Christianity, language contact and language change

Maria Khachaturyan
UC Berkeley

1. Introduction

As Ostler claims in his recent book (2016), the influence of religions on languages is a relatively easy and superficial story to tell. He goes on to insist that "[i]n fact, the effect of religions on major lingua francas of the world is easily seen" (Ostler, 2016: xviii). This paper aims to render the problem of language change in religious contexts more subtle. It provides evidence that language change does not consist in a simple endowment with "technical terms" needed "to represent a faith that may originally have been alien" (Ostler, 2016: xviii). In other words, it is not limited to vocabulary. Lexical change is certainly the most visible; but language change may occur at all levels, including the level of morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and language ideology. The paper also argues that the change is not circumscribed to "dialects" used solely in the religious context: the change may affect the standard varieties, as well.

The argument about the linguistic consequences of religious conversion and practice begins with a sketch of a theoretical framework which brings together theoretical insights of works on language contact and works on sociolinguistic variation (Section 2). In Section 3, I apply this framework to instances of language contact with ecclesiastic languages. In section 4, I overview several case studies which exhibit various types of language change as a consequence of religious conversion: historical (Maya, Latin, several languages of Europe) and contemporary (Bosavi, Papua New Guinea), including examples from my own fieldwork (Mano, Guinea).

2. Sociolinguistic variation and language contact

As Weinreich et al. (1968) observed, language is not a homogenous entity with random variation. Indeed, the language is heterogeneous, and variation is patterned into social groupings of various kinds, e.g., class or gender. Communicative competence of speakers consists in handling sets of linguistic variants according to different social situations. Linguistic variants typically have social-indexical properties which are precisely this connection of a variant to a given social situation.

Linguistic heterogeneity can be seen not only in the distribution of variants of a specific linguistic feature (a phoneme, a construction), but also in linguistic varieties, where variety is understood as an association between a "number of linguistic features in covariation, especially features of different sorts (from segmental or prosodic phonology, lexicon, morphology, syntax, discourse structure, or the system of orthographic representation)" (Zwicky & Zwicky, 1982: 213). A variety that is tightly connected to the contexts of its use and to the social personae of its users is called a register: "a register [is] a social regularity of recognition whereby linguistic (and accompanying nonlinguistic) signs come to be recognized as indexing pragmatic features of interpersonal role (persona) and relationship" (Agha, 2005:57). A phenomenon closely related to register is discourse genre, which is also defined both by its formal features and by its extralinguistic features linking it to communicative acts situated in social contexts (Hanks, 1987). The key difference between genres and registers is that genres are types of texts, rather than varieties of language.

A major insight can be gained if the abovementioned sociolinguistic approaches to language variation were applied to situations of language contact. Studies in historical and variational sociolinguistics suggest that "[l]anguage change results from the differential propagation of linguistic variants distributed among the linguistic repertoires of communicatively interacting individuals in a given community" (Michael, 2014:484). In contrast, studies in language contact usually adopt a coarse-grained model of the sociolinguistic world and are interested in change when it affects the standard varieties. Although different social dimensions of the situation of language contact, such as relations of dominance between social groups, are commonly taken into consideration, they often concern relations between speakers of different languages, rather than relations between speakers of the same language. The approach of Sarah Thomason explained in the preface of her book on language contact is illustrative: "The focus of the book is on linguistic results of contact rather than on the sociolinguistics or psycholinguistics of languages in contact" (Thomason, 2001:ix).

However, more often than not, language contact is socially structured and its intensity varies depending on the social situation of interaction and the social profile of the speakers (Enfield, 2003). It can be expected that linguistic results of the contact situation will also depend on the social value attached to the innovations: "it is the endowment of social value on a particular variable that is responsible for launching it into the language of the wider community" (Drinka, 2017:17). The best way to look at the differential results of language contact and change is to take into account the sociolinguistic landscape, including register variation. A careful study of the way a linguistic feature introduced through contact was adopted in texts of a particular genre, written/spoken in a particular register, and then propagated into other registers, potentially becoming a default variant, may help elucidate the process of language contact and change.

An even more specific context favorable to language change is language contact through translation (Mounin, 1963). Indeed, the translator is by definition a bilingual individual, and translated texts show ample evidence of interference phenomena. Although sometimes these innovations are limited to translated texts, they may propagate and become default variants of the recipient language, as shown by Kranich et al. (2011).

3. Language contact and language change in the Christian context

Conversion to Christianity provides good examples for the study of the sociolinguistics of language contact and change, including for the comparative work on different contact situations. In Europe, the population has been exposed, and in a lesser extent, continues to be exposed, to ecclesiastic languages different from the vernacular they habitually spoke. Outside Europe, the missionaries interact with the populations they try to evangelize. Everywhere in the world Christianity goes hand in hand with translation. The contact between ordinarily spoken vernaculars with the languages of the missionaries or the ecclesiastic languages can be seen as a fertile ground for innovations.

Religious affiliation creates social boundaries, so conversion to Christianity restructures social space (Schieffelin, 2014). The processes through which religious affiliation comes to be redefined vary in different historical circumstances (compare Hanks, 2010; Neckebrouk, 1984; Stakeman, 1986). Whatever the historical process behind the conversion to Christianity, it shapes social – and moral – geographies of larger social groups.

Thus, the contact with ecclesiastic languages occurs in socially structured contexts. The ecclesiastic languages themselves are often endowed with high social prestige, or even considered sacred. Moreover, the texts produced and used in the church space typically belong to well-defined genres, such as sermons or prayers. Therefore, linguistic innovations appearing in such contexts acquire a strong social-indexical potential, and therefore, a potential for spreading. As these innovations are taken up in an increasing variety of genres (e.g., not only in translations, but in other ecclesiastic texts and in other written and oral genres), by an increasing number of the speakers (not only the translator, but the priest and the layperson) and in an increasing variety of social contexts (not only in church, but outside of it), the introduced variant becomes the default variant in the language.

The general explanatory framework for language change in Christian contexts can thus be formulated in the following way. Language change can occur in contact, including in the case of translation of ecclesiastic texts. The locus of interference is not the target language as a whole (there is no such thing as a homogenous language), but a specific ecclesiastic register in which ecclesiastic genres are translated and/or performed. In this ecclesiastic register interference with the source language is the strongest. Linguistic features characteristic of ecclesiastic genres become indexes of a religious social space and a religious community. They can potentially spread to other discourses and genres, as they are adopted by larger groups of people and used in more social situations.

4. Case studies

4.1. Community boundaries as indexed in the language

I begin the review of case studies by an example of the way the boundaries of religious communities are indexed in the language.

A classical case of a linguistic form indexing religious affiliation was studied by Silverstein (1985). He argues that the loss of a singular-plural (T/Y) distinction in the second person of pronouns in English, in contrast with other European languages, was due to the ideological struggle between the members of the Puritan sects, especially the

Quakers, and the rest of the (Christian) population and their respective use of language. This example illustrates the idea that among most important relations defining a Christian religious community are relations of inclusion and exclusion (Quaker vs non-Quaker). These relations are reflected in the language and are constantly played out and redefined.

These social relations are also indexed in the speech of present-day Bosavi Christians (Papua New Guinea). Missionization in Bosavi started in the early 1970s. Schieffelin did fieldwork among Bosavi from 1975 to 1995, so the process of conversion and its social and linguistic consequences unfolded before her eyes. In the example 1 below, a Bosavi convert reprimands his relative who was engaged in an unacceptable relationship. The former refers to himself as belonging to the church social space ("inside the mission") and to his interlocutor, as breaching away to the "Satan's side" (Schieffelin 2014:S233). As the example shows, the Bosavi Christian clearly marks in his speech the division of social space and the oppositions between religious identities.

(1) *misini usami godeya: ene wi wa:la iliki*
'I am **inside the mission**, staying **in God's name**'
ge o:go: mada ha:iten hena lab ge nodo: sedalelo:boda dowo: ko:m.
'you are now really in **heathen land**, you completely went to **Satan's side**'

4.2. Change in lexicon. Missionary language prescription

As noted above on several occasions, lexical innovations are common in language contact. In this section, I suggest looking at the process from a different point of view and exploring what may happen with the vocabulary in the missionary linguistic project.

A perfect correspondence in lexicon of two languages is difficult, if not impossible, to establish. Indeed, to take the domain of color terms and the word *white*: in Latin, it corresponds to two terms, *albus* 'white' and *candidus* 'bright, shining white' (see the discussion in Mounin, 1963:76). Any pair, *white – albus* or *white – candidus*, would be an imperfect correspondence: it would gain precision in translation from English into Latin, and lose precision in translation from Latin into English. To cope with this imperfect correspondence in lexicon, languages and their speakers often have a recourse to borrowing.

This problem is most critical for the missionaries translating the Christian literature (including, in some cases, the Bible) and, prior to that translation, composing dictionaries and grammars. One example of such missionary project is the missionization of Yucatan and the Maya, as described by Hanks (2010). Crucially, as Hanks argues, dictionaries and grammars are in such cases not so much descriptive projects, but in many important ways prescriptive: missionaries do not necessarily formulate rules of correspondence of Maya and Spanish terms, but rather establish them. The missionary, therefore, is not to be taken as a more or less successful documentary linguist, but as a potential contributor to language change through the creation of his version of the language in which he subsequently writes the doctrinal texts. In this process change at the lexical level, such as the introductions of terms standing for Christian concepts through borrowing (*sacramentoil* 'sacrament') or neologistic process (*oc ha* <enter + water> 'baptism'), is among the most visible.

However, through the process of translation, even original words of the language "take on multiple meaning in the context of multiple registers, codes, and systems of

signification" (Schieffelin, 2014:S229). Therefore, no less important, but more difficult to study, are the subtle shifts in the semantics of the original terms in a language which were enriched with meanings with Christian connotations. Thus, in the colonial texts, the Maya verb *ok* stands for 'cry', 'weep', but also for 'supplicate', and for the specifically Christian idea 'repent'.

As we will see in Section 4.5, the way ecclesiastic texts get to be used by a religious community is a crucial factor enabling, or constraining, the spread of innovations. In the Maya case, through induced recitation of doctrinal texts in religious practice, the translation decisions ceased to be just missionary versions of the language but became truly spoken and propagated. The variety that thus formed is known as a specific colonial register in Maya, *Maya reducido*, whose properties spread far beyond the colonial world and can be found in "traditional" registers and in particular the books of Chilam Balam and in the speech of the present-day Maya shamans.

4.3. Shift in pragmatics. Emergence of reflexive language

An even more important shift can be seen in the appearance of a totally novel speech activity, like inferring what others are thinking and making these inferences public through acts of speaking, which was studied by Bambi Schieffelin among Bosavi Christians (Schieffelin, 2007). The linguistic vehicle of Christianity among Bosavi was Tok Pisin, one of the three official languages of Papua New Guinea. In the Bosavi community, the Tok Pisin Bible is orally translated from Tok Pisin into the Bosavi vernacular by the pastors during church services. Schieffelin's recordings of these translations date from 1975 to 1995, which gives a nice perspective of the historical development of translation practices. Among her most consequential findings is the development of vocabulary for affective and cognitive states calqued from Tok Pisin. The original Bosavi verb 'to think' in the past tense is *asulo:*. A complex expression *kufa: usa asulo:* <stomach center think.PST> 'thought in heart' gradually entered into usage, calqued from Tok Pisin *tingting long bel* 'think in heart'. What is even more important, prior to missionization, reporting of private thoughts or internal states of others occurred very rarely, and only in a restricted set of speech contexts, namely, certain traditional mythological story genres featuring mythological characters who are outside of human social norms. That explains why the reading and translation of Mark 2:6: ("Now some teachers of the law were sitting there, thinking to themselves"), and especially the "thinking to themselves" part, caused difficulty for the Bosavi pastors doing the translation, which manifested in an exceptional amount of hesitations and self-repair. To give some examples from (Schieffelin, 2007), in the translation version as recorded in 1975, there are two self-repairs, as well as additional material, not present in the source text:

(2) *ili asulakiyo: a:la:* ***asulo:***
'they were thinking their thoughts'
ili kufami ***asul****akiyo:*
'they were thinking in their hearts'
iliyo: mada ***asulo:*** *ko:li nowo: miyo: sa:la: bo:bo:ge*
'some different thoughts came really quickly'

It was not before 1995 that a pastor translated this verse using the above-mentioned calque *kufa: usa asulo:*:

(3) *o: ya:suwa:lo: to siyo: a:no: da:da:sa:ga:yo:* ***asulo:****wo: - lolo: asulo:wo: kaluwa:* ***kufa:usa****miyo: a:la:* ***asulo:***
'having heard what Jesus said, they thought - the men who understood law thought in their hearts'

There were three successive versions of the New Testament in Tok Pisin published in 1969, 1978 and 1989. These versions also saw an important revision in these particular verses, which suggests that speaking about internal states of others is problematic not only for Bosavi, but more generally in Papua New Guinea.

Reflexive speech of the type discussed above, involving reference to other people's thoughts, appeared in the oral Bible translations from Tok Pisin to Bosavi. It is not clear whether this shift in pragmatics made its way outside these specific genres. It is an interesting question for a further study.

4.4. Grammatical influence. Periphrastic perfect

The influence of the ecclesiastic languages, Greek and Latin, on the grammar, morphology and lexicon of European languages was first noticed a long time ago and was studied in the influential article by Franz Blatt (1957) or a classic book by Heine & Kuteva (2006). Among most recent contributions is the collective volume in preparation, edited by Cornillie and Drinka. Another important work is the recently published book by Drinka (2017), which studies language contact in Europe as an essential factor in development of the periphrastic perfect constructions. Drinka makes an intriguing observation that the languages of Europe, including non-Indo-European languages, such as Basque and Hungarian, are split relatively neatly into two zones. In the western zone, as in English, the perfect is formed with the HAVE auxiliary. In most of the languages if the area, HAVE is used with transitive verbs, while BE is used with unaccusative verbs, such as in French, Italian, German, or Dutch. In the eastern zone, including the languages such as Armenian, Greek, or Russian, the perfect is typically formed, or used to be formed, with the BE auxiliary only. Languages in the border zone, including some varieties of Ukrainian, gradually develop HAVE perfects under the Western influence. Thus, western varieties of spoken Ukrainian have developed a HAVE perfect, evidently in contact with spoken Polish, which developed HAVE resultatives in contact with German. The eastern varieties of Ukrainian are influenced by modern Russian and use the construction which in Russian originally contained the BE auxiliary but lost it. The explanation for this distribution that Drinka proposes is related to religious affiliation: she argues that Greek and Latin, ecclesiastic languages of the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, respectively, and the perfect constructions in these languages exercised a superstratal influence on the vernaculars. As a result, the East/West split, "along with the ensuing 'leakage' eastward of the HAVE perfect, appears to replicate fairly precisely the confessional distribution of Orthodoxy vs. Catholicism in Europe" (Drinka, 2017:8).

As noticed by Blatt and several other authors, it is important for the comparative analysis of historical corpora to take into account the feature of genre and style. Latin is expected to have a greater influence on the translated ecclesiastic texts, and then on the ecclesiastic genre as a whole. The historical analysis must be differential and pay close attention to the nature of the text (translated and non-translated), genre, and style. A nice example of this type of work is done by Drinka (2011). In this article Drinka analyzes the borrowing of periphrastic progressive and perfect constructions from Hebrew to the Septuagint Greek, from the New Testament Greek to the Latin of the Vulgate and to Old

Church Slavonic, and from Latin to Gothic. One of the examples is the usage of the objective complement-type periphrastic with *have* ('a certain man had a fig tree planted' (Luke 13:6)) calqued from Greek into the Vulgate. The Vulgate, the late fourth-century translation of the Bible, was in large part the work of St. Jerome. Apart from this major work, there are other texts written by him, including his personal letters, which, crucially, do not have the same style as his translations. Thus, the same objective complement-type periphrastic occurs only once. Crucially, it occurs in the letter whose style is "notably learned and even, perhaps, haughty" (Drinka, 2011:51). Therefore, as expected, grammatical interference is genre and style-sensitive.

4.5. What if there is no stable ecclesiastic register?

The examples provided so far may create an impression that the language in the context of religious conversion and translation is highly malleable and open to change. This is not necessarily the case: semantic structures of a language may undermine translation process. As a result, the Christian message may undergo a considerable transformation (or "re-invention", Ostler, 2016). I suggest that the variability of the ecclesiastic register may impede the adoption of innovations.

I have been doing fieldwork among Guinean Mano, including the Mano Catholic community, since 2009. The missionary presence among Mano started around 1940 and ended some thirty years later. Ever since, proselytizing efforts have been made almost exclusively by locals. The Catholic community barely counts 4% (or 3,200) of the overall Mano population in Guinea (80,000). There are several notable characteristics of the register used in church, including the usage of archaic words and elements of the traditional ritual speech, but I will limit the discussion only to the external influence. The key feature of the Christian register is that it allows for interpersonal variation.

The official language of the country is French. During Mass and other celebrations, the readings are typically made from the Sunday Missal, a collection of texts intended for reading on Sundays and on feast days. The Bible excerpts prescribed by the Missal are first read in French and then orally translated into Mano. Only few Mano have access to a French Bible or a Sunday Missal. There exists a translation of the New Testament into Mano, but it is used predominantly by Mano Protestants, although Mano Catholics occasionally read the Gospels from it. In Mano villages, French is barely spoken, and, although schools are in French, the level of mastery of French is relatively low.

French (and, in rarer cases, English) become sources of borrowings and calques (see a discussion in Khachaturyan, 2015 of variability in borrowing). It seems, however, that European languages exercises only a minor influence on Mano. The source of borrowing for many lexical items standing for Christian concepts is not French or English, but Kpelle, the language of a neighboring ethnic group. Kpelle started to convert to Catholicism earlier and in larger numbers; the quasi-totality of local clergy is Kpelle. Even in monolingual communities Mano are exposed to Kpelle in church. During the six months of fieldwork among Mano Catholics in 2014 and in 2015-2016, the Mass was held four times (the rest of the time, in the absence of a priest to perform a Mass, the catechists performed Sunday celebration). However, the Mass was held in Mano only twice, the other two times it was held in Kpelle. Besides the Christian context, Mano has long been in intense contact with Kpelle, so there are numerous contact phenomena in the vocabulary and in the grammar. Thus, the word *kālàŋ̀* 'catechism, church, Christianity' is arguably a borrowing from Kpelle *kàlân* 'teaching (religious or secular)'.

Many innovations brought in from Kpelle are unstable, including the calques, two of which are discussed below. Both in Mano and in Kpelle nouns are divided into two syntactic classes: alienably possessed and inalienably possessed. For alienably possessed nouns the expression of the possessor is optional. Inalienably possessed nouns, such as the word 'father' in Kpelle (*náŋ̀*) and in Mano (*dàā*), are typically accompanied by a possessor. However, in certain Kpelle formulas such as "in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit" or "glory be to the Father", the word 'father' is used without a possessor. Certain Mano speakers systematically follow the Kpelle model:

(4) *dàā* *wà* *né* *wà* *kílí* *mésíà* *ō* *tɔ́* *yí* (Mano)
father and son and spirit proper 3PL name in
'In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit'

Crucially, however, the usage of the syntactic calque in question is limited to the abovementioned religious formulas and occurs only in speech of certain individuals, while other Mano speakers systematically use the word *dàā* 'father' with a possessor, including in the abovementioned formula. It is noteworthy that Mano allow variability even in the core religious formulas. This variability is probably what prevents the innovation from further spreading: having a choice between a variant that goes against the common syntactic pattern (an inalienably possessed noun without a possessor) and a variant that follows it, the speakers may prefer to choose the latter. Therefore, although the syntactic pattern under discussion does become a feature of the ecclesiastic register of certain speakers in their usage of specific formulas, it did not stabilize in the Mano ecclesiastic register as a whole.

Sometimes innovations are even more restricted in circulation. E.L., the only Mano-speaking priest, is born of a Kpelle father and a Mano mother, so his Mano is heavily influenced by Kpelle. On January 25, 2016, he was reading from Luke 4:17 and translated the word *prophète* 'prophet' par *kélá*, which in Mano means 'witness'. The word 'witness' has a similar form in Kpelle. However, while in Kpelle the word belongs to the class of alienably possessed nouns and is combined with possessive pronouns following the full noun phrase of the possessor (ex. 5a), in Mano, the noun belongs to the class of inalienably possessed nouns and, when used with a full noun phrase of the possessor, does not require a possessive pronoun (ex. 5b).

(5) a. *yala* *ŋɔ* *kela* (Kpelle; the tones are omitted because I do
God 3SG.POSS witness not know their precise realization)
'God's witness'

b. *wálà* *kélá* (Mano)
God witness
=5a

In his translation into Mano, and on another occasion, E.L. used exactly the same construction as in Kpelle, with a possessive pronoun (ex. 6). Such construction in Mano is ungrammatical, but is a result of Kpelle influence, as explained to me by my primary consultant. Thus, (6) is structurally identical to (5a), but different from (5b). The third case where *kélá* was used as in (6) was in the speech of a Mano catechist, who is not fluent in Kpelle. Crucially, that third token occurred, once again, in the church context.

(6) *wálà* *là* *kélá* (Mano)
God 3SG.POSS witness
'God's witness' (ungrammatical, but occurred in the speech of E.L.)

To sum up, in the case of influence of Kpelle, French, and English on Mano, innovations often remain occasional. In religious formulas innovative features are systematically reproduced, at least in the speech of certain individuals. But even the sustained repetition is not enough to make them a standard, so the circulation of these innovations remains limited. It is perhaps the variability of the Mano ecclesiastic register that limits the chances of the innovations to get stabilized, let alone to spread to the standard vernacular. The reasons for such variability and the extent to which Mano case contrasts with other cases reviewed above remain a question for future investigation.

Conclusion

In this paper, I argued that conversion to Christianity and Christian practice provide a context for linguistic contact between the vernacular language of the converted population and the ecclesiastic language. This contact, as any other language contact, can trigger language change. Moreover, because religious affiliation often provokes the division of social space, it is responsible for the development of strong social-indexical characteristics of innovative features introduced through contact. I suggested a gradual model of language change which implies that the change will first occur and stabilize in ecclesiastic genres and only then spread to the standard or to other varieties. I also emphasized the role of translation in this process. I provided examples of several case studies of change in vocabulary (colonial Maya), morphology (European languages, Latin), and pragmatics (Bosavi). The discussion of examples of syntactic change in Mano, where certain innovations introduced in the situation of contact in Christian context failed to stabilize, suggests that the variability of the ecclesiastic register is the factor impeding the spread of innovations. The model of language change in contact applied in this paper which takes into account the sociolinguistic landscape, as well as such factors as distribution of variants in different registers, can contribute to the studies of language contact and change beyond the Christian context.

References

Agha, A. (2005). Voicing, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 15*(1), 38–59.

Blatt, F. (1957). Latin influence on European syntax. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague 11*, 33-69.

Drinka, B. (2011). The Sacral Stamp of Greek: Periphrastic constructions in New Testament translations of Latin, Gothic, and Old Church Slavonic. In: Eirik Welo (Ed.), *Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: Contrastive approaches*. *Oslo Studies in Language 3*(3), 41-73.

Drinka, B. (2017). *Language contact in Europe. The periphrastic perfect through history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enfield, N. J. (2003). *Linguistic epidemiology. Semantics and grammar of language contact in mainland Southeast Asia*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Hanks, W. F. (1987). Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice. *American Ethnologist 14*(4), 668-692.

Hanks, W. F. (2010). *Converting words. Maya in the Age of the Cross*. Berkeley: UCP.

Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2006). *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khachaturyan, M. (2015). *"Did the fire of baptism burn you?" Translation and understanding in Mano Catholic service*. Talk presented at Linguistic anthropology working group, UC Berkeley, Department of Anthropology.

Kranich, S., Becher, V., & Höder S. (2011). A tentative typology of translation-induced language change. In Svenja Kranich (Ed.), *Multilingual discourse production: Diachronic and synchronic perspectives* (pp. 9–44). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Michael, L. (2014). Social dimensions of language change. In Claire Bowern and Bethwyn Evans (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics* (pp. 484-502). London: Routledge.

Mounin, G. (1963). *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.

Neckebrouck, V. (1984). Incluturation et identité. *Cultures et développement 14*(2), 250-275.

Ostler, N. (2016). Passwords to paradise: How languages have re-invented world religions. London: Bloomsbury.

Schieffelin, B. B. (2007). Found in Translating: Reflexive Language across Time and Texts in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea. In Miki Makinara and Bambi B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Consequences of contact. Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies* (pp. 140-165). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. (2014). Christianizing language and the dis-placement of culture in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea. *Current Anthropology 55*(S10), S226-S237.

Silverstein, M. (1985). Language and culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In Elizabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier (Eds.), S*emiotic mediation: Sociocultural and psychological perspectives* (pp. 219-259). Academic Press.

Stakeman, R. (1986). *The cultural politics of religious change. A study of the Sanoyea Kpelle in Liberia.* Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Thomason, S. (2001). *Language contact: an introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Weinreich, U., Labov, W., & Herzog, M.. (1968). Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In Winfred Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel (Eds.), *Directions for historical linguistics* (pp. 97-195). Austin: UT Press.

Zwicky, A. M., & Zwicky, A. D. (1982). Register as a Dimension of Linguistic Variation. In Richard Kittredge and John Lehrberger (Eds.), *Sublanguage. Studies of language in restricted semantic domains* (pp. 213-218). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Maria Khachaturyan
University of California, Berkeley
Department of Anthropology
232 Kroeber Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-3710
mashaha@gmail.com