics koinéized into a new variety now called English and gradually displaced the indigenous Celtic languages. In North America, as in other recent settlement colonies, the varieties brought from the major colonial metropole likewise koinéized into new colonial varieties and prevailed over the languages both of other European nations and of the indigenous populations. The Celtic languages have died as gradually as the Native American languages are dying now, regardless of the difference in speed.

There also appear to be some similarities between, on the one hand, former European exploitation colonies of Asia and Africa and, on the other, Southwestern Europe as a former constellation of Roman colonies. The most significant of these similarities may be the fact that

in both cases the language of the former colonizer has (initially) been retained after independence as the language for the ethnographically high functions of their societies. Thus arises the following question: Are the indigenized varieties of European languages likely to displace the indigenous languages in the same way as the indigenization of Latin has in the now Romance countries?

This is really an open question, as a great deal depends on how the economies of the former exploitation colonies fare and how the masses of the population are engaged in them. An evolutionary path similar to that of the Romance countries seems possible in economically successful, though small, polities such as Singapore, where political leaders have promoted English as the main language for the overall population. On the other hand, one cannot ignore the different language evolution course followed by another successful city state, Hong Kong, where usage of English in the white collar sector of the economy has had no negative impact on Cantonese. The demographic dominance of the Cantonese in Hong Kong, facilitated by the geographical proximity of Canton, makes this city an endogenous contact setting more favorable to the retention of its major indigenous language. Although the Chinese are an overwhelming majority in Singapore, they speak several Chinese varieties that are not necessarily mutually intelligible, and they are surrounded by Malay-speaking countries, a situation that makes the city an exogenous contact setting more likely to thrive with a colonial language. Unfortunately theories of evolution are not about predicting the future and only the future will rule on these speculations.

For the vast majority of former exploitation colonies, one important factor bearing on the

fate of the European languages is the concurrent development of indigenous *lingua francas* which function also as urban vernaculars of the overwhelming proletarian majorities. In kind, these nations share this particular evolutionary trajectory with former plantation settlement colonies, which were indeed ruled like exploitation colonies after the abolition of slavery and where creoles are also the primary vernaculars of their proletarian majorities. To the extent that creoles are considered separate languages by linguists, the economies of all these places have functioned in more than one language: the indigenized/local standard variety of the European language for the white collar sector of the economy and an indigenous *lingua franca* or some variety of Creole (mesolectal or basilectal) for the other sectors of the economy. With the unemployment rate quite high and most of the available jobs limited to the non-white collar sector, most of the populations have had no incentive for speaking the European language, even if they learned it at school. The elite continue to speak some variety of Creole – as is obvious in Haiti (Dejean 1993) and in Jamaica (Mufwene 2003) – or any of the indigenous languages in order to remain in touch with less fortunate members of their societies.¹⁸ There is thus an ethnographic division of labor that does not make European

¹⁸ It is debatable whether the linguistic situation is that different in European countries and former settlement colonies where non-creole varieties of European languages have prevailed. Acrolectal varieties are used in the white collar sector of the economy, whereas other varieties, including basilectal ones, are used in the other sectors. These nonstandard varieties are not endangered by their acrolectal counterparts. The few, like the Ocracoke Brogue, that are in this predicament are affected by neighboring nonstandard varieties (Wolfram & Schilling Estes 1995). Conservative, rural varieties

languages a threat to indigenous ones. However, in the same way that, thanks to the urban lifestyle associated with it, the then indigenizing Vulgar Latin of today's Romance countries was attractive to rural populations, the urban vernaculars are attractive to rural African populations in particular. (See also Pandharipande 2003 for a similar situation in India). Although one can argue that the prestige of urban lifestyle is having a negative impact on rural lifestyle, the notion of prestige itself, which has often been invoked as an important factor in language attrition, needs to be reconsidered in rather complex relative terms. One would otherwise have expected European colonial languages to have given a fatal blow to the relevant indigenous vernaculars.

Although there are undoubtedly several African and Asian languages that are endangered, it is not evident that language attrition is proceeding as fast in Africa and Asia as in Europe and its former settlement colonies. Predictions of the imminent extinction of non-European languages around the world as if the process were uniform everywhere certainly need to be framed in a perspective that reflects the complexity of the present state of competition and selection among the world's languages.

We must also reassess the adequacy of terms such as *language war*, *linguicide*, and *killer language* in our academic discourse. They seem to be worse misnomers than the terms

of African-American English (including Gullah) are influenced more by urban varieties of the same language than by white vernaculars (Wolfram & Thomas 2002; Bailey & Cukor-Avila 2005; Mufwene 1997). Generally, non-European languages in former settlement colonies may also be said to have been endangered by non-standard vernaculars rather than by the standard varieties of the same languages.

competition and *selection* which I prefer. The latter two terms have to do with values that speakers as the immediate ecology of linguistic species (Mufwene 2001, 2003) assign to the languages from among which they select those that they consider the more/most useful to their lives. A major problem with the former terms is that they overshadow the agency of speakers as those who actually select and give up particular languages (although they are not necessarily aware of their acts), allowing some to thrive and dooming others to extinction.

Languages do not engage in wars either, though they co-exist in competition – like biological species. As a matter of fact, languages are more endangered when population speaking them interact peacefully with each other. As noted above, cases of language extinction associated with genocide remain a very small minority in the history of mankind. Moreover, in the competition that involves languages, populations rarely engage in the activities that endanger some languages in a concerted way, certainly not like sport teams that anticipate some outcomes. Language endangerment is the cumulative outcome of individual practices of speakers, though communal patterns emerge from the ways their individual acts affect the vitality of their languages. This is precisely why language attrition and death are such protracted processes. They proceed in non-uniform ways in the relevant communities.

There is one last thing that we certainly can learn from language endangerment in England and the Romance countries. It has everything to do with colonization and globalization, with the former interpreted as the political and economic domination of a population by another and the latter interpreted as an economic network of production and consumption interdependencies. The two seem to go hand in hand but not in the same ways everywhere.

Globalization proceeds faster and is more complex in the more recent than in the more distant cases of colonization, and is faster and more pervasive in settlement than in exploitation and trade colonies. Globalization cannot be confused with McDonaldization as the world-wide distribution of McDonald and other fast food stores as symbols of American lifestyle. McDonaldization, which is similar to the French terms *mondialisation* ‘universalization’, is made possible by globalization, but not the other way around. Moreover, as noted above, globalization is often local or regional. The smaller number of American fast food stores and the shift of socio-economic status associated with them in some former exploitation colonies, where one can be invited to a McDonald store for a good dinner, is also an indication of the non-uniform way in which globalization has proceeded. It has created economic inequities among nations of the world (Stiglitz 2002, Blommaert 2003, Faraclas 2001), and those inequities seem to be correlated with the uneven way in which language endangerment is proceeding.

I assume that primitive forms of colonization and globalization must have started with the domination of hunter-gatherers by agriculturalists (see also Harmon 2002) and that these processes had already become more complex by the time the capitalist system had evolved in Europe, producing nation states associated typically with single national languages and leading to the European colonization of the past half-millennium. While political colonization is no longer in style, economic colonization has become more insidious and globalization much more complex, affecting former exploitation colonies differently from Europe and its former settlement colonies. From the point of view of language endangerment, the settlement

colonies are almost replicating the experience of Europe, where only 3 % of the world languages are spoken today (Mayor & Bindé 2001). We have no clear picture of how language shift will proceed in most former exploitation colonies. However costly language endangerment is to typological research in linguistics, we cannot forget the fact the speakers shift languages as part of their adaptive responses to changing socio-economic conditions (see also Pandharipande 2003).

Linguists concerned with rights of languages must ask themselves whether these prevail over the right of speakers to adapt competitively to their new socio-economic ecologies. Advocates of the revitalization of endangered languages must tell us whether the enterprise is possible without restoring the previous socio-economic ecologies that had sustained them. Like cultures, languages are dynamic, complex adaptive systems that cannot be considered independent of the adaptive needs of their speakers. In fact they are constantly being shaped by those who speak them, precisely what the indigenization of European languages illustrates. It's certainly not outrageous to counter the current practice in linguistics by claiming that, like features that are associated with them, languages and cultures at any given point in time are commodities with "market values" – "linguistic capitals" according to Bourdieu (1991) – which are subject to competition and selection. Speakers decide what is useful to them, and they determine history relative to their current needs without any foresight. Such has been history in population genetics, and such it is among humans, despite our consciousness of it. It is much easier to intervene in what involves our surroundings than in what involves ourselves in our spontaneous behavior.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Cécile Vigouroux for various useful editorial comments on a preliminary draft of this essay.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, Charles-James N. & K. Maroldt 1977. The French lineage of English. In *Pidgins - creoles - languages in contact*, ed. Jurgen M. Meisel, 21-53. Tübingen: Narr.
- Bailey, Guy & Patricia Cukor-Avila. 2005. *The development of African-American vernacular English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Brigitte L.M. 1996. Language loss in Gaul: Socio-historical and linguistic factors in language conflict. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 15.23-44.
- Bhatia, Tej K. 1988. Trinidad Hindi: Its genesis and generational profile. In *Language transplanted: The development of overseas Hindi*, ed. Richard K. Barz, Jeff Siegel, 179-196. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7.173-221.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2003. A sociolinguistics of globalization. Commentary. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7:607-623.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Brenzinger, Matthias, ed. 1992. *Language death: Factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brenzinger, Matthias, ed. 1998. *Endangered languages in Africa*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köper Verlag.
- Brutt-Griffler, Janina. 2002a. *World English: A study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Brutt-Griffler, Janina. 2002b. Class, ethnicity, and language rights: An analysis of British colonial policy in Lesotho and Sri Lanka and some implications for language policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 1:207-234.
- Cantoni, Gina, ed. 1997. *Stabilizing indigenous languages*. Northern Arizona University: Center for Excellence in Education.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1992. *Des îles, des hommes, des langues: essais sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2001. *Creolization of language and culture*. London: Routledge.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2003. *La créolisation: théorie, applications, implications*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crosby, Alfred W. 1986. *Ecological imperialism: The biological expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2000. *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dalby, Andrew. 2002. *Language in danger*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- DeCamp, David. 1971. Toward a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum. In *Pidginization and creolization of language*, ed. Dell Hymes, 349-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dejean, Yves. 1993. An overview of the language situation in Haiti. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 102:73-83.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1997. *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1981. *Language death: The language cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dorian, Nancy, ed. 1989. *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faraclas, Nicholas. 2001. Globalization and the future of pidgin and creole languages. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics. The University of Coimbra, Portugal.
- Ferreira, Jo-Anne Sharon. 1999. *The Portuguese language in Trinidad and Tobago: A study of language shift and language death*. Doctoral thesis, the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad.
- Fischer, David Hackett. 1989. *Albion's seed: Four British folkways in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations*

of assistance to threatened languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, Joshua A. 2003. Endangered minority languages: Prospects for sociolinguistic research. *MOST Journal of Multicultural Societies* 4. (no consecutive pagination)

Friedman, Victor A. 2001. The Vlah minority in Macedonia: language, identity, and standardization. In *Selected papers in Slavic, Balkan, and Balkan studies (Slavica Helsingiensia 21)*, ed. by Juhani Nuoluoto, Marti Leiwo, and Jussi Halla-aho, 26-50. University of Helsinki.

Garnsey, Peter & Richard Saller. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, society, and culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grenoble, Lenore A. & Lindsay J. Whaley, eds. 1998. *Endangered languages: Current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hagège, Claude. 1992. *Le souffle de la langue*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Hagège, Claude. 2000. *Halte à la mort des langues*. Paris: Editions Odile Jacob.

Harmon, David. 1996. Losing species, losing languages, connections between biological and linguistic. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 15.89–108.

Harmon, David. 2002. *In light of our differences: How diversity in nature and culture makes us human*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hazaël-Massieux, Marie-Christine. 1999. *Les créoles: l'indispensable survie*. Paris: Editions Entente.

- Hinton, Leanne & Ken Hale, eds. 2001. *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Joseph, Brian et al, 2003. *When languages collide: Perspectives on language conflict, language competition, and language coexistence*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Kallen, Jeffrey, ed. 1997. *Focus on Ireland*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lodge, R. Anthony. 1993. *French: From dialect to standard*. London: Routledge.
- Lüdtke, Helmut. 1995. On the origin of Middle and Modern English. In *Linguistic change under contact conditions*, ed. Jacek Fisiak, 51-54. Berlin: Mouton.
- Maffi, Luisa, ed. 2001. *On biocultural diversity: Linking language, knowledge, and the environment*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Maurais, Jacques & Michael A. Morris, eds. 2003. *Languages in a globalizing world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayor, Federico & Jérôme Bindé. 2001. *The world ahead: Our future in the making*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing; London and New York: Zed Books.
- Mohan, Peggy & Zador, Paul. 1986. Discontinuity in a life cycle: The death of Trinidad Bhojpuri. *Language* 62:291-320.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1994. On decreolization: The case of Gullah. In *Language and the social construction of identity in creole situations*, ed. Marcyliena Morgan, 63-99. Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1997. The ecology of Gullah's survival. *American Speech* 72:69-83.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2003. Colonization, globalization, and the future of languages in the twenty-first century. *MOST Journal of Multicultural Societies* 4 (no consecutive pagination)

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2004. Multilingualism in linguistic history: Creolization and indigenization. In *Handbook of bilingualism*, ed. Tej Bhatia and William Ritchie. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1996. *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region*. London: Routledge.

Nettle, Daniel et Suzanne Romaine 2000. *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pandharipande, Rejeshwari. 2003. Minority matters: Issues in minority languages in India. *MOST Journal of Multicultural Societies* 4 (no consecutive pagination)

Phillipson, Robert. 2003. *English only? Challenging language policy*. London: Routledge.

Pollard, Velma. 2000. *Dread Talk: The language of Rastafari*. Mona, Jamaica: The University of the West Indies Press.

Polomé, Edgar C. 1983. The linguistic situation in western provinces of the Roman Empire. *Principat* 29:509-553.

Reyhner, Jon et al. 1999. Revitalizing indigenous languages. Northern Arizona University: Center for Excellence in Education.

Roberts, Sarah Julianne. 1998. The role of diffusion in the genesis of Hawaiian Creole.

Language 74:1-39.

- Robins, R.H. & E.M. Uhlenbeck, eds. 1991. *Endangered languages*. Oxford: Berg.
- Salmons, Joseph. 2003. The shift from German to English, World War I and the German-language press in Wisconsin. In *Menschen zwischen zwei Welten: Auswanderung, Ansiedlung, Akkulturation*, ed. Walter G. Rädcl & Helmut Schmahl, 179-193. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte. 1977. L'origine des langues romanes: un cas de créolisation ? In *Langues en contact — pidgins — creoles — Languages in contact*, ed. Jürgen Meisel, 81-101. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1914. *Die Sprache der Saramakkaneger in Surinam*. Amsterdam: Johannes Muller.
- Skutnab-Kangas, Tove. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education – or world-wide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2002. *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Swaan, Abram de. 2001. *Words of the world: The global language system*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Szulmajster-Celnikier, Anne 2000. Un regard particulier sur le yidiche, l'ivrit et l'esperanto. *Cahiers Bernard Lazare* 204:15-19.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and*

- genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vennemann, Theo. 2001. Atlantis Semitica: Structural contact features in Celtic and English. In *Historical linguistics 1999: Selected papers from the 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, 9-13 August 1999*, ed. by Laurel Brinton, 351-369. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vennemann, Theo. 2002. On the rise of “Celtic” syntax in Middle English. In *Middle English from tongue to text: Selected papers from the Third International Conference on Middle English*, ed. by Peter J. Lucas & Angela M. Lucas, 203-234. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Warner-Lewis, Maureen. 1996. *Trinidad Yoruba: From mother tongue to memory*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Winford, Donald. 2003. *Introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wolfram, Walt & Natalie Schilling-Estes. 1995. Moribund dialects and the endangerment canon: The case of the Ocracoke Brogue. *Language* 71:696-721.
- Wolfram, Walt & Erik R. Thomas. 2002. *The development of African-American English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Woolf, Greg. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The origins of provincial civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.