



HAL
open science

A typology of small-scale multilingualism

Brigitte Pakendorf, Nina Dobrushina, Olesya Khanina

► **To cite this version:**

Brigitte Pakendorf, Nina Dobrushina, Olesya Khanina. A typology of small-scale multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2021, 25 (4), pp.835-859. 10.1177/13670069211023137. hal-03483495

HAL Id: hal-03483495

<https://hal.univ-lyon2.fr/hal-03483495>

Submitted on 17 Dec 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Brigitte Pakendorf, Nina Dobrushina, and Olesya Khanina (2021): A typology of small-scale multilingualism. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 25/4: 835-859 (Special issue on “Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism” edited by Nina Dobrushina, Olesya Khanina, and Brigitte Pakendorf)

doi/10.1177/13670069211023137

1. Introduction

This special issue is devoted to small-scale multilingualism¹, a linguistic phenomenon that was for a long time overshadowed by studies of urban multilingualism. This has only recently come into the focus of linguists working among small non-European communities (see for example Evans, 2017; François, 2012; Singer & Harris, 2016; and the contributions to a special issue of *Language and Communication* dedicated to “Indigenous Multilingualisms” published in 2018), with highly commendable overviews found in Lüpke (2016), Vaughan & Singer (2018), and Di Carlo et al. (2019). This kind of multilingualism has been given different labels by different authors: in addition to the term chosen here, namely small-scale multilingualism (Lüpke, 2016; Singer & Harris, 2016), we find Indigenous multilingualism and non-polyglossic multilingualism (Vaughan & Singer, 2018), endogenous multilingualism (Di Carlo, 2018), egalitarian multilingualism (François, 2012), and reciprocal (or balanced) multilingualism (Jourdan, 2007, p. 32).

These different terms each highlight different aspects that are considered key elements of this type of multilingualism, namely: it involves situations in which individuals can speak and/or understand numerous Indigenous languages with small numbers of speakers (generally on the order of hundreds or a few thousand), usually with additional competence in erstwhile colonial languages. These Indigenous communities often have egalitarian social structures, both within each community and with respect to other communities. In these situations, there is no “social compartmentalization” (Di Carlo et al., 2019) of the languages, i.e. no system of di- or

¹ This issue resulted from a workshop on the “Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism” held in Lyon in April 2019. We want to express our gratitude to all the presenters for stimulating discussion, the authors for contributing interesting papers that made editing this issue a highly enjoyable experience, and—last, but most certainly not least—the institutions who sponsored the workshop that laid the foundations for this collection: the LabEx ASLAN and the Collegium de Lyon, both from the University of Lyon; the research unit “Dynamique du Langage” of the CNRS and University Lyon 2; and the Linguistic Convergence Laboratory of the HSE University (Russian Federation). The Institute of Linguistics, RAS, Moscow provided organizational assistance, for which we are also grateful. We furthermore want to thank Ad Backus, Patience Epps, Jeff Good, Friederike Lüpke, and Kristine Stenzel for their pertinent comments on a draft version of this paper. Although we were not able to take them all into account for lack of space, they helped us improve this article. Needless to say, any remaining shortcomings are entirely our responsibility.

polyglossia, and none of the languages involved is ideologically ranked above the others; therefore multilingualism tends to be reciprocal (or balanced, symmetric). Nevertheless, asymmetric multilingual situations involving exclusively indigenous languages exist as well (see Section 4), often due to asymmetries in numbers of speakers, but also due to social inequalities.

However, while there are certain features that unite situations of small-scale multilingualism, these should not be considered as constituting “a single homogenous type of language ecology” (Vaughan & Singer, 2018, p. 84; cf. Di Carlo & Good, 2017, p. e257). As will be outlined in some detail in this introductory article and as emerges from the contributions to this issue, individual cases of small-scale multilingualism differ in various social and cultural aspects. For instance, while exogamous marriage rules frequently encourage multilingualism in small communities, endogamous groups can also be multilingual. In some communities, children of linguistically mixed parents are raised with multiple languages, while in others they are expected to learn and speak only their father’s language (the ‘patrilect’). In some areas regional lingua francas are common, but in others they are absent and communication takes place in different local languages. Here, use of multiple languages might index multiple affiliations, while in other parts of the world a particular language is tied to a categorical (often patrilineal) identity. Similarly, the extent to which code-mixing is practised varies widely from strict proscription (at least in theory) to widespread acceptance and a cultural norm of linguistic accommodation. Furthermore, small-scale multilingualism can involve linguistic units at very different levels: from distinct languages belonging to different families to different regional and social lects within one language, and the field of study could even be extended to include different registers.

The increased interest in the domain of small-scale multilingualism has been boosted by the realization of its significance for understanding the factors involved in language maintenance vs. endangerment (Di Carlo & Good, 2017; Lüpke, 2017) as well as the social conditions that favoured linguistic diversity in the pre-colonial world (e.g. Evans, 2017; Lüpke, 2016; Epps 2020). We aim here to provide as geographically and thematically comprehensive an overview as possible, beginning with the keystone of this type of language ecology, namely the ideologies that underlie it (Section 2). In Section 3 we describe the various sources for this kind of multilingualism, and in Section 4 we discuss to what extent situations of small-scale multilingualism are truly egalitarian and symmetric. Section 5 presents a survey of the different methods used in the study of this domain, and Section 6 concludes the paper. Many topics we can here only touch upon briefly are elaborated in the contributions to this issue.

2. Ideologies of small-scale multilingualism

Language ideologies are ideas, or sets of beliefs, shared by the members of a community concerning language, its uses, and its role in their social world (Kroskrity, 2000; Rumsey, 1990; Silverstein, 1979; Woolard, 1998). In the case of multilingual settings, these ideas are by definition not about a single language, but about several languages. “[T]he centrality of linguistic ideologies for creating languages and groups and their boundaries, and for conceptualizing their interaction” (Lüpke 2016, p. 45) place them at the very heart of research on multilingualism. So, the notions introduced in this section provide a framework for our approach to small-scale multilingualism and will be referred to in the rest of the paper.

As noted by Michael (2011, p. 135), language ideology is a very recent field of inquiry in linguistics (the earliest reference being Silverstein, 1979), and even more so as applied to small-scale multilingualism, itself a new research area. Woolard (1998, p. 16) lists the following dimensions of language ideology: “ideas of what counts as a language and, underlying this, the very notion that there *are* distinctly identifiable languages, objects that can be ‘had’ — isolated, named, counted, and fetishized; values associated with particular language varieties by community members; assumptions that identity and allegiance are indexed by language use”. However, this list turns out to be non-exhaustive, and some recent papers on small-scale multilingualism, including many contributions to this special issue, suggest one more important issue stemming directly from the domain in focus, namely how language ideologies contribute to the maintenance of multilingualism.

2.1. Explicit language ideologies

Two types of language ideologies can be distinguished: explicit ideologies, understood as peoples’ overt opinions about the languages around them, and implicit ideologies, understood as covert systems of beliefs governing language use.

Explicit ideologies are statements and explanations proposed by people about their own language repertoires and behavior or those of others, e.g. who can and cannot use which local languages. They can also be statements about expected, or ‘correct’, language behavior (e.g. which languages should be used in a marriage where the spouses have different linguistic backgrounds, see Section 3.1), and even about ‘correct’ language repertoires (e.g. languages that one is supposed to understand only, but never speak, following the linguistic loyalty principle, see Chernela, 2013; Singer, 2018; Stenzel & Williams, in revision; Vaughan & Singer, 2018). They can be instantiated in ancestor stories, creation myths, metaphors, or in the

value communities attach to one's patrilect as opposed to all other languages of the repertoire. The notion of patrilect is indeed a good example of an explicit ideology, since various languages across the globe use completely different terms to describe one's competence in this vs. other languages. For instance, in the Cape York Peninsula of Northern Australia, "[t]he language associated with the father's clan is regarded as one's own language, while other languages are only used (or 'mocked' rather than 'talked', as this used to be called in Cape York Creole [...]) and not owned" (Verstraete & Rigsby, 2015, p. 11). In the Piraparaná region of the Upper Rio Negro, people "speak" their patrilect but only "imitate" other languages (Gomez-Imbert, 1991, p. 543). Among the Tariana on the Vaupés, those who have shifted to Tukano and who have thus "'lost' their father's language are referred to as 'those who speak a borrowed language'" (Aikhenvald, 2003, p. 5; see also Chernela, 2013).

Another well-known example of an explicit ideology is the strong connection between land and language in Australia, seen in prescriptions about which language should be spoken where, or in a requirement to know the toponyms and names for flora and fauna in the languages of the particular places where they are found (cf. Merlan, 1981, for Arnhem Land; Rumsey, 2018, for Kimberley; and Sutton, 1978, for Cape York; and the similar link reported for the Morehead region of New Guinea (Döhler, 2019, p. 34)). Languages can also be associated with territories in other ways, e.g. Lüpke (2018; this issue) describes the Casamance association of so-called 'patrimonial' languages with places that goes back to founding events in which the ancestors are seen as a linguistically homogeneous group lending a place its linguistic identity.

Yet another example of an explicit ideology, also from Australia, is language ownership (cf. among others, Evans, 2010; Sutton, 1997), understood along the following lines: "those who own a language, through their father and his father, have the most authority to speak about that language" (Singer, 2018, p. 112). According to Ball (2011), cases from the Upper Xingu in Amazonia show that language can be talked about as an inalienable property: it is even marked by specific possessive morphology in one of the languages, Wauja, but conceptually this is true for all the languages of the area.

Explicit ideologies can also concern the attitudes of speakers to languages of the others, often in aesthetic terms, via the iconization of languages to social groups (see Irvine & Gal, 2000). In non-hierarchical societies, multilingual individuals often find all local languages equally appealing, "separate but equal" in Jackson's (1983, p. 174) words (for specific examples see, among others, Khanina, this issue, or Stenzel, 2005). As will be outlined in more detail in Section 4, attitudes are also involved in the ideologically constructed symmetry of relations in a multilingual setting.

2.2. Implicit language ideologies

Among other things, implicit ideologies govern the demarcation of speech modes into reified units, and they are also responsible for individuals' choices between the codes of these units in actual language use (and for the possibilities of their mixing; e.g. see Di Carlo et al; Khachaturyan & Konoshenko; Li; Lüpke; Vydrina, all this issue). These functions are particularly relevant in multilingual communities.

The existence of implicit ideologies can also be seen in contradictions between observed language use and explicit ideologies, abundant in the literature on small-scale multilingual societies (see also Lüpke, 2016, p. 45; Goodchild & Weidl, 2019). Various cases of individuals speaking a language of which they have explicitly denied proficiency have been reported, e.g. Chernela (2013, p. 225), Silva (2020), and Stenzel & Khoo (2016, p. 76) for the Upper Rio Negro, Campbell & Grondona (2010, p. 623) for Misión La Paz in Argentina, and Vydrina as well as Khachaturyan & Konoshenko (both this issue) for Guinea. Döhler (2019, p. 35) describes a community in the Morehead region of New Guinea where all members are expected to speak exclusively Komnzo, but “this is often violated and virtually everybody grows up in a multilingual context”. Epps & Stenzel (2013) describe the East Tukano model of exogamous marriages in the Upper Rio Negro: men cannot marry women speaking the same language as themselves, but this ‘speaking’ refers to language affiliation inherited through the male line, and not necessarily to actual practice, meaning that in reality the spouses can have language competence in the same language(s). It is a separate research question what actually motivates matches and mismatches between explicit ideologies and linguistic behavior.

2.3. Reification of languages and language communities

The demarcation of speech modes into reified units is ultimately a process determining what is counted as a language and what is not. In the case of small communities without any traditions of literacy or standards it is far from evident where one language ends and another starts (cf. issues of language attribution discussed in Stenzel & Williams, in revision, for a multilingual Vaupés context involving related languages, and also the 'translanguaging' notion applied to multilingual settings by Goodchild & Weidl, 2019). What people believe to be a language, a dialect of a language, or a sociolect, etc. is often conditioned by implicit language ideologies. So often it is the ideologically loaded demarcation that predetermines whether a particular ecology is seen as mono- or multilingual. Besides, through the semiotic process of fractal recursivity described in detail by Irvine and Gal (2000) as a means by which people construct

ideological representations of linguistic differences, distinctions between separate languages and those between genres or registers of the same language mirror each other. This means that ultimately the same ideologies underlie and justify the distinctions both within and outside a language, a point developed for dialectal variation in an Australian language by Vaughan (2018) or in African languages by Lüpke (this issue), and for Amazonian registers by Epps (this issue).

Studies of small-scale multilingualism report that linguistic reification is often spatially anchored, when each locality is considered to have its own ‘language’ (see François, 2012, for an Oceanian case, or Merlan, 1981, for an Australian case), or it can be politically anchored (see Di Carlo et al., 2019, for an African case). When both spatial and political anchors are lacking, borders between linguistic and ethnic groups are often quite blurred, as is the case of Arctic nomadic peoples, for instance (see Khanina, and Pupynina & Aralova, both this issue, for Siberia). The political link can work in both directions: not only are speech varieties associated with political units considered languages by local people, but social units whose speech varieties were given the status of a language by researchers can also claim more political power afterwards (see Anderson, 2000, pp. 97-115, on the Dolgans from Siberia, and Irvine & Gal, 2000, on cases from colonial Africa).

Last but not least, the demarcation of speech modes into reified units is loaded with ideologies not only on the part of the communities themselves, but also on the part of researchers approaching them (cf., among others, Di Carlo et al., 2019; Irvine & Gal, 2000; Lüpke, this issue; Vaughan, 2018). Indeed, there are plenty of examples when the latter count fewer ‘languages’ than the people themselves, e.g. Di Carlo (2016) and Di Carlo et al. (2019) with 7-8 vs. 13 for Lower Fungom, Lüpke (2018) with 15 vs. ca. 30 for Casamance in Senegal, Verstraete & Rigsby (2015, p. 10, p. 14) with 1 vs. 4 in Australia, or Khanina (this issue) with 5 vs. 6 in Siberia.

The reification of languages is closely connected to the reification of language communities. Epps (2018, p. 156) calls our attention to the manipulating role played by language(s) in establishing social groups with which individuals wish to be identified or distinguished from. Besides, the same conceptual area generates the following research question: Is there always a corresponding speaker community for each reified language? The answer seems to be negative, since Childs et al. (2014) for Africa, Khanina (this issue) for Siberia, and Kroskrity (2018) for North America describe multilingual settings where “specific confluences of languages are a defining feature of communities” (Childs et al., 2014, p. 182), rather than a single language. The researchers suggest that the close link between a language and its community proves to be another product of colonial nation-state ideologies, a ‘latent ideology’ of researchers hindering

their adequate sociolinguistic analysis of indigenous multilingualism. As Kroskrity (2018, p. 134) puts it, “for communities with a long history of multilingualism [...] their linguistic repertoires may be the more useful locus of authenticity rather than the conventional but limited focus on a single, heritage language”. Already one of the pioneers of the language ideology field, Silverstein (1972), proposed to make use of a subtle distinction between a language community, defined by one language, and a speech community, which could be used with reference to several languages (see for such uses e.g. Ball, 2011; Singer, 2018; and Khanina and Morozova & Rusakov, both this issue).

2.4. Language ideologies and identities

Implicit language ideologies are also involved in such constructs as identities (a category allowing one to group an individual with some other people as opposed to all the rest), be they linguistic, ethnic, or social (see Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985). Language is deemed central in establishing identities, as noted by Bucholtz & Hall (2004, p. 374), and so all sociolinguistic studies of multilingualism deal with the issue.

Here the opposition between categorical (or essentialist) and relational (or indexical) identities (first introduced in Di Carlo & Good (2014) and later developed by Lüpke (2016) and Di Carlo et al. (2019)) becomes crucial, as this turns out to be a parameter of typological variation. Categorical identities flag belonging to a single group only, while relational identities index diverse components of one's social self, depending on the language s/he uses. In ecologies with categorical identities, when someone is English, or French, this is a permanent quality, a category one belongs to, while in ecologies with relational identities someone can identify himself/herself as Tundra Enets in one communicative event, but as a Nganasan in another, indexing his/her identity through a choice of language (Khanina, this issue). Many small-scale multilingual ecologies deal with relational identities; however, there are also indigenous, pre-colonial contexts with categorical identities, where the close association between a linguistic identity and an ethnic group is observed, e.g. in the Upper Rio Negro (Epps & Stenzel, 2013; Stenzel & Williams, in revision), so this phenomenon is clearly not exclusive to Western Europe. Note, though, that in these multilingual ecologies “linguistic identity” concerns not the single language a person can speak, as in Europe, but the language that one associates with, the patrilect in the case of Upper Rio Negro.

Besides, the overall weight of languages in one's identity can be quite low in small-scale multilingual ecologies. Based on Australian evidence, Singer (2018) suggests that the very centrality of languages in identities represents another product of the (European) world view:

“languages are not necessarily the most important aspects of people's identities at Waruwi [...]. The languages that people identify with are not straightforward reflections of other aspects of their identity or their ancestry, upbringing and life history”. The same absence of a direct link of the language that someone speaks with the culture that they belong to or that they practice has been noted by de Vries (2012) for West Papua and Khanina (this issue) for northern Siberia.

2.5. Language ideologies and maintenance of multilingualism

Finally, an important parameter of typological variation in the domain of multilingual language ideologies are justifications in favor of maintenance or retraction of multilingualism. Indeed, ideologies can support multilingualism and high linguistic diversity, preventing shifts to one (bigger) language, and most studies of small-scale multilingualism supply examples for this (however, see also Stenzel & Williams' (in revision, §4) word of caution that ideological factors influence language vitality only on a par with other details, historical, geographic, and demographic). However, what exactly is valued in a multilingual state of affairs varies substantially.

First of all, multilingualism can be seen simply as “a desirable state of social affairs” (Evans, 2010, p. 276) that has always been present, an ideology known from Aboriginal Australia, where people also praise the aesthetics of multilingualism as reflecting the diversity and the beauty of real life better than monolingualism (Evans 2010; Merlan, 1981; Sutton, 1978, 1997). Secondly, multilingualism can be a strategy “that maximizes alliances and protective networks through different languages” (Lüpke, 2016, p. 53), where the protection can be sought from humans or from spirits connected to this language via the 'land - language' or 'land - political unit' link, as Di Carlo (2016), Lüpke (2016), and Watson (2019, p. 136) suggest for African cases, de Vries (2012) and Foley (2005) for West Papua, Cabalzar (2013) and Epps & Stenzel (2013) for the Upper Rio Negro, and Kroskrity (2018) for California. Third, multilingualism can be perceived as a guarantee of peace, a way to prevent conflicts, realizing the urge to be distinct through languages (cf. Evans, 2010, p. 277; Rumsey, 2018; Sutton, 1997, p. 240; Vaughan & Singer, 2018, p. 86, with Australian evidence, and Watson, 2018, p. 173, with African cases). Drawing on an Australian example, Singer (2018, p. 107), discusses “the importance of creating a context in which people can be ‘different together’”. Fourth, multilingualism can be justified as a positive politeness move, a way to accommodate to interlocutors. As Watson (2018, p. 173) puts it for Casamance: “people take pride in being linguistically adaptable and in many cases will take the trouble to learn the language of their

hosts or guests” (see also Lüpke, 2016, p. 48). The same is reported for the Arawakans in the Vaupés by Aikhenvald (2002, p. 23, 2003, p. 3).

Besides, explicit language ideologies are often responsible for the existence of distinct registers, with avoidance registers that restrict direct communication between certain types of relatives among the most widely attested cross-linguistically (see the numerous Amazonian examples in Epps, this issue; but also Dixon, 1980, on Australia; Herbert, 1990; Irvine & Gal, 2000; Mitchell, 2015, on Africa; Simons, 1982, on New Guinea; O'Connor, 1990 on North America; Matic, 2019 on Siberia). Epps (this issue) suggests that the same “particular ideological approach to the social self” underlies the internal and external diversity of languages; even though the causality of the link may go in different directions in different societies, or be entirely absent, the similarity of the two are hard to deny, so the presence of one would always serve as an extra support for the maintenance of the other.

Even when they are negative towards speaking languages of the others, language ideologies can actually support multilingualism, if they are positive towards understanding them, a practice known as receptive multilingualism. This refers to non-reciprocal language use where each individual speaks his or her own language but understands the other’s language, also called dual-lingualism, passive bilingualism, or *lingua receptiva* (cf. Campbell & Grondona, 2010; Lincoln, 1979; Rehbein et al., 2012; ten Thije & Zeevaert, 2007)². In the long term, this ideology contributes towards the maintenance of all languages involved, as it helps sustain language allegiance via avoiding speaking languages that one has no right to own (see also Chernela 2013, p. 231). This kind of ideology is attested in Australia (Singer, 2018; Singer & Harris, 2016; Vaughan & Singer, 2018), the Upper Rio Negro (Aikhenvald, 2003, p. 5; Chernela, 2013, pp. 228-229; Stenzel & Williams, in revision), and Argentina (Campbell & Grondona, 2010). Given the land-language link that exists in aboriginal Australia, the act of speaking a language is also performative in claiming the lands associated with it, and so avoidance of active use of a language is a way to keep hold of one's own lands without the risk of accidentally being suspected of claiming someone else's lands (Singer, 2018, p. 115).

Moreover, ideologies can be explicitly negative towards any type of multilingualism, but support the long-term maintenance of all local languages: this is the case of Upper Xingu (see the papers in Franchetto (2011), and Fausto et al., 2008), where several groups, each with its

² While in the short run receptive multilingualism may be chosen by an individual or a community not on ideological grounds, but from a purely practical perspective (just because it is easier to acquire only a passive command of another language), this choice sustained over a longer period seems to be always backed up by an ideology.

own language belonging to one of three different families, live near each other and share a common economy, rituals, and culture, including communicative culture. However, there is an explicit monolingual ideology disfavoring direct communication between people who do not speak the same lect, there are few bilinguals (and these use their skill only in very limited situations), speaking the language of others is considered to be in conflict with adherence to one's own language group, and as a result, all languages are used and maintained. In contrast, the language ideologies of particular groups can be positive towards multilingualism, but lead to language shift, and thus loss of multilingualism, if the linguistic groups interacting with them do not share the same beliefs. Such shifts have been reported for Western Mono in California (Kroskrity, 2018) and Enets in Siberia (Khanina, this issue). The identities of speakers of these languages were not linguistically indexed, as their multilingual ideologies “foregrounded the practical economic adaptations offered by particular languages while deemphasizing linguistic contributions to personal and group identity” (Kroskrity, 2018, p. 135).

Summing up, language ideologies can value (active) multilingualism or they may not, but there is no simple causal link between the type of ideology (positive vs. negative towards multilingualism) and the survival of languages in a multilingual setting, at least if colonial languages are not taken into account (see also Section 4). Rather, as Kroskrity (2018, p. 142) suggests, particular details of a language ideology assemblage, including, but not limited to “how communities use languages in acts of identification”, define the survival chances of particular languages in multilingual environments. So studies of language ideologies in contact settings contribute not only to a typology of multilingualism per se, but also, more broadly, to an understanding of language maintenance and shift (cf. Di Carlo & Good 2017, Luepke 2017).

2.6. Importance of language ideologies: concluding remarks

This overview of the role played by language ideologies in small-scale multilingual ecologies can be concluded with reference to two regional Amazonian systems, Upper Rio Negro and Upper Xingu, where the cultural, economic, and environmental contexts are very similar (cf. Chernela, 2013; Epps & Stenzel, 2013; Stenzel, 2005, for the Upper Rio Negro, and Ball 2011; Franchetto 2011; Fausto et al., 2008, for the Upper Xingu; Stenzel, 2005, devotes several pages to a comparison of the two systems). In both cases, small, relatively egalitarian groups, each speaking their own language, live next to each other and are engaged in intensive interaction and trade; besides, they share many rituals, some of which they perform together. However, their language ideologies diverge considerably, and so these alone are responsible for the crucial differences in the levels of multilingualism. While the ideologies of the Upper

Rio Negro groups support linguistic exogamy, speech accommodation, and thus multilingualism, those of the Upper Xingu do not: most individuals take part in linguistically endogamous marriages, understanding the verbal parts of joint rituals is deemed unnecessary, and multilingualism as a communicative property of individuals is generally downplayed. This contrast illustrates well the responsibility of language ideologies for patterns of multilingual language use, and stresses the importance of detailed descriptions of such ideologies for the budding typology of small-scale multilingualism.

Last but not least, it should be mentioned that ideologies not only govern language use, but can also actively influence the evolution of linguistic structures (cf., among others, Irvine & Gal, 2000; Rumsey, 1990; Silverstein, 1979; Woolard, 1998, p. 11). The most famous example of this effect in indigenous multilingual ecologies is the recurrently attested absence of lexical borrowing in languages in contact. This is conditioned by a cultural imperative to keep languages separate in order to maintain a distinction between the groups claiming them as 'theirs'. At the same time, it has also frequently been noted by researchers that morphosyntactic structures—as opposed to lexemes—prove beyond speakers' consciousness and thus often manifest extensive interference in such settings; see Silverstein (1981) and Thomason (2008), among very many others, for cross-linguistic theorization of this phenomenon, and also, among others, Aikhenvald (2002), Chernela (2013), and Epps (2018) for Upper Rio Negro; Watson (2018) for Africa; Rumsey (2018) and (Vaughan (2018) for Australia, Gumperz & Wilson (1971) for an Indian setting, and François (2012) for Vanuatu.

3. Sources of small-scale multilingualism

3.1. Exogamous marriages and multilingualism

There is a common assumption that one of the main sources of multilingualism in indigenous societies is exogamy—the practice of taking marriage partners from other groups. However, not all exogamous marriage patterns entail the command of several languages, since exogamy does not necessarily cross language borders.

Exogamy can rest upon various segmentations of people. Languages as such rarely occur as a ground for exogamous grouping. However, if language groups are small, there are greater chances that exogamous groups coincide with language groups. Hence the role of exogamy in the spread of multilingualism strongly depends on the size of language communities: the smaller the language group, the greater the linguistic influence of exogamy. In Australia, where languages are small, clans often coincide with language groups, and exogamous marriages cross language borders (Evans 2017). The correlation between the size of language groups and the

frequency of linguistically exogamous marriages is also pointed out by Khanina (this issue) for Northern Siberia.

In extreme cases, the link between the exogamous groups and languages becomes so tight that individuals directly associate exogamy with languages. Among the Komnzo in southern Papua New Guinea (about 150 – 250 speakers; Döhler, this issue and 2019), people who share an identification with a particular place of origin should not intermarry. Ayres (1983, p. 186), as quoted by Döhler (2019, p. 27), notes that this rule is sometimes explained by the people themselves as a rule of dialect exogamy: “‘We should not intermarry because we talk the same language’ is a phrase sometimes stated by informants”. The most notorious example of what is called linguistic exogamy is that of the Vaupés basin (Upper Rio Negro), where individuals obligatorily marry outside their language group (Aikhenvald, 2002; Fleming, 2016; Jackson, 1974; Sorensen, 1967; Stenzel, 2005; for a brief overview of the studies see Chernela, 2013). However, Fleming (2016) suggests that linguistic exogamy in Vaupés could have developed as an epiphenomenon of clan-based exogamy, the custom of living in the husband’s settlement, and self-identification of individuals with their patrilineal descent group membership. Fleming (2016, p. 22) shows that “the patrilineal descent group membership is not determinative of one’s descent group membership. Individuals still identify with their patrilineal descent groups even after they have ceased to speak the patrilineal register indexical of it”.

The relations of exogamy may link two groups in a kind of regular exchange, e.g. Eastern Tukanoans (Jackson, 1977) often marry a member of their mother’s patrilineal descent group, since cross-cousin marriage is preferred. The husband’s language is hence often the same as the matrilineal (Fleming, 2016). Such a system, which results in the constant presence in a village of a group of women with the same patrilineal descent group membership leads to at least a passive knowledge of this language in the community (cf. Döhler, 2019, p. 19, and Li; Morozova & Rusakov; and Walworth et al., all this issue), and often to stable bilingualism practiced from early childhood. In contrast, women whose patrilineal descent group membership is not spoken by many residents have little chance to use it. This is what happens in Daghestan, where mixed marriages are the exception (see Section 3.2).

Explicit and implicit language ideologies, introduced in Section 2.1, to a large extent determine which languages are used by spouses in case of exogamous marriages. Studies on small-scale multilingualism suggest several possibilities. Chernela (2013) argues for two different patterns of linguistic behavior of in-marrying wives among the virilocal communities of Kotiria (formerly called Wanano) and the Tariana in the Vaupés. Whereas the Kotiria wives continue to speak their Kotiria patrilineal descent group membership in the Tariana villages into which they marry, the Tariana wives never speak Tariana in the Kotiria villages, using Kotiria or the lingua franca,

Tukano. As Chernela puts it, whereas Kotiria norms favor linguistic loyalty, Tariana norms favor accommodation. A similar difference in norms is attested among two exogamous groups in China. Here, in-coming Zhuang wives have to shift to their husband's dialect (Stanford & Pan, 2013), while Sui wives maintain their original clan dialect features (Stanford, 2009).

The family language can also be determined by the land or settlement. In Vanuatu (François, 2012, p. 91) and the Lower Yenisei in Siberia (Khanina, this issue) post-marital residence is not rigidly assigned. According to a study of the northern Banks islands discussed by François (2012), in about 61% of cases the woman relocates to her husband's village and becomes fluent in his language; in 39% of cases it is the reverse situation. Among the nomadic populations of the Lower Yenisei, the lect chosen for communication with children in case of cross-linguistic marriages is the one that is heard the most often in the whereabouts of the family. Hence in these cases the area of residence, or the migratory territory in the case of nomadic peoples, becomes the main factor of language choice, resulting in the ideological connection between a language and a territory that was discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.3 above.

Children's linguistic upbringing also varies depending on language ideologies (e.g. rules prescribed to the mother, the location of the family, etc). As shown for the Kotiria (Chernela, 2013), groups in northeastern Arnhem Land (Brandl & Walsh, 1982), and the Mano and Kpelle in Guinea (Khachatryan & Konoshenko, this issue), children start speaking their mother's language, because that is what she uses when talking to her child. However, under pressure of the local strict norms they are socialized at a later age to switch to their patrillect. This is different in highland Daghestan, where an in-married woman has to speak the language of her husband and his village with her child from the very beginning. A rare case is described for Misi6n la Paz in Argentina (Campbell & Grondona, 2010), where children decide for themselves to identify with the language of one of the parents, and children in the same family might choose to identify with different languages.

Whereas language exogamy often creates bilingualism and therefore attracts the attention of linguists, endogamy frequently remains unnoticed. However, cases of endogamy exist in even very small language groups, as will be shown in the next section.

3.2. Endogamous marriages and multilingualism

Although exogamy is sometimes presented as a logical option for small language groups (Singer & Harris 2016, p. 165, 167), linguistically endogamous groups are not rare. Even within Amazonia, notorious for its exogamous traditions, there are communities where marriages across language borders are infrequent, such as Upper Xingu discussed in Section 2. According

to Epps (2008), the Hup people of the Vaupés (about 1500 speakers) marry mostly amongst themselves, although they observe rather strict clan exogamy. Endogamy is also found among various peoples of Papua New Guinea (Awin and Yongom - Serjeantson, 1975; Yimas - Foley, 1991; Urapmin - Robbins, 1998). A low level of language exogamy is also reported in Sagna & Hantgan (this issue) for Essil, an Eegimaa speaking village of the Casamance region in Senegal. In the Lower Fungom region of Cameroon, speakers of Fang, who number about 5000 and live in the village of the same name, are practically endogamous, even though in the surrounding villages intermarriages are common (Mve et al., 2019, p. 175).

Another endogamous region, rarely discussed with regard to its marriage patterns, is Daghestan, a republic of the Russian Federation located in the Northeast Caucasus. Endogamy is widespread in Daghestan and covers all language groups, irrespective of their population size (Comrie, 2008; Dobrushina & Moroz, this issue; Wixman, 1980). For example, the speakers of Archi, a highland one-village language in Central Daghestan with the population about 1200 (Dobrushina, 2013) practiced clan-based endogamy until the beginning of the 21st century. According to the Archis, no woman has ever married out of the village. In the rare cases when a man took a wife from outside, the incoming wife was expected to learn the language of her husband, and communicate with him, his family and other villagers using their language. Unlike the above-mentioned cases of the Kotiria (Chernela, 2013), Arnhem Land (Brandl & Walsh, 1982), and Guinea (Khachatryan & Konoshenko, this issue), where children initially speak their matrilect, in Daghestan children exclusively speak their patrilect from infancy, and learn their mother's language only at a later age, when they communicate with their maternal grandmother and aunts or spend time in the mother's village, if ever.

The result of this custom is that Daghestanian villages, like many of those in Upper Xingu, are linguistically homogeneous. However, unlike Upper Xingu, bilingualism in Daghestan is pervasive. Most villagers speak the languages of their neighbors, acquiring them not in early childhood but later. Epps (2008, p. 27) observes a similar pattern for Hup people. She notes that children learn Tukano as they grow up, mainly in the context of their parents' frequent interactions with River Indians, although young children sometimes understand relatively little.

The age of L2 acquisition is known to be one of the most important factors for the consequences of language contact. Linguistically exogamous and linguistically endogamous societies presumably differ more in this respect than merely in the number of individuals who are bilingual. Marriages across language borders often lead to the use of two languages within the family and early bilingualism. In contrast, the acquisition of multiple languages in

endogamous societies does not happen within families and often occurs at a later age, when languages are presumably less fully acquired.

3.3. Acquiring multiple languages by means other than intermarriage

As discussed above, a frequent source of multilingualism in linguistically exogamous societies is the use of several languages within the family. Endogamy, by contrast, does not enhance multilingualism, but endogamous communities can also be multilingual. There must thus be other ways of learning languages, apart from intra-family bilingualism, which are as yet understudied. In fact, any relations with other language groups might lead to the acquisition of another language. Most frequently mentioned are regular interactions with adjacent groups (sometimes within the same settlement), economic exchanges, visits to marketplaces, participation in common rituals, the mobility of hunter-gatherers and pastoralists, labor engagement, mobility for the purposes of training and education, and fostering of children.

Regular interactions with adjacent groups are one of the most frequent sources of multilingualism. In Daghestan, adjacent villages always have a language in common, although the bilingualism is often asymmetric (see Section 4). The pragmatic reason for such relations is to obtain allies and strengthen bonds for potential cooperation. In Lower Fungom, too, speaking the lect of neighbouring villages is considered an important social ‘insurance’, since it increases one’s chances of easy integration into these villages should social conditions in one’s home settlement make resettlement necessary (Di Carlo 2018: 150). In West Africa, “landlord-stranger settlement patterns” lead to the presence of multiple languages in one settlement, with the language of the firstcomers having a special status as the patrimonial language. However, this patrimonial language is often restricted largely to ceremonial uses (Lüpke & Watson 2020: 533).

Some indigenous communities feature craft specialization, notably the association of a particular village with specific skills, as found in the Upper Rio Negro region (Epps, 2008, p. 24, 2018) and the Upper Xingu (Fausto et al., 2008, p. 144). Such local specialization enhances the exchange of goods and can concomitantly lead to an exchange of languages, although as pointed out above, communities of the Upper Xingu are practically monolingual. In Daghestan, crafts are often named as a motivation for the command of other languages; for instance, in the past men from the Lak-speaking village of Balkhar acquired Avar while they travelled around Daghestan to sell their ceramics.

The exchange of goods can take place at the marketplace. Then, as it happens in some parts of Daghestan, the visits to the market motivate people to learn another language, at least

passively. Connell (2009) observed the language behaviour of a Cameroonian who during a market visit took part in forty-five conversations involving no fewer than eleven languages over a period of less than two hours. He used his visit to the market not for the purpose of shopping, but rather to meet friends and socialize.

In contrast, in the region of the Lower Yenisei River (northern Siberia) all indigenous people used to practice the same type of activities, so no barter exchange or trade was attested in the area, nor were there any regular markets (Khanina, this issue). However, domestic reindeer were exchanged from time to time to avoid inbreeding. The exchanges were usually not with families in the direct vicinity, but with more distant ones, resulting in language contact. Herding was also one of the sources of multilingualism in some regions of Daghestan, where people practiced seasonal migrations with their sheep herds, moving away for several months and interacting with people speaking other languages.

Travelling for education might appear a relatively new phenomenon (see, for example, the short-term displacement of individuals in North Malekula in order to be nearer to a school or to a church described by Walworth et al., this issue), but in reality, it existed in precolonial societies as well. In Daghestan, people used to walk to one of the villages in the vicinity to learn Islam from some knowledgeable person (Dobrushina, 2013, pp. 381-382).

Fostering of children is especially widespread in Africa, where it serves to help a woman look after her children and with domestic chores, find a place for illegitimate children, place children in the proximity of a (good) school, and reinforce kinship and friendship ties (Lüpke & Storch, 2013, p. 41). Children may be fostered across language borders, thus enhancing multilingualism, or within the families of close relatives where the patrillect is spoken (Khachatryan & Konoshenko, this issue).

Just as the linguistic effect of exogamy is significantly more visible in small language communities, the effects of other kinds of contact surveyed in this section are also more pronounced among small communities. Thus, the size of the language group itself is a factor enhancing multilingualism (see Dobrushina & Moroz, this issue), and, as will be outlined in the following section, might play a significant role in the local hierarchies of languages.

4. Egalitarian and symmetric vs. hierarchical and asymmetric multilingualism

As was mentioned in the beginning of this paper, many Indigenous communities characterized by small-scale multilingualism are not socially stratified with respect to each other. In such societies, the patterns of multilingualism are often also egalitarian, or balanced, which means that none of the languages involved is ranked above the others in Indigenous

ideologies. However, the concept of the equality of languages needs to be elaborated. Linguistic egalitarianism can come in various forms, and scholars have to recognize its different guises (4.1). Moreover, along with egalitarian relations between languages, descriptions of Indigenous communities also mention cases of hierarchical multilingualism (4.2).

4.1. Egalitarian multilingualism

The egalitarian nature of small-scale multilingualism can be seen in the absence of social stratification of languages, the equal treatment of non-colonial languages in local hierarchies and the symmetrical nature of bilingualism.

That higher prestige is not attributed to some languages as compared to others is a linguistic consequence of the lack of social hierarchy among the interacting communities. Connell (2009, p. 134) described the Cameroonian society of subsistence farmers as essentially unstratified. He is echoed by François (2012, p. 93) for Vanuatu: “This egalitarianism between social groups is mirrored in the balance of power between languages. No language in this region is ever represented as more prestigious, useful, or important than another”.

This does not mean that there is no hierarchy of languages within a particular language community. As discussed above, many indigenous communities exhibit a pronounced preference of the patrillect over the matrilect or of the language identified with their own land, settlement, or clan over other languages (see also Li; Sagna & Hantgan; Walworth et al., all this issue). Yet, although this creates relations of inequality between languages within a given community, across different communities it applies to all languages of the area, irrespective of their size or local importance. Thus, it does not introduce a hierarchy on the scale of interethnic communication. The special status of languages as patrillects is relational, unlike that of colonial languages, such as English, French or Russian, whose prestige, and hence their higher status, in small-scale multilingual societies is an inherent feature.

Symmetric, or bilateral bilingualism—the situation when two language communities reciprocally speak each other’s languages (Weinreich, 1953)—is multifaceted. It is manifested in the eagerness to speak or at least to be spoken to in languages of the adjacent groups, and to switch to these languages whenever needed. This orientation towards mastering other languages is reflected in the language ideologies sustaining multilingualism (see Section 2.5).

While the receptive multilingual mode implies minimization of code-switching, as each speaker mainly sticks to one language, in other egalitarian communities speakers frequently switch between different codes. Vydrina (this issue) discusses an example of what she calls the ‘semi-receptive mode’ among three individuals, each having Pular, Kakabe and Maninka in

their active repertoires. In a conversation, each of them uses all three languages, and although there is a tendency to stick to their patrillect, they can also decide to accommodate to the language of the interlocutor. Similarly, Morozova & Rusakov (this issue) show that in the Macedonian village of Velja Gorana, bilingual speakers of Albanian and the local dialect of Bosnian-Croatian-Macedonian-Serbian use different languages to speak to different people within the same conversation. Symmetric bilingualism manifests itself in that the choice of language is dictated by the pragmatics of the situation, and not by the relative status or prestige of one of the languages.

We conclude that the manifestations of language equality are not the same in all cases of small-scale bilingualism. Meanwhile, language communities do not only refract this ideology in many different ways, but also combine egalitarian multilingualism with language asymmetry.

4.2. Hierarchical multilingualism

As was noted by François (2012) in relation to Vanuatu, differences in the relative sociopolitical status of languages can have different motivations, some of which may have always been present in the region, while others have arisen under later, colonial or post-colonial circumstances. The most obvious reason for asymmetric bilingualism, which could have been in place even in prehistoric times, is the difference in size between language communities. This tendency was observed in Australia (Elwell, 1977; Singer, 2018, p. 105-106) and West Africa (Khachaturyan & Konoshenko, this issue), and demonstrated quantitatively for Daghestan (Dobrushina & Moroz, this issue). Asymmetry can also be a result of the history of the region, when the order in which groups arrived is reflected in the hierarchy of languages (cf. the notion of patrimonial language in Lüpke, this issue). However, it is important to stress that asymmetric bilingualism does not necessarily involve inequality at the ideological level. Kroskirty (2018: 139) describes the Tewa of Arizona who interpret their asymmetric bilingualism in Hopi as “a product of their own agency” and clearly an advantage over the Hopi, despite their position as a displaced minority in the Hopi environment.

A further reason for asymmetric multilingualism is social inequality in inter-group relations. The forest-dwelling Hup, Yuhup, and Kakua peoples of the Upper Rio Negro occupy a socially inferior position in relation to the riverine Indigenous groups, who speak Tukanoan languages (cf. Stenzel & Williams, in revision, §3). The latter view the forest dwellers as subhuman and servant-like (Jackson 1983, p. 148–163), and marriages between forest-dwellers and Tukanoan people are highly restricted, involving only forest-dwelling women who marry into Tukanoan communities. While the forest people have traditionally maintained high levels of bilingualism

in neighboring Tukanoan languages, this is not reciprocated; Tukanoan peoples do not speak the languages of the forest peoples (Epps, 2008, pp. 25-27). Co-existence of asymmetric marriage relationships and asymmetric bilingualism arising from social inequality is also attested in West Africa. Khachaturyan & Konoshenko (this issue) describe asymmetric marriage preferences and asymmetric bilingualism between the speakers of Kpelle and Maninka, while Vydrina (this issue) considers the asymmetric marriage preferences between Fula and Kakabe people as a legacy of past slavery.

There is a common assumption that asymmetric bilingualism often results in shift to the dominant language. In fact, what we find are linguistically diverse areas with ubiquitous asymmetric relations where languages are assumed to have been stable for hundreds of years, such as Daghestan. Here, no cases of language death have been documented since the beginning of the 19th century; yet, bilingualism is usually asymmetric (Dobrushina, 2013). Epps (2018, p. 159) makes a similar observation concerning the relations of Naduhup and Tukanoan languages: “Despite the social and linguistic imbalance between the forest peoples and their riverine neighbors, there is no indication that any of these groups have experienced language shift—all of the forest peoples speak languages unrelated to those of their neighbors”. It appears that in precolonial societies linguistic asymmetry may have been balanced by some of the equality mechanisms discussed in 4.1: Hup people speak several languages instead of shifting to the dominant one; Kakabe, the language of erstwhile slaves, can be spoken by the ex-masters of the Kakabe people; and in Daghestan, the women whose patrilect is spoken by thousands of otherwise monolingual individuals are supposed to learn and use the local L1 when marrying into a language community speaking a minority language. These counter-balances can be weakened and lost in situations of colonialism or other social changes.

Consider language mixing. Many accounts of code-switching in situations of traditional small-scale multilingualism mention that even though people often switch between several local languages, they hardly ever mix them within one utterance³, but this is very different with respect to the colonial languages. For instance, Khachaturyan & Konoshenko (this issue) indicate that there is virtually no intrasentential code-mixing between Mano and Kpelle; this is in striking contrast with frequent code-mixing involving French. Li (this issue) notices that Zazou, Lisu, and Bai occur in intersentential code-switching, but are uncommon in

³ Note, however, that what is seen as code-switched or mixed is a question of perspective and depends on speakers' and listeners' repertoires and on their access to prototypes and linguistic norms (Watson 2019). We acknowledge the ideological underpinning of the distinction, but continue to use it as a handy tool in numerous ecologies where these notions are clear-cut for community members.

intrasentential code-mixing, unlike Mandarin, which is involved in both code-switching and code-mixing. These observations conform with many other studies showing that there is little or no intrasentential code-mixing involving indigenous languages, in contrast to code-mixing that involves the large state language/lingua franca (Di Carlo et al., 2019; Epps, 2018, pp. 160-165; Vaughan, 2019). A possible explanation for this phenomenon is that state languages and lingua francas do not belong to any particular indigenous community and are therefore considered neutral in the local language ideologies, which aim at maintaining borders between local communities (cf. Vaughan, 2019). In addition, many terms pertaining to a modern lifestyle are lacking in indigenous languages, so that speakers might mix codes out of semantic necessity (see Stenzel & Williams, in revision, § 5.4.1 for code-mixing between Kotiria and Portuguese). However, the opposite pattern was observed in the Upper Rio Negro, where code-mixing between East Tukanoan languages, especially Desano and Siriano, did not elicit any disapproval, whereas the use of the Spanish word *mamá* ‘mom’ in Indigenous discourse, in which both Desano and Tukano were used, sparked a rebuke (Silva, 2020, p. 151).

As this discussion and the studies presented in this issue show, small-scale multilingual communities are hardly ever perfectly egalitarian. Most often the researchers encounter a tangle of various power relations between languages, some of which “can be recognized as stemming from relatively recent sociohistorical circumstances, while others seem to represent the persistence of older patterns” (Di Carlo et al., 2019).

5. Methods used in investigations of small-scale multilingualism

5.1 Studying synchronic multilingualism

As amply shown by the discussion so far, small-scale multilingualism is a complex phenomenon, involving community-wide linguistic ideologies, patterns of intermarriage and trade relations, as well as the specifics of individuals’ biographies. It is therefore not surprising that most researchers dealing with this type of multilingualism make use of a panoply of methods, including the widely used methods of participant observation (by way of example see Campbell & Grondona, 2010; Epps, 2018; Singer & Harris, 2016; and from this issue Khachaturyan & Konoshenko and Morozova & Rusakov) and sociolinguistic surveys (see, among many others, Di Carlo, 2016; and from this issue Döhler; Khachaturyan & Konoshenko; Li; Pupynina & Aralova; Sagna & Hantgan; Walworth et al.). In order to ensure that their respondents were as much at ease as possible, Stenzel & Williams (in revision) let Indigenous research assistants lead the sociolinguistic interviews, which were furthermore conducted in group sessions. Other methods used are the targeted observation of multilingual interactions in

shops (Elwell, 1982) and in markets (Connell, 2009), detailed analysis of language use in conversations (e.g. from this issue Di Carlo et al.; Li; Lüpke; Vydrina), data on child language acquisition (Sagna & Hantgan, this issue), and collection of linguistic biographies (Singer 2018; Singer & Harris, 2016). In order to facilitate the collection of such biographies, Singer (2018) and Stenzel & Williams (in revision) make use of language portraits. This is a novel method initiated by Busch (2012), where individuals fill in human silhouettes with different colours to represent the different languages in their repertoire. These portraits are then discussed, and the portraitee's comments on the placement and colour of each language in the silhouette can offer insights into individuals' life histories, attitudes, and linguistic ideologies. A different approach to linguistic biographies is that taken by Morozova & Rusakov (this issue), who provide schematic "lifespan snapshots" that show changes in linguistic repertoire over four life stages. A creative approach to assess the extent of community multilingualism is the 'blindfold test' applied by Sagna & Hantgan (this issue), who as part of their sociolinguistic survey asked individuals what language they would use to greet people if they were being led blindfolded around the village. The more linguistically homogeneous a village is, the easier it is for respondents to name only one locally restricted Indigenous language, while in multilingual settlements answers to this question are much less straightforward and are likely to include frequent mention of a lingua franca. This can thus serve as an index for the degree of multilingualism of the village.

There is an increasing awareness that studies of small-scale multilingualism need to include ethnographic methods (Di Carlo, 2016; Epps, this issue; Lüpke, 2017, p. e275), ideally via close collaboration of linguists and ethnographers (Di Carlo et al., this issue). Furthermore, documentation of such situations needs to focus on naturalistic interactions in casual settings, without the a priori focus on a single language that is still all too common in documentary and descriptive linguistics (Di Carlo et al., this issue; Lüpke, 2016, p. 45). For instance, it is only in recordings of naturalistic discourse involving individuals with different patrillects that code-mixing was observed in the Upper Rio Negro region, where such linguistic behaviour has up to now been reported as entirely unacceptable (Silva, 2020; cf. Stenzel & Khoo, 2016, and especially Stenzel & Williams, in revision, for similar findings). One way of acquiring naturalistic speech data is to provide a consultant with a small audiorecorder that records all of their interactions for the duration of the batteries' life-span (Beyer, 2010; Connell, 2009). Since this method of data collection takes place without the potentially disturbing presence of the (mostly foreign, often white) researcher, it provides data that is "probably the closest to natural speech that one could get" (Beyer, 2010, p. 139). However, given the potentially sensitive data

that might be collected, this method should only be used with particular attention to ethical issues.

In multilingual situations that involve many non-standardized, under- or undescribed varieties, investigating language use can be a challenge (Di Carlo et al., this issue). A novel solution to this problem is taken by Watson (2019), who applies a prototype theory approach to establish salient features for two closely related languages spoken in close proximity in Casamance, Senegal, and then uses these to identify the different languages that occur in naturalistic multilingual interactions. It is of note that this approach makes heavy use of detailed sociolinguistic knowledge of individuals' biographies and linguistic repertoires.

A method that has so far not been much used in studies of small-scale multilingualism, but which could provide potentially rewarding insights, is Social Network Analysis (Beyer & Schreiber, 2017). This involves the investigation of individuals' links in different culturally relevant social networks, such as the extended family or the neighbourhood, via questions such as whom the interviewees go to for advice, with whom they like to undertake communal tasks such as gathering firewood or repairing houses, and with whom they prefer to spend their leisure time (see Khanina, 2019, and this issue, for generalizations based on data from interviews targeting social networks in the Lower Yenisey region in Siberia). While Beyer (2010) and Schreiber (2009) employed the method to investigate the social correlates of linguistically variable features, it could also be employed for fine-scaled analyses of language use in multilingual settings.

While current small-scale multilingualism can still be documented and studied in many areas of the world, this situation is rapidly changing, with large languages of wider communication (a regional lingua franca or the former colonial/current national language) taking over as medium of intergroup communication. In order to understand what multilingual interactions may have looked like prior to colonialization and globalization, it is necessary to study (pre)historic patterns of multilingualism. In addition, understanding such past patterns may help us understand contact-induced language changes, providing potential explanations for observed distributions of features among languages. There are two major types of approach to elucidating (pre)historic multilingualism: indirectly via the changes the languages have undergone, and directly via retrospective interviews or questionnaires and investigations of narratives recorded prior to the spread of lingua francas and large-scale societal changes.

5.2. Studying past patterns of multilingualism

The indirect approach to the study of past patterns of multilingualism makes use of particular features that have changed in a language under the influence of another language. Even if currently the speakers of these languages are not multilingual anymore, depending on the nature of such changes these can provide insights into prehistoric multilingualism (cf. Pakendorf, 2007; Pakendorf et al., 2017, for case studies from Siberia and southern Africa, respectively, that draw on molecular anthropological data for additional insights). For instance, Rumsey (2018) uses the distribution of presence and absence of lamino-dental consonants in languages belonging to the Wororran family in northwestern Australia to conclude that the languages that lack this type of consonant lost it via diffusion through multilingualism in other Wororran languages. Watson (2018) uses loanwords to elucidate the sociolinguistic aspects of past multilingualism, establishing that patterns of social and linguistic dominance must have changed over time. Similarly, Chechuro et al. (this issue) trace the use of particular varieties of Azerbaijani as lingua franca in southern Daghestan with the help of loanwords found in local Lezgian languages. Döhler (this issue) combines data on toponyms and bird names with ethnographic data to investigate the prehistoric multilingualism of speakers of Komnzo in southern Papua, while Moro (this issue) uses structural changes in Alorese, an Austronesian language spoken in close vicinity with non-Austronesian languages on two islands of Eastern Indonesia, to establish changes in the multilingual setting over time.

Beside the use of census data, where these are available (Dobrushina & Moroz, and Khanina, both this issue; Khanina & Koryakov, 2018), a further means of directly accessing past patterns of multilingualism is via “retrospective family interviews” (Dobrushina, 2013). In this approach, sociolinguistic surveys are conducted that do not ask individuals only about their own linguistic repertoires, but also about those of their parents and grandparents. Collecting data from related individuals serves to validate the data on people who are already deceased. This method, which has also been used in Siberia (Khanina, 2019, this issue; Pupynina & Aralova, this issue) allows the reconstruction of patterns of multilingualism a couple of generations back; depending on the social circumstances, this can reach to the end of the 19th century (Dobrushina, 2013) or the 1930s (Khanina, 2019, this issue). It can be based on semi-structured interviews (Khanina, 2019), questionnaires that are filled in by the researchers or the respondents (Pupynina & Aralova, this issue), or a combination of extensive interviews and short questionnaires (Dobrushina, 2013). In order to study the dynamics of multilingualism over time, Pupynina & Aralova (this issue) develop a novel means of assessing the number of individuals with particular linguistic repertoires for each decade from 1940 to 2010.

An additional direct means of elucidating past multilingualism on the Lower Yenisey in Siberia was used by Khanina & Meyerhoff (2018): they studied published texts recorded in the 1930s and noted all described interethnic interactions involving speakers of Enets, a Northern Samoyedic language. In this way, they were able to reconstruct egalitarian multilingualism of Enets with Nenets and Nganasan—both also Northern Samoyedic languages—and more restricted multilingualism involving Evenki, an unrelated Tungusic language, for the period of 1850-1930.

6. Conclusions

This paper has aimed to provide an introduction to the budding typology of small-scale multilingualism, a type of multilingualism that offers a very different perspective on multilingual communication than what is commonly in the focus of research on urban and post-colonial multilingualism. Small-scale multilingual communities provide ample demonstration that “language acquisition” is not always “hard work”, nor is the “solution” always “to use a *lingua franca*”, and receptive multilingualism need not be restricted to closely related varieties, as suggested by Gooskens (2019: 149). Furthermore, extensive multilingualism is clearly not merely a product of globalization, as subsumed under the label of “super-diversity” (Blommaert & Rampton 2012), but has existed throughout human history. This type of multilingualism is also the exact opposite of that referred to by Baptista (2017, p. e302), who assumes that social and functional compartmentalization is key for the survival of small languages. In contrast, linguists working on small-scale multilingualism have shown that the type of egalitarian, reciprocal language ecology discussed in this article actually fosters language maintenance (Di Carlo & Good, 2017; Epps, 2018; Lüpke, 2017; Vaughan & Singer, 2018, p. 85; see also Section 2.5). Nevertheless, it is becoming increasingly evident that traditional multilingual settings are highly endangered (cf. Lüpke, 2016, p. 42). Competence in small local languages is being displaced by the use of large lingua francas, such as Cameroon Pidgin English in Lower Fungom (Di Carlo, 2016, p. 79), Pijin in the Solomon Islands (Jourdan, 2007), Bislama in Vanuatu (François, 2012, pp. 103-106), Tukano in the Upper Rio Negro (Aikhenvald, 2003; Cabalzar, 2013), and Russian in Dagestan (Dobrushina et al., 2019) and Siberia (Khanina, this issue; Khanina & Meyerhoff, 2018; Pupynina & Aralova, this issue). The study of small-scale multilingualism—both synchronic and (pre)historic—is thus of utmost urgency.

In this paper, we have summarized promising areas of research in this domain, as well as methods to accomplish this. The following parameters of cross-linguistic variation emerge from

the current state of research: explicit and implicit language ideologies and their role in sustaining different types of multilingualism, the reification of particular lects, the role played by languages in identity construction (categorical vs. indexical), the sources of multilingualism (exogamy, trade, a mobile life-style, fostering, among others), ways of acquiring various languages (e.g. childhood bilingualism vs. explicit teaching later in life), modes of multilingualism (active competence in multiple languages vs. receptive multilingualism, symmetric vs. asymmetric multilingualism), the social symmetry or asymmetry of languages, and the acceptability of code-mixing and code-switching. These topics recur in the descriptions of small-scale multilingual ecologies worldwide and are thus important components for a typology of this domain.

The articles collected in this issue take the study of small-scale multilingualism a big step forward: they provide exciting new data on previously un(der)described multilingual settings from around the world (see Figure 1 for the locations of the case studies), suggest innovative methods of investigation, and offer insightful theoretical discussion.




Figure 1. Locations of the case studies discussed in this issue

References

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2002). *Language Contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2003). Multilingualism and ethnic stereotypes: the Tariana of northwest Amazonia. *Language in Society*, 32(1), 1-21.
- Anderson, D. G. (2000). *Identity and ecology in arctic Siberia*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ayres, M. C. (1983). *This side, that side: Locality and exogamous group definition in Morehead area, Southwestern Papua*. Chicago: University of Chicago dissertation; cited from Döhler (2019).
- Ball, C. (2011). Pragmatic multilingualism in the Upper Xingu speech community. In B. Franchetto (Ed.), *Alto Xingu: uma sociedade multilíngue* (pp. 87–112). Rio de Janeiro: Museu do Índio – Funai.
- Baptista, M. (2017). On the role of agency, marginalization, multilingualism, and language policy in maintaining language vitality: Commentary on Mufwene. *Language*, 93(4), e298–e305.
- Beyer, K. (2010). Language contact and change: A look at social factors in an African rural environment. *Journal of Language Contact*, 3(1), 131–152.
- Beyer, K., & Schreiber, H. (2017). Social Network Approach in African Sociolinguistics. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.236>
- Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton. 2012. Language and superdiversity. *MMG Working Paper* 12(09). 3–36.
- Brandl, M. M., & Walsh, M. (1982). Speakers of many tongues: Toward understanding multilingualism among Aboriginal Australians. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1982(36), 71-81.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 369–394). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Busch, B. (2012). The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 503–523.
- Cabalzar, A. (2013). Organização socioespacial e predomínios linguísticos no Rio Tiquié. In P. Epps, & K. Stenzel (Eds.), *Upper Rio Negro. Cultural and linguistic interaction in Northwestern Amazonia* (pp. 129–162). Rio de Janeiro: Museu do Índio - Funai.
- Campbell, L., & Grondona, V. (2010). Who speaks what to whom? Multilingualism and language choice in Misión La Paz. *Language in Society*, 39(5), 617–646.
- Chechuro I., Daniel M., & Verhees, S. (This issue). Small-scale multilingualism through the prism of lexical borrowing. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Chernela, J. (2013). Toward a Tukanoan ethnolinguistics: Metadiscursive practices, identity, and sustained linguistic diversity in the Vaupés basin of Brazil and Colombia. In P. Epps, & K. Stenzel (Eds.), *Upper Rio Negro: Cultural and Linguistic Interaction in Northwestern Amazonia* (pp. 197–244). Rio de Janeiro: Museu do Índio - Funai.
- Childs, T., Good, J., & Mitchell, A. (2014). Beyond the Ancestral Code: Towards a Model for Sociolinguistic Language Documentation. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 8, 168-191.
- Comrie, B. (2008). Linguistic Diversity in the Caucasus. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 37, 131–143.
- Connell, B. (2009). Language diversity and language choice: A view from a Cameroon market. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 51(2), 130–150.
- de Vries, L. (2012). Speaking of clans: language in Awyu-Ndumut communities of Indonesian West Papua. *International Journal of the Sociology of language*, 2012(214), 5-26.
- Di Carlo, P. (2016). Multilingualism, affiliation and spiritual insecurity. From phenomena to processes in language documentation. In M. Seyfeddinipur (Ed.), *Language Documentation & Conservation, special issue: African language documentation: new data, methods and approaches 10* (pp. 71–104). University of Hawai'i Press.

- Di Carlo, P. (2018). Towards an understanding of African endogenous multilingualism: ethnography, language ideologies, and the supernatural. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2018(254), 139–163.
- Di Carlo, P., & Good, J. (2014). What are we trying to preserve? Diversity, change, and ideology at the edge of the Cameroonian Grassfields. In P. K. Austin, & J. Sallabank (Eds.), *Endangered Languages: Beliefs and Ideologies in Language Documentation and Revitalization* (pp. 231–264). Oxford: OUP.
- Di Carlo, P., & Good, J. (2017). The vitality and diversity of multilingual repertoires: Commentary on Mufwene. *Language*, 93(4), e254–e262.
- Di Carlo, P., Good, J., & Diba, R. O. (2019). *Multilingualism in rural Africa*. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.227>
- Di Carlo, P., Diba, R. O. & Good, J. (This issue). Towards a coherent methodology for the documentation of small-scale multilingualism: Dealing with speech data. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1980). *The languages of Australia*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dobrushina, N. (2013). How to study multilingualism of the past: Investigating traditional contact situations in Daghestan. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(3), 376–393.
- Dobrushina N., Kozhukhar A. A., & Moroz, G. (2019). Gendered multilingualism in highland Daghestan: story of a loss. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(2), 115-132.
- Dobrushina, N. & Moroz, G. (This issue). The speakers of minority languages are more multilingual. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Döhler, C. (2019). *A grammar of Komnzo*. Language Science Press.
- Döhler, C. (This issue). Birds and places: what the lexicon reveals about multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Elwell, V.M.R. (1977). *Multilingualism and Lingua Francas Among Australian Aborigines: a Case Study of Maningrida*. Honours thesis. Australian National University, Canberra.
- Elwell, V. M. (1982). Some social factors affecting multilingualism among Aboriginal Australians: A case study of Maningrida. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 36, 83–103.
- Epps, P. (2008). *A grammar of Hup*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Epps, P. (2018). Contrasting linguistic ecologies: Indigenous and colonially mediated language contact in northwest Amazonia. *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 156–169.
- Epps, P. (2020). Amazonian linguistic diversity and its sociocultural correlates. In M. Crevels, & P. Muysken (Eds.), *Language Dispersal, Diversification, and Contact: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 275-290.
- Epps, P. (This issue). Diversifying multilingualism: Languages and lects in Amazonia. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Epps, P., & Stenzel, K. (2013). Introduction. In P. Epps, & K. Stenzel (Eds.), *Upper Rio Negro: Cultural and Linguistic Interaction in Northwestern Amazonia* (pp. 13–52). Rio de Janeiro: FUNAI - Museu do Índio; Museu Nacional.
- Evans, N. (2010). A tale of many tongues: documenting polyglot narrative in North Australian oral traditions. In B. Baker, I. Mushin, M. Harvey, & R. Gardner (Eds.), *Indigenous language and social identity: papers in honour of Michael Walsh* (pp. 275-295). Pacific Linguistics.

- Evans, N. (2017). Did language evolve in multilingual settings? *Biology & Philosophy*, 32(6), 905–933.
- Fausto, C., Franchetto, B., & Heckenberger, M. (2008). Language, ritual and historical reconstruction. Towards a linguistic, ethnographical and archaeological account of Upper Xingu Society. In K. D. Harrison, D. S. Rood, & A. Dwyer (Eds.), *Lessons from Documented Endangered Languages (Typological Studies in Language 78)* (pp. 129–157). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fleming, L. (2016). Linguistic exogamy and language shift in the northwest Amazon. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2016(240), 9–27.
- Foley, W. A. (1991). *The Yimas language of New Guinea*. Stanford University Press.
- Foley, W. A. (2005). Personhood and linguistic identity, purism and variation. *Language Documentation and Description*, 3, 157–180.
- Franchetto, B. (2011, ed.). *Alto Xingu: uma sociedade multilíngue*. Rio de Janeiro: Museu do Índio – Funai.
- François, A. (2012). The dynamics of linguistic diversity: egalitarian multilingualism and power imbalance among northern Vanuatu languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2012(214), 85–110.
- Gomez-Imbert, E. (1991). Force des langues vernaculaires en situation d'exogamie linguistique : le cas du Vaupès colombien, Nord-Ouest amazonien. *Cahiers des Sciences Humaines (Charmes Jacques (Ed.). Plurilinguisme et Développement)*, 27(3–4), 535–559.
- Goodchild, S. & Weidl, M. (2019). Translanguaging practices in the Casamance: similar but different - two case studies. In A. Sherris & E. Adami (Eds.), *Making signs, translanguaging ethnographies. Exploring urban, rural and educational spaces* (pp. 133–151). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gooskens, C. (2019). Receptive multilingualism. In Simona Montanari & Suzanne Quay (eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on multilingualism: The fundamentals* (Language Contact and Multilingualism 19), 149–173. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gumperz, J.J., & Wilson, R. (1971). Convergence and creolization: a case from the Indo Aryan/Dravidian border. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages* (pp. 151–168). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Herbert, R. (1990). Hlonipha and the Ambiguous Woman. *Anthropos*, 85, 455-473.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity, (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 35-84
- Jackson, J. (1974). Language identity of the Colombian Vaupés Indians. In R. Bauman, & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, 50–64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, J. (1977). Bará zero generation terminology and marriage. *Ethnology*, XVI(1), 83–104.
- Jackson, J. E. (1983). *The Fish People. Linguistic Exogamy and Tukanoan Identity in Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jourdan, C. (2007). Linguistic paths to urban self in postcolonial Solomon Islands. In M. Makihara, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Consequences of contact. Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies* (pp. 30–48). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Khachatryan, M., & Konoshenko M. (This issue). Assessing (a)symmetry in multilingualism: the case of Mano and Kpelle in Guinea. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Khanina, O. (2019). Praktiki mnogojazyčija v nizov'jax Eniseja : opyt sociolingvističeskogo opisanija situacii v prošlom [Multilingual practice on the Lower Yenisey: A sociolinguistic

description of the situation in the past]. *Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology*, 1, 9–28

- Khanina, O. (This issue). Language and ideologies at multilingual reaches of Lower Yenisei (Siberia). *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Khanina, O., & Koryakov, Y. (2018). Mapping the Enets speaking people and their languages. In S. Drude, N. Ostler, & M. Moser (Eds.), *Endangered languages and the land: Mapping landscapes of multilingualism, Proceedings of FEL XXII/2018* (Reykjavík, Iceland), 69–77. London: FEL & EL Publishing.
- Khanina, O., & Meyerhoff, M. (2018). A case-study in historical sociolinguistics beyond Europe: reconstructing patterns of multilingualism of a language community in Siberia. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), 221–251.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2018). On recognizing persistence in the Indigenous language ideologies of multilingualism in two Native American Communities. *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 133–144.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Language ideologies in the expression and representation of Arizona Tewa identity. *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*, 329–59.
- Le Page, R.B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Li, Y. (This issue). The interaction of age, L2, types of code alternation and multilingualism in the Zauzou community. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Lincoln, P. C. (1979). Dual-lingualism: passive bilingualism in action. *Te Reo. Journal of the Linguistic Society of New Zealand Auckland*, 22, 65–72.
- Lüpke, F. (2016). Uncovering Small-Scale Multilingualism. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 4(2), 35–74. <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/id/eprint/23312>
- Lüpke, F. (2017). African(ist) perspectives on vitality: Fluidity, small speaker numbers, and adaptive multilingualism make vibrant ecologies (Response to Mufwene). *Language*, 93(4), e275–e279.
- Lüpke, F. (2018). Multiple choice: language use and cultural practice in rural Casamance between convergence and divergence. In K. Jacqueline, & W. T. Filho (Eds.), *Creolization and pidginization in contexts of postcolonial diversity: language, culture, identity* (pp. 179–208). Leiden: Brill.
- Lüpke, F. (This issue). Patterns and perspectives shape perceptions: epistemological and methodological reflections on the study of small-scale multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Lüpke, F., & Storch, A. (2013). *Repertoires and choices in African languages* (Vol. 5). Walter de Gruyter.
- Lüpke, F. & Watson, R. (2021). Language contact in West Africa. In Evangelia Adamou & Yaron Matras (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language contact*, 528–549. Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Matić, D. (2019, April 4–6). *Documenting dying languages: kinship avoiding speech in Tundra Yukaghir* [Conference paper]. Linguistic Forum 2019: Indigenous languages of Russia and beyond, Moscow. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uhzXcflimJOT-pV22Fci02R-DdQ-RdAB/view>
- Merlan, F. (1981). Land, language and social identity in Aboriginal Australia. *Mankind Quarterly*, 13(2), 133–148.
- Michael, L. (2011). Language and Culture. In P. Austin, & J. Sallabank (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages* (pp. 120–140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mitchell, Alice. 2015. *Linguistic avoidance and social relations in Datooga*. University at Buffalo Doctoral dissertation.
- Moro, F. (This issue). Multilingualism in eastern Indonesia: linguistic evidence of a shift from symmetric to asymmetric multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Morozova, M. & Rusakov, A. (This issue). Societal multilingualism à la balkanique: the Montenegrin Velja Gorana and beyond. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Mve, P., Tschonghongi, N. C., Di Carlo, P., & Good, J. (2019). Cultural distinctiveness and linguistic esoterogeny: the case of the Fang language of Lower Fungom, Cameroon. In P. Akumbu, & E. P. Chie (Eds.), *Engagement with Africa. Linguistic essays in honor of Ngessimo M. Mutaka* (pp. 163–178). Koeln: Ruediger Koepe.
- O'Connor, M. (1990). Third-person reference in Northern Pomo conversation. *International journal of American linguistics*, 56(3), 377-409.
- Pakendorf, B. (2007). *Contact in the Prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and Genetic Perspectives* (LOT Dissertation Series 170). Utrecht: LOT.
- Pakendorf, B., Gunnink, H., Sands, B., & Bostoen, K. (2017). Prehistoric Bantu-Khoisan language contact. *Language Dynamics and Change*, 7(1), 1–46.
- Pupynina, M. & Aralova, N. (This issue). Lower Kolyma multilingualism: Historical setting and sociolinguistic trends. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Rehbein, J., ten Thije, J. D., & Verschik, A. (2012). Lingua receptiva (LaRa) – remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 16, 248–264.
- Robbins, J. (1998). Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Desire among the Urapmin of Papua New Guinea. *Ethnology*, 37 (4), 299-316.
- Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, meaning, and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist*, 92(2), 346–361.
- Rumsey, A. (2018). The sociocultural dynamics of indigenous multilingualism in northwestern Australia. *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 91–101.
- Sagna, S. & A. Hangtan. (This issue). African multilingualism viewed from another angle: challenging the Casamance exception. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Schreiber, H. (2009). Social networks, linguistic variation and micro-change in an African context. A case study in the borderland of Mali and Burkina Faso. In W. J.G. Möhlig, F. Seidel, & M. Seifert (Eds.), *Language Contact, Language Change and History Based on Language Sources in Africa* (Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 20) (pp. 209–230). Cologne: Köppe.
- Serjeantson, S. (1975). Marriage patterns and fertility in three Papua New Guinean populations. *Human biology*, 47(4), 399–413. www.jstor.org/stable/41462827
- Silva, W. D. L. (2020). Multilingual Interactions and Code-Mixing in Northwest Amazonia. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 86(1), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.1086/705756>
- Silverstein, M. (1972). Chinook Jargon: Language Contact and the Problem of Multi-Level Generative Systems, I. *Language*, 48(2), 378–406.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Silverstein, M. (1981). *The Limits of Awareness. Sociolinguistic Working Paper No. 84.* Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin.
- Simons, G. (1982). Word taboo and comparative Austronesian linguistics. *Pacific Linguistics C-76*, 157–226.
- Singer, R. (2018). A small speech community with many small languages: The role of receptive multilingualism in supporting linguistic diversity at Waruwi Community (Australia). *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 102–118.
- Singer, R., & Harris, S. (2016). What practices and ideologies support small-scale multilingualism? A case study of Waruwi Community, northern Australia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2016(241), 163–208.
- Sorensen Jr, A. P. (1967). Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon 1. *American Anthropologist*, 69(6), 670-684
- Stanford, J. N. (2009). ‘Eating the food of our place’: Sociolinguistic loyalties in multidialectal Sui villages. *Language in Society*, 38, 287–309.
- Stanford, J. N., & Pan, Y. (2013). The sociolinguistics of exogamy: Dialect acquisition in a Zhuang village. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(5), 573-607.
- Stenzel, K. (2005). Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon, revisited. In I. I. L. Martín (Ed.), *Memorias del Congreso de Idiomas Indígenas de Latinoamérica-II* (pp. 1–28). University of Texas at Austin.
- Stenzel, K., & Khoo, V. (2016). Linguistic hybridity: A case study in the Kotiria community. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 4(2), 75–110.
- Stenzel, K. & Williams, N. (In revision). Toward an interactional approach to multilingualism: Ideologies and practices in the northwest Amazon. *Language & Communication*.
- Sutton, P. (1978). *Wik: Aboriginal society, territory and language at Cape Keerweer, Cape York Peninsula*. Brisbane: University of Queensland dissertation (cited from Evans 2017).
- Sutton, P. (1997). Materialism, sacred myth and pluralism: Competing theories of the origin of Australian languages. In F. Merlan, J. Morton, & A. Rumsey (Eds.), *Scholar and sceptic: Australian Aboriginal studies in honour of L.R. Hiatt* (pp. 211-242, 297-309). Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- ten Thije, J. D., & Zeevaert, L. (2007). *Receptive Multilingualism: Linguistic Analyses, Language Policies and Didactic Concepts*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, S. (2008). Language contact and deliberate change. *Journal of language contact*, 1(1), 41-62.
- Vaughan, J. (2018). “We talk in saltwater words”: Dimensionalisation of dialectal variation in multilingual Arnhem Land. *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 119–132.
- Vaughan, J. (2019). The ordinariness of translanguistics in Indigenous Australia. In J. W. Lee, & S. Dovchin (Eds.), *Translanguistics: Negotiating innovation and ordinariness* (pp. 90–103). London: Routledge.
- Vaughan, J., & Singer, R. (2018). Indigenous multilingualisms past and present. *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 83–90.
- Verstraete, J.-C., & Rigsby, B. (2015). *A Grammar and Lexicon of Yintyingka (Pacific Linguistics 648)*. Berlin, Boston, Munich: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Vydrina, A. (This issue). Fouta-Djallon linguistic ecology: between polyglossia and small-scale multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).
- Walworth M., Dewar A., Ennever Th., Takau L., & Rodriguez I. (This issue). Multilingualism in Vanuatu: Four Case Studies. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special issue on "Typology of Small-Scale Multilingualism" edited by N. Dobrushina, O. Khanina, B. Pakendorf).

- Watson, R. (2018). Patterns of lexical correlation and divergence in Casamance. *Language & Communication (Indigenous Multilingualisms)*, 62, 170–183.
- Watson, R. (2019). Language as category: using prototype theory to create reference points for the study of multilingual data. *Language and Cognition*, 11(1), 125–164.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle.
- Wixman, R. (1980). *Language Aspects of Ethnic Patterns and Processes in the North Caucasus*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory* (pp. 1–47). New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.