Language contact

Book · January 2020

CITATION		READS
1		23,398

1 author:

Peter Auer
University of Freiburg
390 PUBLICATIONS **11,922** CITATIONS

<div align="right">8</div>

Language contact
Pragmatic factors

Peter Auer

---

1. Introduction and definitions

Language contact is usually seen as a result of social factors enabling, encouraging or forcing speakers of different languages to communicate with each other. The type and amount of linguistic contact appears to be conditioned by these social factors (cultural, political, or economic superiority and power, etc.), as well as the concomitant language ideologies. In addition, grammatical parameters (the linguistic resources available to the speakers, the amount of structural overlap between the grammars and vocabularies, the amount of variation within the languages, etc.) have been shown to impact on the quantity and quality of language contact (see Thomason and Kaufman, 1988 for an initial overview). It is often forgotten that in addition to (and sometimes underlying) these social and linguistic factors, the pragmatics of language use also play an important role. These are the topics of this chapter.

Before going into details, both the concept of language contact and that of pragmatics need some clarification. The idea of 'languages' being in 'contact' is part of the structuralist heritage of linguistics (even though the notion of 'Sprachmischung' has of course nineteenth-century predecessors); in this tradition, research on language contact has focused on the outcomes of processes due to which (at least) one linguistic system changes under the influence of another, without looking at these processes themselves (i.e., after the change was complete). The term 'language contact' is here short for 'contact-induced language change.' At this level of abstraction, the idea of a pragmatic, action-based approach to language contact makes little sense, for languages do not 'act.' The problem with such a structuralist approach to language contact is that its explanatory value is limited. Modern contact linguists have therefore moved beyond the idea of language systems influencing each other and consider instead the languages users as the real carriers of language contact. It is generally acknowledged today that language contact occurs in bilingual encounters (in the widest sense of 'bilingual' and 'encounter,' including, in addition to social encounters, also written communication) and in bilingual cognition, not (or only in a very metaphorical sense) between language systems, and it is there that any explanation must start (cf. Matras, 2009). There is therefore a large area of overlap between research on language contact and research on bilingualism and second language acquisition. Indeed, some researchers' definition of language contact closely resembles a definition of

bilingualism. Already Weinreich starts his ground-breaking 1963 book on 'Languages in Contact' by equating the two: 'Two or more languages will be said to be IN CONTACT if they are used alternately by the same persons' (1963, p. 1). Thomason (2001, p. 1) echoes him when she defines 'language contact [as] the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time.' On the other hand, there is also general agreement that even at the level of the speakers, language contact presupposes not only bilingual language use, but also some kind of (unidirectional or mutual) influence of the speakers' cognitive representations of their languages. One can of course question whether there can be bilingualism without such a mutual influence of the languages in the speakers' mind (and often also in their linguistic behaviour): the normal and unmarked state for the bilingual is not the monolingual, but the bilingual mode in which both languages are activated (Grosjean, 2001). In this sense, bilingualism may always entail language contact in the individual. Nevertheless, there is a difference of analytical focus between studies of language contact and studies of bilingualism.

In a narrow sense, language contact requires, according to most researchers, that the unilateral or mutual influence of the two languages is more than momentary, and that it occurs in a similar way in more than one individual. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between the effects of the use of two languages on the cognitive representation of these languages in the individual speakers, or on their behaviour, which may be idiosyncratic and fleeting, and the larger-scale impact of bilingual communicative contacts at the community-level.

For instance, the acquisition of a second language regularly passes through phases of interferences with the first language. However, these interferences usually disappear in the course of the acquisition process or remain idiosyncratic. In some cases, however, interference features fossilize and occur so systematically in a group of learners that a new variety emerges due to language contact, which is perhaps even handed on to the next generation as an L1. Another example is code-switching. It is often the case that bilingual speakers switch between their languages within an encounter or even within a sentence, without this behaviour leaving a trace in the mental representation of their two language systems, let alone on the community level. Here again, we are on the level of individual actions, and no language contact (in the narrow sense) is involved per se. In other cases, however, frequent switching or mixing may lead to convergence of the contact varieties in the bilingual community; this is a lasting effect of bilingual behaviour which falls under the heading of language contact.

In sum, while the origins of language contact cannot be located anywhere but in bilingual language use and cognition, language contact means more than bilingual behaviour and language processing in the individual, or even in an aggregate of individuals in isolation. Like all language change, it is a social process. Conversely, contact-induced change also goes beyond bilingualism. The contact-induced innovations that originate in bilingual speakers may spread across the community and be adopted by monolingual speakers as well. The sociolinguistic mechanisms of such a spread are usually the same as in endogenous change, but they are part of the total picture of language contact.

In this chapter, the pragmatics of language contact will therefore *not* be equated with the pragmatics of bilingual (inter-)action; this would be a field that is impossible to summarize in a short article anyway. Rather, the pragmatics of language contact will be understood as dealing with those non-momentary and non-idiosyncratic contact phenomena that can be explained (at least in part) by the pragmatics of (bilingual) language use. Not much research has been done from such a perspective and some of the thoughts presented in the following will therefore have a slightly programmatic character.

The definition of pragmatics as a field within linguistics is notoriously difficult. Mostly, pragmatics is defined as the study of action, i.e., as the ways in which we can 'do things with

words' (to quote Austin's felicitous phrase). Other writers define pragmatics as the study of how linguistic meaning is created in and by its context. The two views are intricately linked, as actions can only be recognized and thereby become meaningful in their context. In this chapter, both views will be pursued. But whatever definition of pragmatics is chosen, it is obvious that a pragmatic approach to language contact is more restrictive than, and hence not identical with, a speaker-centred approach. This is due to the fact that a large number of contact phenomena on the level of the individual speaker do not serve pragmatic ends. They are either not intentional and occur below the radar of action-formation or fail to contribute to meaning-making in context.

A pragmatic approach to language contact can be broken down again into three more specific research questions.

First, it is possible to look into the pragmatic needs of speakers in bilingual encounters in order to establish correlations with the ensuing contact-induced changes. The question here is: for which pragmatic reasons do the speakers use the language which, as a consequence, undergoes contact-induced change? Or, for which pragmatic purposes does a new contact variety emerge? This requires a study of the 'communicative household' (Luckmann, 1986) of a community, which, (theoretically) comprises all the action and activity types that are relevant to it, together with their status in the community. We can then ask which of these actions and activities are linked to the language that is undergoing change (or the variety that emerges due to language contact), and which actions and activities are linked to the dominant (donor) language.

The aim here is to find correlations between specific pragmatic needs and specific types of language contact. To give a simple example: when the activities linked to a specific variety only serve the pragmatic needs of trade and commerce, limited to perfunctory and temporally limited exchanges, types of language contact will emerge (such as trade pidgins with simplified grammar, or *lingue franche* with distinctive substrate features of the speakers' L1) that are different from those in a social situation in which the contact language has to take over the entire communicative household (as in language shift).

The realm of pragmatic explanations for contact-induced changes increases substantially when acts of identity (in the sense of Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985) are included. Social identity is a powerful motivation for copying elements from another language or variety into one's own (or for refraining from doing so), as such borrowing is a highly efficient strategy for expressing affiliation with a social group. The usual appeal to language attitudes as a 'predictor' of contact-induced change (Thomason, 2010, p. 36) can be reframed – at least in its intentional part – as a pragmatic wish to perform acts of identity. In fact, if attitudes are understood as dispositions for behaviour, an approach that stresses the performative, pragmatic character of acts of identity seems to be particularly adequate. Acts of identity take place in the social arena of interaction and may be more suited to explain the adoption and spread of an identity-related innovation in the community than mental dispositions.

While this first pragmatic approach to language contact is linked strongly to (macro-) social factors in language contact, the **second**, perhaps somewhat more controversial approach zooms in on the microstructure of conversational exchanges. Code-switching (the use of elements from various 'codes' in an interactional exchange) is a specific resource that is available to multilingual speakers for structuring these exchanges and in this sense obviously a pragmatic phenomenon. The research question here is: what kind of consequences does code-switching have on the languages involved? Frequent code-switching can make the 'codes' involved converge with each other over time. That convergence can go hand in hand with matter borrowing (Matras, 2009), in the simplest case of lexical material, in more advanced cases by grammatical fusion and the emergence of so-called mixed languages. But it can also be manifest

in pattern borrowing, which means that the grammatical systems of the languages-in-contact becoming more similar (which facilitates frequent clause-internal switching). Convergence here is a non-intentional effect of intentional switching between the languages for discourse-related reasons.

A **third** pragmatic approach in contact linguistics starts from the definition of pragmatics as the study of linguistic meaning-making in context, with a special focus on deictic and discourse-structuring grammatical means whose very job it is to situate language in context. These pragmatic elements of language play a special role in language contact. It is well known that discourse markers and other pragmatically rich elements are particularly prone to borrowing. But 'pragmatic borrowing' goes far beyond discourse markers. It can affect syntax (e.g., via word order) and morphology (e.g., via the borrowing of derivational morphology or modal and epistemic affixes) as well. Here, the main research question is to investigate which pragmatic needs of the speaker are so pressing that the relevant structures of one language are copied into the language that undergoes contact-induced change.

2. Historical overview: actions and activity types as drivers of language-contact

Explanations of language contact often refer to lists of generalized social/sociolinguistic scenarios. For instance, Myers-Scotton (2002, pp. 31–32) distinguishes between (1) military invasion and subsequent colonization, (2) living in a border area or an ethnolinguistic enclave, (3) migration for social and economic reasons, (4) education, (5) spread of international languages, and (6) ethnic awareness. While such listings are useful and valid for demonstrating the variety of sociolinguistic constellations under which bilingualism and language contact occur, there are reasons to believe that they are not specific enough to lead to hypotheses on correlations between phenomena of language contact and their sociolinguistic embedding. It seems more likely that such hypotheses can be formulated when generalized sociolinguistic scenarios (such as the ones mentioned earlier) are broken down into the typical and recurrent action and activity types that are required in each case.

Let us consider just one of these scenarios as an example: migration. Migration can have hugely different outcomes in terms of language contact depending on which parts of the communicative household require competence in the language of the receiving society, even when the same languages and the same societies are involved. For instance, adult work immigration from Turkey and other Mediterranean countries into Germany (as well as other central and northern Europe countries) in the 1960s and 1970s required the acquisition of some German, but the pragmatic needs it had to serve were limited. German was basically needed in order to understand instructions to do simple manual jobs in the workplace. Outside work, few opportunities to use German were offered by the receiving society (nor were they sought by the immigrants since few of them originally planned a more than temporary stay). The resulting pidgin-like variant of German (cf. for a summary Klein and Perdue, 1997) corresponded to these limited pragmatic opportunities. The huge numbers of later immigrants in the 1990s from Eastern Europe (mainly Russia and Poland) did not lead to any similar developments. One of the explanatory factors[1] surely is the much broader pragmatic profile connected to German which is needed today in order to succeed in a job market that requires much more sophisticated skills, together with the long-time perspective of living in Germany connected with these migratory movements which also requires communicative competences well beyond those needed by (and offered to) the 'guest workers.'

That migration as such is too broad a factor when it comes to finding correlations with formal outcomes of language contact can also be demonstrated by looking at second or third generation immigrants today and comparing them to previous cases of labour immigration into Germany. An example is the substantial immigration of Polish-speaking workers into the mining sites of the Ruhr District in the late nineteenth century. This migration has left no traces; people of Polish-speaking descent shifted to German in the second generation. In contrast, present-day Turkish-German bilingualism is rather stable; again, a constellation of factors contributes to this situation (among them the continuous influx of new L1 speakers of Turkish), but one of them is pragmatic: Turkish is needed and useful not only for communication within the large Turkish-speaking community in Germany today, but also for uninterrupted family, friendship, and media contacts with Turkey. The linguistic household requires spoken Turkish for informal purposes, while competence in more formal (and particularly written) forms of the language is dwindling and characterized by grammatical interferences with German (cf. Şimşek and Schroeder, 2011). No specific Turkish contact-variety has consolidated itself, but for identity displays, a pan-ethnic German-based youth register (multi-ethnolect) may be used. In addition to various deviations from mainstream German grammar (cf. Siegel, 2018) it allows for the integration of a few Arab- or Turkish-origin interjections or address terms that are shared with other speakers of immigrant background.[2] Alternatively, the speakers may resort to code-switching and mixing.

The general aim of a pragmatic approach to language contact is to map the resources in the speakers' bi- or multilingual repertoire onto the structures of their communicative household. According to Luckmann (1986), this communicative household can be seen as a system of recurrent patterns of action that have undergone typification. Their relevance is socially and culturally determined. While in one society, certain action types may be particularly salient and of high social value, the same action types may not be of prime relevance in another. Sequences of actions may also become typified into communicative genres (Luckmann, 1986). For instance, western middle class cultures have typified certain forms of phatic communication under the folk concept of 'conversation' (as evidenced by the normative expectations that lead to an evaluation of good and bad conversations, and the codification of an 'art of conversation' that can be taught and acquired), while in others, there may be elaborate, formal rules for insulting or praising others that have developed into communicative genres of their own. Salutation routines may be of primary importance in one society while they may be reduced to a minimum in others. On a still larger level of abstraction, action and activity types can be grouped into 'domains of action,'[3] based on society members' schematic knowledge about the actions and activities linked to them.

The program of a pragmatic approach to language contact yields the best results when the pragmatic needs that a language must serve are rather precisely defined. Here are some examples.

When interlanguage communication among adult speakers is restricted to a small and narrowly defined number of action types in only one domain of action, one of the recurrent linguistic solutions is the emergence of simplified contact varieties (Ferguson and DeBose, 1977). They present a minimal solution for problems of understanding in sociolinguistic contexts in which understanding is rather unlikely, given the non-overlapping linguistic repertoires of the speakers. A clear case is the domain of trade and commerce, and well-known examples are trade pidgins which developed along trade routes, for instance on the West African coast. Typically, these varieties are highly specialized in their pragmatic profile: they are only used for activities linked to buying and selling (making offers, bargaining, etc.). Another requirement

for trade pidgins is that they must be easy to acquire; hence, their structure typically shows reductions on all levels of linguistic structure. A typical example of such a trade pidgin is Russonorsk, as spoken in the arctic region in order to facilitate communication between Norwegians and Russians (as well as Sami etc.) in the fish trade between the mid-eighteenth century and the Russian revolution (cf. Jahr, 1997). The speakers were mainly fishermen who sold their fish to the Russian ships (the Norwegian middle classes apparently spoke a simplified version of Russian). The pidgin had a limited number of topically relevant words coming from both languages, almost no morphology (despite the rich morphology of both contact languages), rigid SOV word order (despite the pragmatic word order in both contact languages), and it shows overgeneralizations of the use of certain grammatical words from both languages (such as the Russian question word *kak* 'how' as a generalized conjunction, or the Norwegian preposition *på*/ Russian preposition *pa* 'in' as a generalized preposition). The overall strategy of Russonorsk (as well as other trade pidgins) is to (over-)exploit overlapping structures and drop the divergent structures in the grammar of both languages, which is a typical strategy for ensuring interaction in a situation of hardly overlapping repertoires when only a limited number of action types need to be served.

Consider, as an example for this strategy, the following extract (from Franziskus and Gilles, 2012, pp. 63–64). The recording was made in Luxemburg where a huge number of foreigners commute for work from the neighbouring countries Germany, France, and Belgium, usually on a daily basis. The two speakers, employees of a supermarket, share only few linguistic resources. Melanie is a native speaker of French and comes from Belgium; she has a very limited knowledge of Luxemburgish (a Germanic language closely related to the dialects spoken in neighbouring Germany) and no knowledge of German. Elena is a native speaker of German and has no knowledge of French or Luxemburgish. However, her own dialect allows her to understand some Luxemburgish. Melanie and Elena share a core inventory of words related to the (officially Luxembourgish-speaking) domain of work, some of which have cognates in their own language: *Etikett* ('price tag'), *Klient* ('costumer,' with a slightly different meaning in German, and a different pronunciation in French and Luxembourgish: /kliã/), *storno* ('cancellation,' 'reversing entry'), *retour* ('return'), *präis* (Germ. /prais/, no cognate in French). The episode takes place while they are stocking shelves (French in italics, German underlined, Luxembourgish and dialect boldface, ambiguous passages recte; transcription according to GAT2):

```
01   mel:   et le prÄis eh direct eh:
            'and the price ehm directly ehm'
02          (1.0)
03          etiKETT?
            'price tag?'
04   ele:   <<in the back> ja=ja [ge] nau;>
                             'yes yes exactly'
05   mel:                    [oui;]
06          (1.0)
07   ele:   und eh (.) (für) Oben-=ne?
            'and uhm (for) top-=eh? '
08          (1.0)
09          (für) Oben.
            'for top.'
10          wenn kliEnt nEt (.) NET [kofen-=ne?]
            'when client not not buy eh?'
```

11	mel:		[*oui fri*] *GO*.
		'yes fridge.'	
12		(1.0)	
13	ele:	<u>eh ma*?</u>	
		'uhm do'	
14		<u>ja=aber ERST</u> eh retour.=<u>ne?</u>	
		'yes but first uhm retour. eh?'	
15		STORno.	
		'cancellation'	
16		(1.0)	
17	mel:	ah oKE.	
18	ele:	<u>ne?</u>	
		'right?'	
19		<u>machs jetzt hier normal dann sO:</u> etiKE[TT?]	
		'now you do it here normally then like this price label?'	
20	mel:		[*oui*]
21		*ou* <u>klEin</u> etiKETT?=*eh:-*	
		'or small price label=uhm:'	
22	ele:	(.) *non*	
		'no'	
23		<u>machs hier=kanns hIer RICHtig</u> etikett.	
		'you put here = you can correct price tag here'	
24	mel:	*oui*	
25	ele:	(de) <u>klIent</u> [KAUFT ja.]	
		'the client buys, yes.'	
26	mel:		[oKE]

In the pragmatically highly determined context of their work in the supermarket, the speakers have developed strategies to make themselves understood. Two of these strategies stand out, and it is easy to see their resemblance to the structures found in a trade pidgin such as Russonorsk. One is the use of key terms linked to the action domain in question and known to both of them. They provide a kind of skeleton for meaning-making. When these words are cognates in the contact languages, they are particularly useful. The second strategy is grammatical simplification; Elena's German utterances such as *aber ERST eh retour* 'but first return' (14) or *kanns hIer RICHtig etikett* 'you can correct price tag' (23) come from a simplified register ('xenolect') in which full verbs are lacking. Melanie sometimes also speaks in fragments of German with highly simplified grammar (*klEin etiKETT?*, line 21 instead of *ein kleines Etikett* 'a small tag'). The same holds for Melanie's French (cf. *oui friGO* 'yes, fridge,' line 11). A third strategy is to switch for minimal contributions in the other person's language; cf. Elena's use of the French negation particle *non* in line 22.

Russonorsk is typical but also special as the groups of speakers who used it to communicate were of more or less equal social status, which may have fostered the inclusion of Norwegian *and* Russian elements. In other cases of contact with a very narrow pragmatic profile, power asymmetries restrict the overtly borrowed components to one language (the one spoken by the more powerful group). The *Gastarbeiter* variety of German alluded to earlier is an example (as well as many other pidgins that have emerged in the work domain); the L1 of the speakers (Turkish, Italian, Greek, Spanish, etc.) does not play an overt role in it. So-called *Kitche Duits* spoken by African servants in German households is another example, although here more

indigenous lexicon seems to have been involved (cf. Deumert, 2009). Once again only one domain (that of work/service) is concerned, and the number of action types which the register has to serve is restricted.

In these examples, a minimum of mutual comprehension is at stake (and achieved); but there are also contact varieties of an equally narrow pragmatic profile which serve the opposite, i.e., non-comprehension. An example are cryptolects ('secret languages'). Here, the pragmatic motivation is to communicate with group-members in certain situations and for certain purposes in the presence of out-group participants without being understood (which may be advantageous, for instance while bargaining with a customer). For such a cryptolect to work, it is necessary to replace (parts of) the core referential lexicon of the language shared with the out-group with words taken from one or more languages that are not intelligible to them; syntax and inflectional morphology may not be affected. Matras (2009, pp. 291–297) discusses several cryptolects that used to be spoken in Germany, such as Yenish, which is in use among traveling families who live on changing service occupations, or Lekoudesch, which was used by Jewish cattle-traders. These languages can be called 'symbiotic' (Smith, 2000) in the sense of relying on another language (the host) for most of their grammar and lexicon, with only the relevant lexical items replaced by new (contact) vocabulary. The host language of Yenish is (dialectal) German, into which words from Rotwelsch (the German 'thieves' cant'), Hebrew and Romani were borrowed. The host language of Lekoudesch was a Judeo-German ethnolect to which Hebrew words were added.

Another example of a contact variety with a narrow pragmatic profile is language play. A very learned example is Macaronic Latin, which emerged as a literary genre of parody, and was popular from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century. It first developed in Italy and was then copied in almost all other European societies by elite writers. Macaronic Latin (cf. Demo, i.pr.) consisted of a mixture of (classical/vulgar/medieval/'kitchen') Latin and Italian/Italo-romance dialect. It started out as a parody of the 'degenerate' Latin spoken and written in Europe in the early renaissance (i.e., a Latin full of interferences with the vernacular languages). Quite different from the examples discussed before, the structure of Macaronic Latin involves no simplifications. Most of the grammatical elements are taken from Classical Latin, into which lexemes/roots of the vernacular language are inserted. The only pragmatic function in addition to parody and fun was to display the writer's sophisticated knowledge of Classical Latin and its literature (to which many allusions were made), which nicely corresponds with its complex structure.

So far, we have discussed examples in which a very specific and narrow pragmatic profile could be correlated with structural features of language contact. Once the pragmatic tasks to be served by the variety/register/language undergoing contact-induced change multiply, and become more complex, the relationship between pragmatic function and linguistic structure is more difficult to pinpoint. It is then often useful to compare two socially, linguistically, and culturally very close groups in which different processes of language contact set in due to diverging pragmatic profiles. Here is an example.

Adamou (2010) compares two languages spoken in Thrace (Greece) by Muslim minorities which have traditionally been in contact with Turkish: the Southern Slavonic language Pomak and the Balkan-Romani (Vlach) language spoken in Komotini. In both cases, the speakers are mostly trilingual today (with Turkish and Greek in addition to the minority language), and Turkish is more and more becoming the dominant language. However, Pomak is not undergoing much contact-induced change, although speakers code-switch between Pomak and Turkish; they do so while keeping the structures of the languages more or less separate. There are numerous lexical borrowings, which are always integrated into Pomak morphology; verbs are

rarely borrowed. In addition, the speakers use Turkish expressions for rituals (such as greetings) to express their Islamic identity (which of course contrasts with the orthodox Christian orientation of the Greek-speaking majority). Quite in contrast, Komotini Romani has developed into a 'fused lect' (Auer, 2014, i.e., a lect characterized by heavy structural borrowing), in which borrowed Turkish elements have become obligatory. This Turkish influence is not recent but must have impacted on Komotini Romani during the Ottoman empire (as similar forms of fusion can be found in Vlach communities in which Turkish is not spoken any longer). The most striking difference from Pomak is that Turkish verbs are borrowed together with the entire Turkish aspect, person, and tense morphology into Komotini Romani, leading to a partial compartmentalization of the language (verbal system = Turkish, nominal system = Romani). The impact of Turkish on the language has therefore been much stronger than in the case of Pomak – despite the fact that both minority groups have experienced the same sociolinguistic history with Turkish as the prestige language (and *lingua franca*) in the Balkans. As Adamou points out, the reasons are to be found in the language ecology of the two languages at the time when the present-day contact patterns originated, and the different pragmatic profiles that resulted from it. The Pomaks lived as (semi-sedentary) farmers and cattle-breeders in a rather isolated mountain region, and their communicative contact with Turkish-speaking people in Ottoman times was restricted to the religious domain (with the exception of (elite) members of the community who travelled). Consequently, the borrowings come from this domain; they served religious and cultural pragmatic needs (and therefore mainly extend to close kinship terms, greetings, and thanking expressions). The Roma in Ottoman times were mostly non-sedentary and always in interaction with Turkish-speaking people for instrumental reasons, as their existence was built on trading and providing services as craftsmen for the *gadze* (non-Roma). But at the same time, the Roma communities had strict rules on how to communicate with the outsiders thereby protecting their own group identity. This social-communicative situation is reflected in grammatical structure: Turkish elements are marked as such (by carrying along their Turkish grammatical markers) and not integrated into Romani structures, but they are also systematic and therefore compartmentalize the grammar. Hence the different language ecologies with their specific pragmatic profile resulting from different ways of interacting with mainstream society can be mapped on the existing language contact patterns. It might be added that a purely identity-related or attitudinal explanation would not be successful in accounting for the differences in this case: both groups are separate from Greek mainstream society (due, in the first place, to their religious orientation), but also from the Turks. If anything, it is the less Turkish-oriented community, the Roma, which has experienced more Turkish language contact.

But of course, the choice of a particular way of speaking one's own language which is strongly or weakly (or not at all) influenced by an (outgroup) contact language, can also be an act of identity. Language-related acts of identity are superimposed on the pragmatics of language use, i.e., they are usually not performed for their own sake, but as a kind of metapragmatic comment on what is verbally done.

Germans in the late nineteenth century who increasingly avoided French loans and instead chose the (partly neologistic) German alternatives (*Fernsprecher* for *Telephon*, *Fernschreiben* instead of *Telegramm*, *Fahrkarte* instead of *Billet*, *Bahnsteig* instead of *Perron*, etc.) did so deliberately in order to position themselves against the 'invasion' of the German language by French and, by extension also against the French and France in general. Undoing the effects of a previous, long-standing language contact was an act of identity here (which was linguistically successful, in the sense that standard German as spoken today shows less French loanwords than Swiss standard German). The same acts of identity aiming at divergence can be

found today in nationalist independence movements within the European states. For instance, Corsican activists might prefer non-Italian (sounding) alternants to those close or identical to Italian: *avali* instead of *ora* 'now,' *ci vole à* & INF instead of *bisogna* & INF 'it is necessary to. . . ,' etc. (cf. Kailuweit, 2014); Galician activists might deliberately choose Portuguese-sounding variants over Castilian ones, etc. All modern constructions of national standard languages are partly built on the creation of *Abstand* (in Kloss' terms, 1967) and are therefore acts of identity.

Acts of identity are also involved when substrate features due to imperfect L2 learning are not avoided, although the speakers are well aware of them. The numerous national varieties of English with substrate interference form the local language(s) are good examples (see Rüdiger, 2017 for a recent description of Korean L2 English and its Korean substrate features, or the numerous studies on Singapore English and its Chinese substrate, e.g., Leimgruber, 2013). Phonology and phonetics are particularly well suited for identity displays of this kind, as denotational reasons for copying are lacking. A European example would be the persistent use of word-initial stress on bisyllabic words in the French taught and spoken as an L2 in Germanophone Switzerland (a feature that also occurs in traditional dialects of French-speaking Switzerland but is quickly disappearing there due to convergence with the Paris norm of French, resulting from long-standing contact with Germanic and its initial stress pattern in native trochees).

A well-known, though complex and partly disputed example of prestige-driven language contact not due to imperfect second language learning but to (elite) bilingualism is the spread of uvular /R/ in central Europe (see Trudgill, 1974; King and Beach, 1998). While it is unlikely that the entire area in which uvular /R/ is spoken today has borrowed this sound from the French (more exactly, Paris) pronunciation, there is evidence that on a more local level, such borrowing took place and was based on collective acts of identity. One example is the city of Ghent, where the local bourgeoisie copied the uvular rhotic from French, the prestige language in Belgium in the nineteenth century. From Ghent, it spread to the surroundings of the city (Rogier, 1994). In Brussels, too, contact borrowing from French into Flemish seems to have taken place (see van de Velde, Tops and van Hout, 2013 for the details of the spread of /R/ in Flanders, a process which is still under way).

3. Critical issues and topics

3.1 Code-switching and convergence

The second, quite different approach to the pragmatics of language contact takes as its starting point the pragmatics of bilingual interaction itself, i.e., the use of more than one language in an interactional episode in order to achieve certain pragmatic ends. In a terminology introduced in Auer (1999), I speak of code-switching here (as distinct from non-discourse-functional mixing). The details of how code-switching can function as a contextualization cue have been outlined elsewhere (cf. Auer, 1995) and will not be repeated here. It is important to underline that the discourse functions of code-switching are based on the participants' perception and construction of the two codes as distinct. It is the very contrast of their juxtaposition that provides the potential of code-switching to contextualize an upcoming activity as different from the preceding, which, together with the sequential and other contextual embedding of the switch, makes it pragmatically meaningful. Syntactically speaking, code-switching can occur anywhere, but its preferred locus is the clause boundary (alternational switching) or a single word from which the switched-to language may 'project' to the phrase level (insertional

switching). In the latter case, we are dealing with a 'nonce borrowing' (but not all nonce borrowings have a function in discourse).

How can code-switching have an impact on the structure of the languages involved? There are several answers, all of which presuppose its gradual de-pragmatization and routinization. Paradoxically then, code-switching is more relevant for language contact the more its potential for assuming discourse functions diminishes, and above all, the more frequent it becomes.

Let us first consider the most obvious case, the way from single-word insertional code-switching to (established) loanwords (cf., e.g., Heath, 1989 with examples from Moroccan Arabic). Some of the more frequent discourse functions of insertional code-switching of single words include the wish to display cultural distinction, be it by claiming membership in the progressive avant-garde or the conservative arrière-garde, to exclude other participants, to pun and play with words, to circumvent and defuse taboo topics and delicate speech acts, to refer implicitly to another discourse or somebody else's opinion (intertextual functions), etc. It stands to reason that this pragmatic strategy weakens the more it is repeated (and hence overexploited) and the more the juxtaposition of the two languages is the normal and unmarked way of speaking. Also, the contrast between the two codes on which the function of code-switching depends, diminishes the more the borrowed item is integrated into the sound pattern and/or in the grammatical frame of the receiving language. Integration and discourse-related function are therefore negatively correlated. A kind of firewall against integration is the preservation of the original morphological form of the borrowed word; hence the tendency for humanist code-switchers (like Martin Luther) to insert Latin words in their inflected form, a format preferred by educated speakers in Europe way into the twentieth century. For instance, Luther says *das auch **mortu+i** sollen herren warden* 'that the dead will also be masters' (with the plural nominative inflectional suffix – *i*), *so wurd er bald all **thesaur+os** wider zu sich bringen* 'like this he will soon bring all the treasures back to him' (accusative plural – *os*), *ob er nun **amor+em** verbirgt* ' whether he hides (his) love' (accusative singular – *em*), *so heyssen sie es **nov+am*** 'so they call it new' (accusative singular – *am*), etc. (in his *Tischreden*, cf. Stolt, 1964, pp. 59–75; the Latin words in boldface have the case and number endings required in this syntactic slot of the German sentence). The inverse does not hold, i.e., borrowings with a merely referential function may but need not be integrated. This may explain Poplack's results of her diachronic study of English borrowings into Canadian French in which she finds no increase of integration over time (Poplack, 2018, pp. 127–140). Pragmatically motivated (intentional) nonce borrowing is of course not the only reason for borrowing, which may also be due to imperfect acquisition or language loss.

Once discourse-functional lexical insertions lose their contextualization value through more frequent use, they gradually become established loanwords. This is perhaps the most frequent effect of the pragmatics of bilingual discourse on the language system which is found practically in every language.

But lexical borrowing can have effects on the grammar of the receiving language as well. In particular, frequent borrowings of words showing the same derivational pattern may lead to the borrowing of this derivational pattern itself. It is a side-effect of the insertion of lexical materials. A well-known example is the extensive borrowing of derivational patterns from medieval French into English and German. Although most of these derivational affixes are today restricted to non-native stems, the restriction holds much less in the early history of their borrowing (cf. Hilpert, 2013, pp. 110–154 for the deverbal – *ment* suffix in English), and even where this restriction holds, the derivational pattern was/is highly productive in the receiving language, leading to new derivations above all with Latin/Greek stems. Some

derivational affixes copied from medieval French such as the German suffix – *ei* (from Old French – *ie*) as in *Bäcker-ei* 'bakery,' *Maler-ei* 'painting (in its totality),' have lost this restriction entirely.[4]

Whether the strategy to insert borrowed words together with their inflectional morphology ('maximal insertion strategy' as opposed to the 'minimal insertion strategy' of using only the stem/bare form; cf. Auer, 2014) can lead to the structural borrowing, is a more controversial question (see Matras, 2009, pp. 212–218 for a discussion). There is good evidence that so-called compartmentalized mixed languages result from this insertion strategy, in which a large part of the verbal system (lexemes and inflection) are taken from one language, and a large part of the nominal system from another (with many variants; see the preceding example of Komotini Romani).[5]

So far, I have discussed examples of 'matter borrowing'; but code-switching can also make the languages in question converge in their structure (Thomason, 2001, pp. 131–136). One of the most radical examples often referred to in the literature comes from Gumperz' and Wilson's 1971 study of the Indian village of Kupwar.[6] In this village in the district of Maharashtra, four languages have been in centennial contact: Kannada and Telugu (Dravidian languages) and Marathi and Hindi-Urdu (both Indo-Aryan). Multilingualism (particularly in the male population) and the permanent use of the languages in outgroup communication between the ethnic groups has not led to language shift, but rather to radical convergence, with Hindi-Urdu most, Kannada somewhat less and Marathi least affected. (Marathi is the official language of the state and used in particular as a *lingua franca*. Telugu has only few speakers and is not analyzed by Gumperz and Wilson any further.) When Gumperz and Wilson did their fieldwork (in the late 1960s), syntax, parts of morphology and phonetics had converged, while the lexicon and morphophonemics had remained separate. The entire process was additionally accompanied by simplification and reduction. As a result, the three languages as spoken in outgroup communication in the village could be translated into each other morpheme by morpheme. In particular, all syntactic (word order) differences were levelled out. Nevertheless, none of the three languages had been given up, as the existing ethnic divisions were a powerful social force keeping them separate. The overall picture was that of a balance between, on the one hand, a pragmatic motivation – the necessity of frequent contacts between the speakers of the three language communities in the village – leading to frequent code-switching and from there to convergence, and, on the other hand, a social motivation to index membership in the three ethnic communities based on caste, residence area, and religion. Gumperz and Wilson see these changes as 'generated by code-switching' (Gumperz and Wilson, 1971, p. 256).[7]

Less radical convergence can be found in many other bilingual communities in which switching and mixing are frequent. However, it is often difficult to decide whether switching has caused this convergence process (through which it becomes easier), or whether the convergence would have taken place anyway. Evidence for the active role of switching and mixing can be gathered from comparing monolingual and bilingual speech in the same sociolinguistic context. To give just one example, it is a well-established finding that Slavonic languages tend to lose gender distinctions when they are in close contact with Turkic languages (which do not have gender). Usually the masculine forms are overgeneralized into grammatical contexts in which the feminine is required. Muhamedova (2006) shows that in Kazakh/Russian mixing in urban Almatı, this loss of gender appears frequently in mixed utterances while it is much less prevalent in the monolingual speech of the same Russian/Kazakh bilinguals. This shows that switching/mixing at least favours the convergence of Russian to Kazakh, and perhaps even causes it.[8]

Code-switching and mixing can also (and regularly do) index social membership, i.e., switching and mixing styles often, if not always, are also acts of identity. Again, comparative studies with the same language pairs involved are telling. An example are the Arabic/ Modern Hebrew contact patterns recently described by Kheir (2019 and MS) for the Arab and the Druze community in Israel. While the bilingual Arabs show the well-known discourse-functional patterns of code-switching and borrowing, Druze Arabic is so heavily mixed with Hebrew that Kheir analyzes it as being on the way to a matrix-language turn-over (in the sense of Myers-Scotton, 1998). In the speech of the Israeli Arabs, language contact with Hebrew also exists, but it never endangers the status of Arabic as the matrix language, while in the speech of the Israeli Druze, it is no longer possible to establish such a matrix language, since both languages equally contribute to the grammar of the Hebrew/Arabic mixed utterances. Kheir shows that the mixed Arabic/Hebrew is linked to the Druze community's distinctly more positive attitudes towards Israel and Modern Hebrew when compared to those of the Israeli (Muslim) Arabs; it can be followed that their mixing behaviour is an act of identity affiliating the speakers with mainstream Israeli society.

3.2 Pragmatic borrowing

With the third pragmatic approach to language contact, we enter a very different field. The question here is whether and under which conditions pragmatic features of a language can be borrowed into another. Interestingly, some of these elements are high on the borrowability scale (Matras, 2007), such as discourse markers and connectors, while others are low (e.g., person inflection). The class of linguistic resources that serve to embed a linguistic utterance into its situational context is therefore certainly not a 'natural' class with regard to borrowability.

Here, I only give a rough sketch with several examples from different layers of linguistic structure, obviously without any claim to completeness.

One of the most frequently borrowed elements in language contact is discourse markers. Discourse markers are 'part of an apparatus with which the speaker monitors and directs the hearer's processing of propositional content' (Matras, 2009, p. 95; see the overview in Matras, 2009, pp. 137–145). They are therefore pragmatic operators. Maschler (1998, pp. 130–131) further differentiates between interpersonal markers (for expressing agreement, or epistemic status), referential markers (for instance used to connect utterances by marking contrast or cause), structural markers (which organize the order of actions or introducing side remarks) and cognitive markers (for instance to mark hesitations). Various reasons are mentioned in the literature for which these markers may be particularly prone to borrowing. Syntactic non-integration into the grammatical structure of the sentence is probably mentioned most often. In some cases, the discourse markers that are borrowed allow the speaker to manage interaction in a way which is not possible on the basis of the resources of the receiving language alone, or the new borrowed and the equivalent old marker take on different functions and thereby provide a richer system of pragmatic markers (Oesch-Serra, 1998). In this case, the borrowing has functional reasons and enriches the grammatical system of the receiving language. However, in other cases, this explanation does not hold. Matras (1998, 1999) suggests a cognitive explanation in hypothesizing that speakers fail to keep their languages apart when using discourse markers because their use requires a special cognitive effort. This makes them fall back on the more entrenched options in their dominant language ('selection malfunction'). For him, discourse markers are just one element of a larger system of 'utterance modifiers,' which also includes connectors, interjections, tag questions, focus markers, modal particles, and certain adverbials. It seems, however, that utterance modifiers which do not occur at the clause

periphery, such as focus and modal particles, are less susceptible to borrowing.[9] In the case of interjections, identity-related motivations may be more important than monitoring and directing the hearer's understanding. They seem to behave more like borrowed turn-final endearment terms, which also primarily have the function of indicating social affiliations. A point in case is the pan-European use of the Arabic/Turkish interjection *vallah* together with Arabic/Turkish address terms such as *lân, abi, kardesh/kardash, moruk/morok*, etc. in the urban vernacular youth vernaculars which have emerged on the basis of multi-ethnolects in the middle and north European countries, while discourse markers and particularly connectors have not been reported often to be borrowed into this register (see the contributions in Kern and Selting, 2011; Quist and Svendsen, 2010).

In derivational morphology, one of the frequently borrowed pragmatic affixes are diminutives. They clearly serve a pragmatic function, as they express affection and intensification more often than simple smallness. As an example, Weinreich (1963, p. 34) mentions the borrowing of the Yiddish diminutive – *(a)l(e)* (identical with the (Southern) German suffix) into Modern Hebrew as an 'endearing form.' Another example is the Spanish diminutive – *ito*, which is borrowed into various Mesoamerican languages (Chamoreau, 2012). The distributional patterns suggest that suffix borrowing is preceded by a phase of lexical borrowings (i.e., stem, usually a proper name, and suffix were borrowed together) and that the suffix generalizes to different degrees to non-borrowed stems (a process known from other derivational borrowings).

Deictic elements for referring to place, time and person are rarely borrowed. However, if deictic adverbials take on functions typical of 'utterance modifiers,' their borrowability increases. For instance, originally temporal adverbials that mark temporal succession are often used as connectors in narrative utterances ('and then'), and the originally temporal adverbials of the discourse marker family *nu/nå* (referring to the time of speaking: 'now') are famous for having developed a variety of discourse functions in many Germanic and Slavonic languages. They were borrowed between the European and into various non-European languages, among them Modern Hebrew (cf. Auer and Maschler, 2016 for examples). Matras (2009, p. 141) quotes the following example from a Volga-German speaker (from Anders, 1993, Russian in italics):

> *Potom* (1.0) *nu* die Wolgarepublik, *potom/nu* so is weiter und weiter/ (1.0) die ganze *istorija*!
> ('*then* (1.0) *well*, the Voga Republic, *then/ well* it went on and on like this/ (1.0) the whole *story*!')

Demonstratives also tend to take on discourse marker functions and are then easily borrowed. For instance, Muhamedova (2006) shows that the Russian particles *eto* (originally a demonstrative adjective, but often used as a hesitation marker) and *vot* (originally a deictic manner adverb, but also used as a discourse marker for turn and topic closure) are borrowed into Kazakh and into Uighur (2006, pp. 185–187, 210–212).

Personal pronouns are rarely borrowed, and if they are, some other function in addition to person reference is usually involved (such as honorification; cf. the overview in Matras, 2009, pp. 203–208). Pattern borrowing seems to be more frequent. An example is the Highest Alemannic dialect spoken in the Northern Italian language enclave of Issime in the Aosta Valley (Zürrer, 1999, pp. 214–218). Here, the full pronouns of the plural have developed composite forms modelled after the (non-standard) plural in the contact languages Italian, French and Francoprovencal. Hence, the simple nominative plural forms of the first, second and third person – *wir, ir* and *dschi* – alternate with the composite forms *wir+endri, ir+endri/ar+endri, dschi+endri* (and accordingly for the other cases); cf. Italian *noi altri, voi altri*, etc.[10]

Although deictic elements are rarely borrowed, the deictic system of a language can change under the influence of another language. For instance, Rehbein (2012) investigates the use of the Turkish demonstrative article *o* ('that') under the influence of German. He finds that bilingual children in Germany occasionally use *o* not for a deictic shift as in monolingual Turkish (drawing the attention of the hearer to a new referent), but as an anaphoric marker which is perhaps on its way to becoming a definite determiner modelled after the German anaphoric determiner *dies*-, referring back to an already established discourse referent. Pro drop languages have also been claimed to lose that feature in contact with languages such as German or English (Rehbein, 2012 for Turkish, but see the counterevidence for English/Spanish contact in Torres Cacoullos and Travis, 2018).

Pattern borrowing is also quite frequent in another deictic domain, that of tense and aspect. For instance, there is evidence that the analytic future and past tense patterns were borrowed from German into Czech in the twelfth century (Berger, 2014). Also well-known are cases of semantic borrowing. An example is the Spanish spoken by Quechua/Spanish bilinguals (Andean Spanish), where the Std. Spanish past perfect tense (*había* + past participle) has developed into a mirative marker, modelled on the Quechua marker – *sqa* for non-experienced past (cf. Babel and Pfänder, 2014).

Finally, it should not be forgotten that syntax also has pragmatic functions via word order, ellipsis, and various syntactic operations such as dislocations. Syntactic borrowing may therefore also be a case of pragmatic borrowing. As an example, consider again the Highest Alemannic dialects in the Aosta valley in Italy (Zürrer, 1999, pp. 340–349). These dialects are in the process of converging syntactically with Italian, the dominant language for most speakers, particularly the younger ones. Italian can topicalize the subject by fronting:

> *Nostra figlia fra un anno entra al collegio*
> lit.: 'our daughter, in one year will go to boarding-school'

instead of the unmarked word order:

> *Fra un anno nostra figlia entra al collegio* or
> *Nostra figlia entra al collegio fra un anno*.

In German (including its dialects) it is not possible to front the subject to clause-initial position if another constituent already occupies the position before the verb:

> **Unsere Tochter in einem Jahr geht ins Internat.*[11]

In order to come close to the Italian word order, the dialects of Gressoney and Issime therefore overexploit the pattern of left dislocation as it is available in German:

> *Ündsch töchter z joar gait=dsch den al collegio*

'our daughter in-one year goes-she then to-the boardingschool'

Left dislocations in German (and its dialects) require the resumptive (demonstrative) pronoun to follow the left-dislocated NP directly:

> *Unsere Tochter, die geht in einem Jahr auf's Internat.*
> Lit. 'our daughter, she goes in one year to the boarding-school.'

In Gressoney/Issime, however, the anaphoric/resumptive pronoun *dsch* is a clitic attached to the finite verb, a highly non-canonical construction in German.

In order to downgrade a topic, Italian can move the subject to the right periphery of the clause:

> *È di Torino quell'avvocato*
> '(He) is from Turin, this lawyer.'

As Italian is a subject-drop language, *è di Torino* is a full clause, and *quell'avvocato* has the status of a right dislocation.

In colloquial German, which is a topic-drop language, the pre-verbal constituent can also be omitted if it is known from context:

> *Ist aus Turin, der Rechtsanwalt.*

The dialects of Gressoney and Issime, however, do not drop the topic pronoun but – just like in the previous case of a left dislocation – attaches its clitic form to the finite verb, resulting in VS/S word order:

> *Ischt=er von turiin, dee aᵃvokat*
> 'Is he of Turin, the lawyer'

This construction is used for a declarative sentence in the dialect but would only be acceptable as a question in German (including the Alemannic dialects).

The two contact-induced syntactic changes show that the dialects have converged with the Italian model almost completely. They are ready[12] to reanalyze the clitic pronouns as inflectional affixes, which would make the convergence perfect:

Nostra	figlia	fra un anno	entr+	a	al collegio
Ündsch	töchter	z joar	gait +	dsch (den)	al collegio

È	di Torino	quell'avvocato
Ischt=er	von turiin	dee aᵃvokat

4. Future directions

In this chapter, I have sketched three pragmatic perspectives on language contact. The topic can be approached by looking at the borrowing of pragmatic elements of language, i.e., those that embed linguistic utterances into a context of situation, which also the metapragmatics of framing utterances and managing speaker-hearer interaction (section 3.2). Even a cursory look at these pragmatic elements, which range from discourse markers to word order demonstratives, shows that they behave in a heterogeneous way with regard to borrowing. It seems therefore unlikely that an integrated approach can be developed in this field.

The second way of approaching language contact from a pragmatic angle is to focus on the effects of bilingual interaction on the languages involved (section 3). There are good reasons to believe that code-switching (including ad hoc borrowing) can have an impact on language

structure, starting from the very simple observation that ad hoc borrowings can develop into established loanwords. Some so-called mixed languages may also be the outcome of habitualized code-switching. In addition, there is evidence that code-switching can lead to the structural convergence of the switched languages. In all of these cases, language change is the unintentional effect of a particular verbal action, i.e., code-switching.

The pragmatic approach to language contact is also the most ambitious program, although it has the longest tradition (section 2). It starts from the pragmatic profiles attached to the languages in contact, i.e., the actions, activities, and domains of activities that are associated with the linguistic resources in the repertoire of speakers or communities. Although this approach has always enjoyed common-sense appeal, its theoretical underpinnings and empirical relevance still need to be. The general assumption is that specific pragmatic profiles (and hence pragmatic needs linked to specific action types) correlate with specific structural outcomes of language contact. Such a pragmatic approach will be able to provide explanations for language contact phenomena and may contribute one factor to the complex of interacting parameters that are responsible for the ~~elaborated~~ effects bilingualism can have on language structure.

5. Further reading

Matras, Y. (2007). The borrowability of grammatical categories. In: Y. Matras and J. Sakel, eds., *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1st ed. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 31–74. Important insights into the borrowability of pragmatic categories.

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: University Press. Recommended as a thoroughly pragmatic orientation in contact linguistics.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics. Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. A standard introduction with a strong focus on sociolinguistics conditions on language contact.

6. Related topics

Code-switching and bilinguals' grammars, borrowing, social factors

Abbreviations

INF   infinitive
L1   first language
L2   second language
NP   noun phrase
SOV   subject, object, verb

Notes

1 Surely, there are other reasons as well; for instance, the infrastructure for formal German language teaching has greatly improved.
2 This register is used by some monolingual Germans as well in the meantime; cf. Dirim and Auer, 2004; Freywald et al. 2011, among others.
3 'Domains' were introduced to bilingual studies by Fishman (1964), with reference to previous work by Schmidt-Rohr (1932, pp. 182–184). He conceives them in terms of topics, locales and role

relationships, although he sometimes also speaks of 'domains of social interaction' and even of 'institutionalized spheres of activity' (Fishman, Cooper, and Ma, 1971), which implies a pragmatic understanding. While for Fishman, domains are useful for describing patterns of language choice (certain domains are associated with certain languages), the idea pursued here is that actions, activities (genres) and domains (as spheres of actions) imply specific pragmatic demands and obligations on the speaker, which can explain (some of the) structural outcomes of language contact.

4 The suffix is still productive in German to form abstract nouns with a slightly negative connotation, cf. *Liebel+ei* 'love affair,' *Prügel+ei* 'brawl,' etc.

5 See Auer (2014) for details and more literature on the emergence of 'mixed languages' (fusion) from code-switching and mixing.

6 See Kulkarni-Joshi (2016) for a recent appraisal of the linguistic facts as described by Gumperz and Wilson and for an empirical study on the developments in Kupvar over the last 50 years.

7 The study does not give details on how code-switching is defined, and which types of switching can be found in the community. The analysis suggests that code-switching results from every person using his/her own language when communicating with a member of another ethnic group.

8 The issue of whether and to which degree code-mixing can lead to convergence is not uncontroversial. For instance, Torres Cacoullos and Travis (2018, pp. 160–173) find no convergence between Spanish and English – here, the overt subject pronoun in Spanish as compared to subject-drop – in the vicinity of code-mixing/code-switching as compared to subjects further away from the switch. Apparently, the activation of a bilingual mode is not enough to lead to convergence throughout the data in this particular case. Also see Backus (2005) for a discussion.

9 Instead, modal particles such as the German *Abtönungspartikeln* are simply lost in language contact (cf. Salmons, 1990). See Matras (2007, p. 57) for the borrowability hierarchy discourse markers > particles.

10 Note that the composite third person plural form has no obvious model in either of the contact languages, i.e., the system has been extended to the third person by analogy. In the second person, the simple form is only used as the polite address form (VOS) today, i.e., functional differentiation has set in.

11 The variant *In einem Jahr, unsere Tochter geht ins Internat* is marginally possible.

12 Of course, the process is not yet completed, as the enclitic pronouns still inflect for gender and number.

References

Adamou, E. (2010). Bilingual speech and language ecology in Greek Thrace: Romani and Pomak in contact with Turkish. *Language in Society*, 39(2), pp. 147–171.

Anders, K. (1993). *Einflüsse der russischen Sprache bei deutschsprachigen Aussiedlern*. Hamburg: Germanisches Seminar.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken, eds., *One speaker, two languages*, 1st ed. Cambridge: University Press, pp. 115–135. (Reprinted in: Wei, L., ed. (2007). *The bilingualism reader*, 2nd ed. Milton Park: Routledge, pp. 123–138.)

Auer, P. (1999). From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3(4), pp. 309–332.

Auer, P. (2014). Language mixing and language fusion: When bilingual talk becomes monolingual. In: J. Besters-Dilger, C. Dermarkar, S. Pfänder, and A. Rabus, eds., *Congruence in contact-induced language change*, 1st ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 294–336.

Auer, P. and Maschler, Y., eds. (2016). *NU/NÅ: A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter.

Babel, A. and Pfänder, S. (2014). Doing copying: Why typology doesn't matter to language speakers. In: J. Besters-Dilger, C. Dermarkar, S. Pfänder, and A. Rabus, eds., *Congruence in contact-induced language change*, 1st ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 239–257.

Backus, A. (2005). Codeswitching and language change: One thing leads to another? *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(3), pp. 307–340.

Berger, T. (2014). The convergence of Czech and German between the years 900 and 1500. In: J. Besters-Dilger, C. Dermarkar, S. Pfänder, and A. Rabus, eds., *Congruence in contact-induced language change*. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 184–200.

Chamoreau, C. (2012). The Spanish diminutive markers – *ito/-ita* in Mesoamerican languages: A challenge for acceptance of gender distinctions. In: M. Vanhove, Th. Stolz, A. Urdze, and H. Otsuka, eds., *Morphologies in contact*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 71–92.

Demo, Š. (To appear). Artificial fusion: The curious case of Macaronic Latin. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Special Issue on *Language Fusion*, ed., by P. Auer and N. Hakimov).

Deumert, A. (2009). Namibian Kiche Duits: The making (and decline) of a neo-African language. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 21(4), pp. 349–417.

Dirim, İ. and Auer, P. (2004). *Türkisch sprechen nicht nur die Türken. Über die Unschärfebeziehung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie in Deutschland*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ferguson, Ch.A. and DeBose, Ch.E. (1977). Simplified registers, broken language, and pidginization. In: A. Valdman, ed., *Pidgin and creole linguistics*, 1st ed. Bloomington, IN and London: Indiana University Press, pp. 99–125.

Fishman, J. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: A definition of the field and suggestions for its further development. *Linguistics*, 2(9), pp. 32–70.

Fishman, J., Cooper, R.L. and Ma, R. (1971). *Bilingualism in the barrio*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Franziskus, A. and Gilles, P. (2012). 'Et le präis direct etikett?' Non-overlapping repertoires in workplace communication in Luxembourg. *Sociolinguistica: Internationales Jahrbuch für Europäische Soziolinguistik*, 26, pp. 58–71.

Freywald, U., Mayr, K., Özçelik, T. and Wiese, H. (2011). Kiezdeutsch as a multiethnolect. In: F. Kern and M. Selting, eds., *Ethnic styles of speaking in European metropolitan cities*, 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 45–72.

Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual's language modes. In: J.L. Nicol, ed., *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing*, 1st ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 1–22.

Gumperz, J.J. and Wilson, R. (1971). Convergence and creolization: A case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border. In: D. Hymes, ed., *Pidginization and creolization of languages*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151–168. Reprinted in: Gumperz J.J. (1971). *Language in social groups. Essays selected and introduced by A. S. Dil*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Heath, J. (1989). *From code-switching to borrowing. A case study of Moroccan Arabic*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Hilpert, M. (2013). *Constructional change in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jahr, E.H. (1997). Language contacts in Northern Europe. In: H. Goebl, P.H. Nelde, Z. Stary, and W. Wölck, eds., *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung,* vol. 2, 1st ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 937–948.

Kailuweit, R. (2014). Avoiding typological affinity: Negative borrowing as a strategy of Corsican norm finding. In: J. Besters-Dilger, C. Dermarkar, S. Pfänder, and A. Rabus, eds., *Congruence in contact-induced language change*, 1st ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 368–389.

Kern, F. and Selting, M., eds. (2011). *Ethnic styles of speaking in European metropolitan areas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kheir, A.E. (2018). [manuscript] *To codeswitch or not to codeswitch? Codeswitching and sociopolitical identity among the Druze and Arabs in Israel*.

Kheir, A.E. (2019). The matrix language turnover hypothesis: The case of the Druze language in Israel. *Journal of Language Contact*, 12(2), pp. 479–512.

King, R.D. and Beach, S.A. (1998). On the origins of German uvular [R]: The Yiddish evidence. *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, 10(2), pp. 279–290.

Klein, W. and Perdue, C. (1997). The basic variety (or: couldn't natural languages be much simpler?) *Second Language Research*, 13(4), pp. 201–347.

Kloss, H. (1967). Abstand languages and ausbau languages. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 9, pp. 29–41.

Kulkarni-Joshi, S. (2016). Forty years of language contact and change in Kupwar: A critical assessment of the intertranslatability model. *Journal of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, 3(2), pp. 147–174.

Le Page, R. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: University Press.

Leimgruber, J. (2013). *Singapore English: Structure, variation, and usage*. Cambridge: University Press.

Luckmann, T. (1986). Grundformen der gesellschaftlichen Vermittlung des Wissens: Kommunikative Gattungen. In: F. Neidhardt, M.R. Lepsius, and J. Weiss, eds., *Kultur und Gesellschaft*, 1st ed. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 191–211. (Partial English translation in: J. Angermuller, D. Maingueneau, and R. Wodak, eds., *The discourse studies reader. Main currents in theory and analysis,* 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 351–356.

Maschler, Y. (1998). On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In: P. Auer, ed., *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*, 1st ed. London: Routledge, pp. 125–150.

Matras, Y. (1998). Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics*, 36, pp. 281–331.

Matras, Y. (1999). Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4, pp. 505–528.

Matras, Y. (2007). The borrowability of grammatical categories. In: Y. Matras and J. Sakel, eds., *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1st ed. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 31–74.

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muhamedova, R. (2006). *Untersuchungen zum kasachisch-russischen Code-mixing (mit Ausblick auf den uigurisch-russischen Sprachkontakt)*. München: Lincom.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). A way to dusty death: The matrix language turnover hypothesis. In: L.A. Grenoble and L.J. Whaley, eds., *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 289–316.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics. Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oesch-Serra, C. (1998). Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: The case of an emerging Italian-French mixed code. In: P. Auer, ed., *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*, 1st ed. London: Routledge, pp. 101–124.

Poplack, S. (2018). *Borrowing – loanwords in the speech community and in the grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Quist, P. and Svendsen, B.A., eds. (2010). *Multilingual urban Scandinavia*. Bristol, etc.: Multilingual Matters.

Rehbein, J. (2012). Turkish deixis and its contact-induced change. In: E. Kincses-Nagy and M. Biacsi, eds., *The Szeged conference: Proceedings of the 15th international conference on Turkish linguistics*. Szeged: Department of Altaic Studies, pp. 459–468.

Rogier, D. (1994). De verspreiding van een social hooggewaardeerd taalkenmerk: de huig-R rond Gent. *Taal en Tongval*, Special Issue 7, pp. 45–53.

Rüdiger, S. (2017). *Spoken Korean English*. PhD. University of Bayreuth.

Schmidt-Rohr, G. (1932). *Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker*. Jena: Eugen Diederichs Verlag.

Siegel, V. (2018). *Multiethnolektale Syntax: Artikel, Präpositionen und Pronomen in der Jugendsprache*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Şimşek, Y. and Schroeder, C. (2011). Migration und Sprache in Deutschland – am Beispiel der Migranten aus der Türkei und ihrer Kinder und Kindeskinder. In: Ş. Ozil, M. Hofmann und Y. DayIoğlu-Yücel, eds., *50 Jahre türkische Arbeitsmigration in Deutschland*, 1st ed. Göttingen: V & R unipress, pp. 205–228.

Smith, N. (2000). Symbiotic mixed languages: A question of terminology. *Bilingualism*, 3(2), pp. 122–123.

Stolt, B. (1964). *Die Sprachmischung in Luthers Tischreden*. Stockholm: Almquvist & Wiksell.

Thomason, S.G. (2001). *Language contact. An introduction*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, S.G. (2010). Contact explanations in linguistics. In: R. Hickey, ed., *The handbook of language contact*, 1st ed. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 31–47.

Thomason, S.G. and Kaufmann, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Torres Cacoullos, R. and Travis, C.E. (2018). *Bilingualism in the community. Code-switching and grammars in contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trudgill, P. (1974). Linguistic change and diffusion: Description and explanation in sociolinguistic dialect geography. *Language in Society*, 3(2), pp. 215–246.

Van de Velde, H., Tops, E. and van Hout, R. (2013). The spreading of uvular [R] in Flanders. In: L. Spreafico and A. Vietti, eds., *Rhotics. New data and perspectives*, 1st ed. Bozen and Bolzano: Bolzano University Press, pp. 227–248.

Weinreich, U. (1963). *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Zürrer, P. (1999). *Sprachinseldialekte: Walserdeutsch im Aostatal*. Aarau: Sauerländer.