grammar, it is reported that the 2nd person pronoun is optional in imperatives. Van Driem describes adhortatives, but they are merely identical to nonpreterite inclusive forms, while the optative is formed by a special suffix. Other moods are formed by clause-final particles. Nonfinite forms in Dumi (other than the gerund and nominalizer, the latter described in chapter 6) are the infinitive, the supine, and the active participle. Unfortunately little detail is given as to what predicate types require one or the other of such forms, although the numerous examples give a hint.

The grammar concludes with the texts, an 80-page glossary, and a small number of photographs. The mythical texts are quite lengthy, but the conversations are extremely short and would probably not be very useful for discourse analysts. The glossary provides more examples and also describes the stem forms of verbs of the various conjugation classes.

The strengths of the grammatical description are the detailed and lucid morphological analyses and the detailed discussion of the semantics of tense, aspect, and Aktionsart. What I missed the most from the grammar was a discussion of syntactic structure, in particular predicate-argument structure, complex sentence structures, and discourse-related phenomena (such as topicalization, focus, the pragmatics of word order, etc.). Examination of the long-glossed mythical texts will give some suggestion of the syntax of Dumi, but the reader can probably only glean of hint of what van Driem could offer us. Finally, there is one important positive feature of the grammar that may be overlooked by the grammarian: the ethnographic description in the first chapter, the myths, the photos, and many anecdotes scattered through the text give us a vivid impression of the people who speak this language, thereby giving us a reminder that a language is not just an abstract grammatical system.
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Tom Dutton and Darrell T. Tryon, editors: Language Contact and Change in the Austronesian World. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs
Ever since the publication of Einar Haugen’s (1950), Uriel Weinreich’s (1953), and Michael Clyne’s (1967, 1972) seminal contributions to the field, the study of language contact has become an area of increasing attention within linguistics. The phenomenon of language contact can be studied everywhere, of course. However, there are certain areas that seem to be of particular interest for research in “contact linguistics” (Meeuwis and Østman 1995). One of these areas covers Island Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Most of the peoples living in this area speak languages that belong to the Austronesian language family — the most widespread and largest language family in the world, containing approximately one-quarter of the world’s languages.

As Dutton and Tryon (ix, x) point out in their introduction to the volume under review here, this “Austronesian area” — which reaches from Madagascar to Rapanui (Easter Island) and from Hawaii to New Zealand — is of particular interest for linguists interested in language contact and change because of the following reasons:

- First of all, the Austronesian area is linguistically one of the most diverse areas in the world in terms of numbers of languages spoken per head of population.
- Second, people in this area generally speak more than one language; they have developed extensive trading systems that bring them in contact with other (types of ) languages spoken in many different speech communities; moreover, numerous movements of populations imply much contact with speakers of other languages.
- Third, in this area we find contact between almost every combination of types and subtypes of languages: Austronesian with Austronesian, Austronesian with non-Austronesian (Papuan), and Austronesian with European.

The 21 contributions to the volume under review cover phenomena that can be observed in contact situations that encompass all these possible combinations of types and subtypes of languages spoken in the area. The well-documented case studies provide the reader with a broad variety of extremely interesting data and thus may finally help accelerate theoretical developments in the field of contact linguistics.

After a table of contents, a list of contributors, and the editors’ rather brief introduction, the volume starts with Alexander Adelaar’s discussion of “The classification of Tamanic languages” (pp. 1–42). These languages (Embaloh, Kalis, Taman) are spoken in the northeast part of West Kalimantan (on Borneo). Adelaar shows that because of shared innova-
tions in the phonology, in the lexicon, and in the pronominal system, the Tamanic languages, together with the South Sulawesi languages, form a separate subgroup within the West-Malayo-Polynesian language group. His evidence, based on an in-depth comparison of these languages, convincingly contradicts Nothofer’s and Blust’s inclusion of Tamanic in the Malayic subgroup. Adelaar points out that cultural-historical inferences on the Tamanic–South Sulawesi relationship and on the origins of the Tamanic and South Sulawesi peoples that go beyond the hypotheses he presents in this paper cannot be made without the cooperation of linguists with anthropologists and prehistorians. Adelaar’s paper is an excellent illustration of the usefulness of comparative-historical approaches for answering specific questions in the field of contact linguistics.

After this discussion of Indonesian languages, Robert Bugenhagen reports on results of the contact situation between an Austronesian (Mangap-Mbula) and a Papuan (Kovai) language in his paper, “Language change on Umboi Island” (pp. 43–108). Because of Mangap-Mbula’s contact with Kovai and processes of lexical borrowing, Bugenhagen can illustrate changes in the phonology, syntax, and lexicon of Mangap-Mbula; Kovai, on the other hand, has absorbed many Austronesian items in its lexicon; moreover, its noun phrase structure has been greatly assimilated to that of Mangap-Mbula.

Contact between Polynesian and Melanesian languages is the topic of Ross Clark’s paper on “The Polynesian Outliers as a locus of language change” (pp. 109–139). Clark documents that although some of the more isolated Outliers are relatively unaffected by non-Polynesian languages, six languages (Rennell, Pileni, Emae, Mele-Fila, Futuna, Fagauvea) show strong influence by Melanesian languages. Clark illustrates that in the cases of Mele-Fila and Emae this influence affects every aspect of the linguistic structure of these languages. With non-Polynesian languages, on the other hand, we find only a small body of culturally relevant lexical loans. Clark explains this asymmetry with the high incidence of out-marriage within the Outlier communities. Because of this fact, many children in these Polynesian-speaking communities were reared by mothers whose first language was non-Polynesian (p. 121).

Adrian Clynes’s paper on “Old Javanese influence in Balinese: Balinese speech styles” (pp. 141–179) comes back to the discussion of contact phenomena between two Indonesian languages. In this seminal paper Clynes shows that contrary to common assumptions speech styles in Balinese derive from the complex style system in spoken fifteenth-century Javanese. With this finding Clynes confirms the hypothesis that because of the marked differences between spoken and written Old Javanese, a state of diglossia prevailed in the fifteenth century. Moreover, Clynes also
confirms Raffles, who argued in 1817 that "the present state of Bali may be considered . . . as a kind of commentary on the ancient condition of the natives of Java" (p. 175). In his bibliography Clynes lists two of his unpublished manuscripts on this topic; given the quality of this paper one can only hope that these papers will soon be published, too.

With Tom Dutton's paper, "Motu-Koiarian contact in Papua New Guinea" (pp. 181–232), we have another example of contact between an Austronesian and a Papuan language. Dutton illustrates among other things that in the long-term contact between the Motu and the Koita, the Papuan speakers borrowed many expressions that reflect the cultural differences between the two groups. Motu speakers, on the other hand, borrowed only a few expression from Koita, and these loans never superseded Motu words.

"Linguistic evidence for the Tongan Empire" is presented by Paul Geraghty (pp. 233–249). The data Geraghty presents suggest that "Polynesians may have visited parts of Vanuatu and Micronesia . . . and may well have had a more abiding presence in Pohnpei." However, it is unclear what Polynesians made these visits, and there is no evidence for "two-way voyaging from Triangle Polynesia into Southern Oceania." Thus, despite the title of this paper the "question of the Tongan Empire having extended into Vanuatu and Micronesia remains open" (p. 245).

A contact situation that involves Malay/Indonesian with European (Dutch and Portuguese) and non-Austronesian (North Maluku, particularly Ternate) languages is discussed in Barbara Dix-Grimes's paper, "Cloves and nutmeg, traders and wars: language contact in the Spice Islands" (pp. 251–274). Dix-Grimes presents an overview of language contact in central Maluku from the fifteenth century up to the incorporation of the Spice Islands into the Republic of Indonesia. She discusses Ambonese Malay as a case of a "mixed language," coastal Buru as another case of language shift, and language maintenance in central Maluku. Dix-Grimes argues that cultural ideas about language and cultural contexts have to be taken into account if we want to understand why and when language shift occurs in a speech community.

In their paper, "Named speech registers in Austronesian languages" (pp. 275–319), Charles E. Grimes and Kenneth R. Maryott explore a taboo language on Buru Island (Li Garan) and Sangir sea speech (Sasahara), give a brief survey of named codes and registers found throughout the Austronesian world, present some generalizations about the lexicon and syntax of these registers, and discuss the implications of such registers for comparative studies.

Contact between Polynesian and Micronesian languages is the topic of S.P. Harrison's paper, "Linguistic evidence for Polynesian influence in
the Gilbert Islands” (pp. 321–349). He argues that all of the Polynesian influence has been lexical and finishes his contribution with a tentative list of Polynesian loanwords in Gilbertese.

In her paper, “The mechanisms of language change in Labu” (pp. 351–376), Susanne Holzknecht presents evidence that this Melanesian language spoken by the Labu people in the Morobe Province of Papua New Guinea has to be classified as a member of the Lower-Markham subgroup of the Markham (or Adzera) Family. Classifying the language as belonging to the Siassi Family is wrong, because this classification is based on linguistic features that Labu borrowed from its neighboring Melanesian language Bukawa.

Anton M. Moelino discusses phonological, lexical, and syntactic change in his paper on “Contact-induced language change in present day Indonesian” (pp. 377–388). He illustrates that the observed language change is due to the contact of Indonesian with related Malay/Indonesian and with European languages (mainly English and Dutch).

Bernd Nelhofer describes “The relationship between the languages of the Barrier Islands and the Sulawesi-Philippine languages” (pp. 389–409) and presents evidence in support of his hypothesis of a Paleo-Hesperonesian proto-language.

The active and passive role of Manado Malay in processes of language change is discussed by the late Jack Prentice in his paper, “Manado Malay: product and agent of language change” (pp. 411–441).

The contact situation between Negrito and other Philippine languages is the focus of Lawrence A. Reid’s contribution, “Unravelling the linguistic histories of Philippine Negritos” (pp. 443–475). He presents evidence that Negritos must have had relationships with their non-Negrito neighbors for thousands of years.

The results of the early contact between Europeans and Polynesians, especially its impact on the Polynesians’ language and culture, are discussed in Karl Rensch’s paper, “Early European influence on the languages of Polynesia: the Gambier Islands” (pp. 477–495). Rensch differentiates between endogenously and exogenously induced changes that result out of the “need for communication” on the one hand and indirectly induced changes that were brought about by political, economic, or social factors and conditions on the other hand. He especially highlights the role of European missionaries in this contact situation and their responsibility for the devastating consequences this contact had for the Polynesians’ language, culture, and life.

In his article, “Contact-induced phonological complexification in New Caledonia” (pp. 497–522), Jean-Claude Rivierre shows how contact between the Melanesian languages of New Caledonia can accentuate the
spread of innovative phonemes. However, he also shows that the loss of certain phonemes can be rapidly compensated for by borrowing back from more conservative languages. The attention of the paper is focused on the structural conditions in which these phonological changes take place.

Results of contact between a Polynesian outlier (Favauvea) and a Melanesian language (Iaai) are presented in Françoise Ozanne-Rivierre's paper, "Iaai loanwords and phonemic changes in Fagauvea" (pp. 523–549). She illustrates "how a Polynesian language with a small set of phonemes (five vowels and ten consonants) and an open (CV) syllable structure has turned into a language with as many as nine vowels and twenty-seven consonants, and a considerable number of words with a closed (CVC) syllable structure" (p. 524). These changes are due to the contact with Iaai, innovations in Fagauvea itself, and borrowings from other Polynesian languages.

In his paper, "Areal phonological features in north central New Ireland" (pp. 551–572), Malcolm Ross examines a case of contact-induced phonological change on New Ireland. His paper is based on data gathered by former students at the Goroka campus, University of Papua New Guinea. Ross describes a set of shared phonological features that links the languages Kuot, Lamasong, Madak, Nalik, and Kara into what he calls a "phonological alliance" (p. 557), and he claims that this alliance of north central New Ireland languages "is attributable to language shift by erstwhile Papuan speakers to an Austronesian language" (p. 567).

William R. Thurston's paper on "Renovation and innovation in the languages of north-western New Britain" (pp. 573–609) starts with a statement that is central for most of the papers in this anthology. Thurston notes, "The issues surrounding the mechanisms of language change have direct import on principles of language classification and on the subsequent use of those language classifications as an aid in the reconstruction of prehistory." Given this kind of guideline for his research, Thurston first gives a rather personal overview on the theoretical background relevant for the taxonomic study in Austronesian languages, for pidginization hypotheses, and for (other) processes of language change and then discusses morphosyntactic and lexical changes in the languages of north-western New Britain.

Darrell T. Tryon describes "Language contact and contact-induced language change in the Eastern Outer Islands, Solomon Islands" (pp. 611–648). He presents a picture of constant contact and intensive interaction between these Austronesian and Papuan languages that "has produced a largely predictable result in terms of borrowings." However, "its extent and nature in Ayiwo and Santa Cruz is quite remarkable, so
extensive in fact that the status of these languages as Austronesian or Papuan has never been completely determined" (p. 638).

Bert Voorhoeve's contribution on "Contact-induced change in the non-Austronesian languages in the north Moluccas, Indonesia" (pp. 649–674) provides extremely interesting data that challenge assumptions like the resistance of various parts of a language to borrowing. This paper finishes a volume that is of high value especially because it meets the demands for more data on language contact and change.

From the more formal point of view, the anthology is — in general — well edited. There are some minor gaps in the index (Yele is not mentioned, for example, though Tryon himself refers to this language on p. 635), there are only a few typos (e.g. p. vii: read "Orientalische" for "Orientalilsche"; p. 40 and p. 177: read "Verhandelingen" for "Verhandelingen"; p. 144: read "(see section 3.3)" for "(see section 2.3)"; p. 543: read "vocabulary" for "vocabular"; p. 552: read "undergo" for "undergoes"; p. 581: read "3. The languages. . ." for "3. The language. . ."), and it is a pity that the editors do not mention that this volume is (at least in part) the result of a symposium or a conference although some of the contributors explicitly refer to this fact (see pp. 531, 577, 604, 652).

To sum up: Tom Dutton and Darrell Tryon have edited a volume that, especially because of its richness in data, is a must not only for Austronesianists but also for typologists and linguists interested in language change and language contact.
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