LANGUAGE COMPETENCE AND LANGUAGE AWARENESS
IN EUROPE 5

Amei Koll-Stobbe / Sebastian Knospe (eds.)

Language Contact Around the Globe

Proceedings of the LCTG3 Conference

PETER LANG
EDITION

Series editor's introduction

Amei Koll-Stobbe

Language use as social practice depicts a plethora of contact phenomena and fundamental changes triggered through colonisation, post-colonisation and economic globalisation. Greifswald, a small university town in its 555th year of existence in 2011 is located in rural North-Eastern Germany at the borders of old and new Europe and arises as a fruitful place to experience and explore the complexity of contact phenomena within and across languages. Contact linguistics marks one of the research fields shared by the language philologies represented at the University of Greifswald. Interdisciplinary lecture series on aspects of language transfer and interference, vitality and endangerment have been documented by the first two volumes in the present book series (cf. Koll-Stobbe 2009a, 2009b).

This edited volume of peer-reviewed conference proceedings is the fifth in the series ***Language Competence and Language Awareness in Europe***. Its main title ***Language Contact Around the Globe*** reflects the fluidity of the conceptual borders of Europe in a multilingual world, where languages of old European powers continue to symbolise the heritage of communities of practice world-wide that are torn between the norms of old and transported codified national languages, new emerging varieties and vernacular variability. Consequences of cross-linguistic cum cross-cultural contact as well as contact-induced language change constitute the topic range of the papers that were presented and discussed at the ***Third Conference on Language Contact in Times of Globalisation (LCTG3)***. The international conference with the globally acknowledged keynote speakers Durk Gorter, Mark Sebba, Dennis Preston and Donald Winford was funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). The event was hosted by the Chair of English Linguistics and took place from June 30 to July 2, 2011, continuing a series of conferences which was established at the University of Groningen (The Netherlands).

Greifswald, March 2014

Language Contact Around the Globe

Amei Koll-Stobbe and Sebastian Knospe

Evidence of language and culture contact as well as of bi- or multilingual practices can be found in virtually all epochs of human history. Yet, due to factors such as worldwide economic co-operation, mass mobility and new communication technologies, the manifold consequences which are connected to the exchange between different languages and cultures have become all the more conspicuous since the second half of the 20th century. As a result, linguistic studies specialised on this topic area have been promoted in virtually all philologies.

Against this background, the University of Greifswald initiated the ***Third Conference on Language Contact in Times of Globalization*** **(LCTG3)** which was open to linguists of all disciplines. For a conference of this format, the University of Greifswald provided a suitable location – not least in light of its own history: Indeed, Greifswald made part of the pan-European Hanseatic League for centuries and was Swedish between 1631 and 1815, before becoming German again. Thus, the town can look back on a history full of change. Apart from that, it is situated in the Baltic Sea Area, which is a linguistic contact zone itself that has regained importance after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

Continuing our attempts to deepen international research contacts, we were happy that our call for papers for LCTG3 evoked high resonance: On the one hand, we were able to win four internationally renowned keynote speakers: Donald Winford (Ohio University), Dennis R. Preston (Oklahoma State University), Durk Gorter (Ikerbasque, Basque Foundation for Science) and Mark Sebba (Lancaster University). On the other hand, we attracted 70 other scholars (both junior and senior ones) from various European countries, Canada, the US as well as from Nigeria and Thailand, involved in English linguistics, Finno-Ugric, German, Romance and Slavic studies or working on African and Asian languages.

The fifth volume of the book series *Language Competence and Language Awareness in Europe* shows this thematic breadth by uniting a collection of peer-reviewed papers which were presented on this occasion. They are arranged in five thematic sections with an interest in the structural, socio- and/or psycholinguistic sides of language contact. Because of the different philologies represented in this volume, the papers reflect some of the divergences found in their general approach to the field as well in the terminologies employed. Considering the fact that participants of the conference came from Europe and overseas, the editors also tolerated both British and American orthography, while other conventions (e.g. the style of the quotations and references) were homogenised.

Part I of the volume concentrates on the effects of language contact that lead to changes in the lexicon and/or in the grammatical structure of the languages concerned. The section is opened by a paper written by **Donald Winford** who

proposes a unified framework for the study of contact-induced change based on the two mechanisms of borrowing and imposition. The papers ensuing all deal with scenarios of borrowing and related processes of transfer which show the nature of languages as open, adaptive codes (cf. Koll-Stobbe 2010). What is in the centre of interest here is the forms of present contact with English, which throughout its history has adopted material from various languages itself. To begin with, **Sylwester Jaworksi**, incorporating data from different sources, investigates recent changes in Polish morphology as a result of English influence. **Cristiano Furiassi**, in turn, using corpus tools, looks at a specific lexical phenomenon: Italian pseudo-loans that have made their way into the English language. The article thus contributes to the investigation of the nativization of foreign language material in the absorbing languages. However, pseudo-loans are an outcome of language contact which needs to be separated from cases where borrowing proper takes place. This situation is dealt with in the following papers: Whereas **Branka Drljača Margić** discusses the attitudes of Croatian university students towards anglicisms. **Amei Koll-Stobbe** and **Laura Zieseler** address this issue with regard to English language awareness in German *Anglistik* students. At the same time, they qualitatively analyse patterns of an emerging hybridisation with a focus on norm shifting and levelling processes characteristic of institutional (and educational) English variability developing in the Expanding Circle of World Englishes. By studying the lexical competition between anglicisms and semantically closely related German expressions, **Esme Winter-Froemel, Alexander Onysko** and **Andreea Calude** move the readers' attention to the level of the language system again. They seek to find out whether the English word or the German quasi-equivalent(s) is/are preferred and in how far this depends on parameters like length and age of the loan.

Part II focuses on two other results of language contact: first, on code-switching as an ephemeral speech phenomenon and second on mixed languages as a consequence of systematic switching and shifting. While code-switching[1] is typically considered a characteristic of oral communication, **Sebastian Knospe** discusses instances of written code-switching into English in the German print media, most notably in the news magazine *Der Spiegel* (for a more broadly oriented study see Knospe, forthcoming). In doing so, the author attempts a functional categorization. **Gerald Stell**'s paper is devoted to code-switching in conversations of non-whites in South Africa, paying attention to its structural variation as well as identity aspects linked to this. **Marisa Patuto, Malin Hager** et al. work out the internal and external parameters that determine the frequency of code-switching of bilingually raised children. As suggested before, intensive language mixing and code-switching may also result in the creation of new lan-

1 In this volume, the hyphenated spelling *code-switching* is used unless authors or titles using different spellings (either as one or two orthographic words) are referred to. The same holds for the term *code-mixing.*

guages (Winford 2003: 168) – a process called *language intertwining* by Bakker and Muysken (1995). An intriguing case of a mixed language in Australia is Light Warlpiri which is analyzed in **Edward Gillian**'s article. Light Warlpiri is based on three source languages: Warlpiri, Kriol and Standard Australian English.

While Parts I and II shed light on the structural outcomes of language contact in specific socio-cultural contexts, Part III of the volume is concerned with the power, political backup, public presence and use of different languages in multilingual settings. As this depends on the values assigned to them, **Dennis R. Preston**'s article delves into the perception of languages and linguistic choices, adopting the perspective of the speakers using them in the global arena. He discusses language variability within the frameworks of perceptual dialectology (see Preston and Long 2002) and folk linguistics (see Preston and Niedzielski 2003). Regarding the reactions provoked by different languages and varieties, English offers a particularly well-studied example since it has been transplanted into different parts of the world. Also, different non-native varieties of English are spoken in the urban agglomerations of the UK, America and beyond, where they may face stigmatization. **Martin Schweinberger** exemplifies this by looking at Singapore English and the use of non-native discourse-pragmatic markers, their frequency, dispersion and at their variation across registers. By contrast, **Heiko F. Marten** takes a macro-sociolinguistic point of view. Departing from the diversification of English, he poses the question of whether the famous Three-Circle Model devised by Kachru (1985, 1990) could also be applied to German. Indeed, German was once a colonial language, too and has meanwhile been reinvigorated as a foreign language and lingua franca especially in some East and South East European countries, where it partly has got the status of a minority language today. The topic of minority languages also shapes the articles of **Birte Arendt** and **László Marácz**. The former looks at Low German and the consequences the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages has had on its status in Germany, while the latter takes into consideration attempts of resiliencing Hungarian minority languages in present-day Europe.

Part IV of the volume contains three articles which are theoretically and methodologically situated in the sociolinguistic paradigm of Linguistic Landscape Studies. This research field is interested in multilingualism and the visibility of different languages in the public sphere, especially on signage, be it billboards, shop or road signs, graffiti or other types of publicly displayed written language. Here, two case studies on the situation in Ukraine (**Svitlana Shakh**) and in Northern Thailand (**Phattharathanit Srichomthong**) are documented. Additionally, **Yael Guilat** and **Shoshi Waksman** have contributed a paper which treats the signage in military cemeteries in Israel.

Part V focuses on transcultural literacy which is linked to the problem of translation, both in literature and institutional settings. **Karin Ebeling** traces

signs of multilingualism in the oeuvres of post-colonial authors that are set in transcultural contexts. Finally, **Antonia Unger and Jekaterina Nikitin** analyze the differences between the English originals and the German versions of BP's corporate communication during the oil spill disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. Through a contrastive analysis of the German and English texts, they show that even in times of globalization, which have led to convergences between various languages, certain differences, e.g. in terms of discourse strategies and routines, have not been wiped out.

It is hoped that the papers brought together in the present volume foreground the state-of-the-art of research on language contact from various methodological and theoretical frameworks as presented at our Greifswald conference. The organisation of the LCTG3 conference would not have been possible without the generous financial support which we gratefully received from the German Research Foundation (DFG). Apart from that, our thanks go to the University of Greifswald which provided us with technically well-equipped conference rooms and assisted us in various administrative respects. Moreover, we would like to thank the whole team of the Chair of English Linguistics that secured a smooth course of LCTG3. As to the preparation of the conference proceedings, we are highly indebted to the reviewers of the papers handed in to us, the publisher Peter Lang (most notably Richard Breitenbach) and, last but not least, our secretary Mathias Köhn who was responsible for the formatting of the manuscript.

References

Bakker, Peter & Pieter Muysken. 1995. Mixed languages and language intertwining. In: Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith, eds.: *Pidgins and Creoles. An introduction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 41-52.

Kachru, Braj B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In: Randolph Quirk & Henry G. Widdowson, eds. *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11-30.

Kachru, Braj B. 1990. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes.* Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Knospe, Sebastian. forthcoming. *Entlehnung oder Codeswitching? Sprachmischungen mit dem Englischen im deutschen Printjournalismus.* Frankfurt: Lang.

Koll-Stobbe, Amei. 2010 [2000]. *Konkrete Lexikologie des Englischen: Entwurf einer Theorie des Sprachkönnens.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Preston, Dennis R. & Daniel Long, eds. 2002. *Handbook of perceptual dialectology*, Volume II. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Preston, Dennis R. & Nancy Niedzielski, eds. 2003. *Folk linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Winford, Donald. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics.* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Part I: Contact-induced change. Linguistic borrowing and pseudo-borrowing

Toward an integrated model of contact-induced change

Donald Winford

Abstract

In this paper, I argue that van Coetsem's (1988, 2000) framework offers the most comprehensive and unified model of contact-induced change, because it focuses on the cognitive processes involved in such change, and allows for links to be made between structural, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic approaches to language contact. His framework distinguishes between two transfer types, borrowing and imposition, which differ in terms of the dominance relationships between the languages in contact. This conception of borrowing and imposition is compatible with psycholinguistic models of language production and yields more promising insights into the processes and products of contact-induced change than other frameworks that have been proposed, such as Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) socio-cultural framework, or Johanson's (2002) code-copying framework. In short, van Coetsem's framework offers a start toward an integrated model of language contact, which draws on linguistic and psycholinguistic approaches (without neglecting sociolinguistic approaches, which are not discussed here).

1 Introduction

The earliest conceptions of the field of Contact Linguistics envisioned it as a multi-disciplinary area of study, encompassing a broad range of language contact phenomena and issues, linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociological and psycholinguistic. Weinreich (1953) was the first to propose a systematized and integrated framework within which language contact could be investigated. His chief contribution was an attempt to integrate linguistic analysis with social and psychological explanations to account for the consequences of language contact. Weinreich consistently emphasized that

> In linguistic interference, the problem of major interest is the interplay of structural and non-structural factors that promote or impede such interference. The structural factors are those which stem from the organization of linguistic forms into a definite system, different for every language and to a considerable degree independent of non-linguistic experience and behavior. The non-structural factors are derived from the contact of the system with the outer world, from given individuals' familiarity with the system, and from the symbolic value which the system as a whole is capable of acquiring and the emotions it can evoke. (1953: 5)

Contact linguistics has tended to focus its attention far more on structural description of contact phenomena and their sources in the input languages, than on the "non-structural" factors that Weinreich placed equal emphasis on. In particular, he emphasizes that language contact can best be understood only "in a broad psychological and socio-cultural setting" (1953: 4). Weinreich also offered a detailed blueprint for the investigation of each of these aspects of language con-

tact situations, identifying a broad range of factors that influence the outcomes of contact. Some of these relate to the individual speaker, for instance (Weinreich 1953: 3):

(a) The speaker's facility of verbal expression in general and his ability to keep two languages apart.
(b) Relative proficiency in each language;
(c) Specialization in the use of each language by topics and interlocutors;
(d) Manner of learning each language;
(e) Attitudes toward each language, and whether idiosyncratic or stereotyped.

Other "non-structural" factors are characteristic of groups, for instance:

(f) Size of bilingual group and its socio-cultural homogeneity or differentiation; breakdown into sub-groups using one or the other language as their mother tongue; demographic facts; social and political relations between these sub-groups.
(g) Prevalence of bilingual individuals with given characteristics of speech behavior (in terms of points a – e above) in the several sub-groups.
(h) Stereotyped attitudes toward each language ("prestige"); indigenous or immigrant status of the languages concerned.
(i) Attitudes toward the culture of each language community;
(j) Attitudes toward bilingualism as such;
(k)Tolerance or intolerance with regard to mixing languages and to incorrect speech in each language;
(l) Relation between the bilingual group and each of the two language communities of which it is a marginal segment.

Research on the language proficiency of bilingual individuals has been conducted chiefly within the discipline of Psycholinguistics; the attitudinal aspects of bilingual language use have been investigated primarily within the Social Psychology of Language, while research on the social aspects of bilingualism has been conducted chiefly within the disciplines of the Sociology of Language and Sociolinguistics, with some contribution as well from Linguistic Anthropology. If Weinreich's vision of an integrated theoretical framework for Language Contact studies is to be achieved, there is clearly need for more cooperation across these disciplines. So far, such a framework has continued to elude us. But progress is slowly being made toward the goal of a theory that includes all aspects of language contact, whether linguistic, sociolinguistic, or psycholinguistic.

I do not pretend to have such a comprehensive framework to offer here, nor to be able to show how such integration of approaches can be accomplished. It would be a gigantic, and (given our current knowledge) near impossible task to cover all of the issues that are relevant to a comprehensive theory of contact-

induced change. Therefore, I limit my attention to ways in which linguistic approaches to contact phenomena might be integrated with psycholinguistic approaches. I won't discuss ways in which sociolinguistic approaches to contact phenomena might inform our approach, though these are obviously of crucial importance. Indeed, Thomason & Kaufman (1988) assign primary importance to the role played by social factors in shaping the consequences of contact, declaring that "It is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact" (1988: 35). What this suggests, first, is that we need to distinguish among the various social contexts of language contact if we are to understand the nature and direction of interference. Second, it is necessary to examine, where possible, the actual speech behavior of persons in each contact situation in order to uncover the factors that motivate them to change their language in one way or another. It follows that an understanding of the role of social factors in contact-induced change is crucial to questions such as the direction of change, and the role played by individual's proficiency and motivation in such change. In that sense, social factors do play a key role in determining the outcomes of contact-induced change.

Whatever the approach may be, students of language contact are all concerned, ultimately, with the same problem – how to analyze and account for language contact phenomena. Hence we should be devoting our efforts to achieving consensus and unity in the field. We might begin by agreeing on the range of phenomena that we are all interested in. There is growing agreement that these include: bilingual language acquisition; bilingual code-switching and mixture; second language acquisition; borrowing and convergence between languages; the creation of new contact languages, and language attrition or obsolescence. Different scholars, working in different disciplines, approach such phenomena with from different perspectives. Contact linguists who study contemporary bilingual behavior have documented and classified various types of bilingual speech, particularly those involving code-switching. Psycholinguists attempt to provide insights into the language processing of bilingual speakers and the cognitive processes attendant on the way they mix their languages. Researchers in SLA attempt to explain the nature and types of transfer that occur in the process of acquisition, and the constraints that regulate them. Historical approaches to language contact deal with outcomes of language mixture that occurred in the past, the processes of whose creation we can no longer observe. Yet it is clear that we are all dealing with the same questions concerning the processes and mechanisms of language mixture. Hence the unity of contact phenomena should be captured in an integrated framework that incorporates insights from all of the disciplines involved in the study of language contact.

My main goal here is to suggest how psycholinguistic approaches to language contact can shed light on the mechanisms of change that linguists are

primarily interested in. Hence my focus will be on the role played by individuals as initiators of change, rather than on the social contexts and forces that shape the ways in which such change becomes conventionalized as part of the linguistic system. At the same time, it is clear that, for any contact situation, it is the precisely the social contexts and forces at work that determine whether individuals or groups are more or less proficient in one or the other language, whether they maintain their ancestral languages or shift toward a second language, or whether they maintain a kind of balanced bilingualism. Each of these sociolinguistic configurations can have profoundly different effects on how the languages in contact influence each other, since they determine not just the social dominance relationships between the languages, but also their linguistic dominance relationships within individual members of the community, as described above by Weinreich.

Clearly we need an appropriate framework for investigating the linguistic processes and mechanisms of contact-induced change – one that is compatible with sociolinguistic as well as psycholinguistic approaches to language contact. However, the frameworks that are currently employed generally fail to link these two approaches. I propose that van Coetsem's framework offers a feasible basis for such an integration. In the following section, I discuss previous approaches to contact-induced change, and contrast them with van Coetsem's framework.

2 Frameworks for contact-induced change

The current frameworks for investigating contact-induced change all follow Weinreich's (1953) distinction between "borrowing" and "interference" as the two basic types of cross-linguistic influence. For instance, Thomason & Kaufman (1988) classified contact-induced changes into two broad types – those due to borrowing, and those due to interference through shift (1988:37). Similarly, Johanson (2000, 2002) distinguishes between 'adoption" (a term that he prefers to borrowing) and "imposition", which corresponds closely to interference through shift. For the most part, scholars seem to accept the classifications summarized above, which are based primarily on the results of contact-induced change, rather than on the psycholinguistic mechanisms involved. I argue that van Coetsem's (1988, 2000) approach offers us a way to understand such mechanisms, and how they determine the outcomes of contact-induced change.

2.1 Van Coetsem's framework

Van Coetsem's approach to language contact is essentially psycholinguistic in nature, and specifically addresses Weinreich's call for investigation of individual's roles as initiators of change in language contact situations. As we shall see, it assigns crucial significance to the factors that Weinreich identified as crucial, such as the individual's facility of verbal expression in general, his or her ability to keep two languages apart, and relative proficiency in each language. As

Weinreich pointed out, such factors in turn are related to the individual's specialization in the use of each language by topics and interlocutors; manner of learning each language; and attitudes toward each language. Such factors are the concern of sociolinguistic investigation. Like other researchers, van Coetsem makes a broad distinction between two types of language transfer, namely borrowing and imposition, but his main contribution was to refine the distinction by specifying the kinds of mechanism and agency that each type of transfer involves. In both types of transfer, there is a source language and a recipient language. The direction of transfer is always from the source language to the recipient language, and the agent of the transfer is either the recipient language speaker or the source language speaker. In the former case we have borrowing (recipient language agentivity), in the latter, imposition (source language agentivity). The distinction between these two types of transfer is based, crucially, on the psycholinguistic notion of language dominance. This refers roughly to the degrees of proficiency that the speaker has in each language, though it must be emphasized that a speaker may have different degrees of proficiency in different areas of a language. Generally, however, a speaker is linguistically dominant in the language in which he is more proficient or fluent – which is usually, but not necessarily, his first or native language (van Coetsem 1988: 13).

Borrowing is the process by which the speaker, as agent of change, introduces elements from an external source language (SL) into a recipient language (RL) in which he is linguistically dominant. As van Coetsem explains,

> If the recipient language speaker is the agent, as in the case of an English speaker using French words while speaking English, the transfer of material (and this naturally includes structure) from the source language to the recipient language is *borrowing (recipient language agentivity)*. (1988: 3, italics in original)

Imposition, on the other hand, is a process by which the speaker transfers features of his linguistically dominant language (as SL) into his version of the recipient language (RL), "as in the case of a French speaker using his French articulatory habits while speaking English" (ibid.). The differences in the way the psycholinguistic mechanisms of borrowing (RL agentivity) and imposition (SL agentivity) work explain why the linguistic consequences of these two mechanisms differ so markedly. In borrowing, the speaker will preserve the more stable components of the recipient language, in which he is dominant. Hence RL phonology, morphology, and syntax are preserved, while less stable features, such as vocabulary, can be replaced or added to. This is why borrowing tends to involve transfer primarily of vocabulary and some kinds of functional elements. Imposition, on the other hand, involves preservation of the structural aspects of the SL which is the speaker's dominant language, and this explains why it tends to involve transfer of phonological and grammatical elements and structures into the less dominant RL. Finally, van Coetsem's framework emphasizes the crucial

difference between linguistic dominance, which is an individual psycholinguistic phenomenon, and social dominance, which is a socio-political concept, based on the power or prestige standing of one of the languages. Only the former is relevant to the processes and mechanisms of contact-induced change. It must be noted that the socially dominant language may or may not be the linguistically dominant language of the speaker as agent of change. Moreover, both linguistic and social dominance relationships may change over time, in individual speakers and in the community at large. It is precisely these insights of van Coetsem's framework that are lacking in other approaches to contact-induced change, which we now turn to.

2.2 Problems with other frameworks

Seen from the perspective of van Coetsem's framework, both Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) and Johanson's frameworks for investigating contact-induced changes are highly problematic in various respects. The chief weakness of Thomason & Kaufman's approach is that they define borrowing as inextricably linked to language maintenance, and interference exclusively as a product of shift that produces 'imperfect' second language acquisition. In fact, there is no one-to-one relationship between any mechanism of change and the type of language situation that is involved. This is because both situations of maintenance and situations of language shift can involve differences in dominance relationships between the languages in contact. Hence there is potential for both borrowing and imposition to come into play in both situations. Moreover, linguistic dominance relations vary from individual to individual, and community to community. This makes it impossible for us to treat all cases of language maintenance or shift as if they were the same, or could produce predictable results. In short, it is by no means obvious that situations of maintenance are associated exclusively with borrowing into the maintained language, and situations of shift exclusively with substratum influence of the L1 on the L2, as Thomason & Kaufman argue. Such equations are simplistic, and lead to serious misunderstanding of both the nature and direction of contact-induced change. It seems clear that these are determined, in the first instance, by the linguistic dominance relationships between the languages, and not by their social status (as ancestral versus target language) or socio-political dominance relationship. Since linguistic dominance relationships can and do differ significantly both within and across speech communities even in situations of language maintenance, they can lead to very different linguistic outcomes. The same is true in situations of shift.

Thomason & Kaufman's approach has particularly unfortunate consequences for our understanding of contact-induced change in situations of language maintenance. This is because there are many situations where speakers who maintain their ancestral or first language are also engaged in shift to a second language. It often turns out that such speakers become linguistically more profi-

cient or dominant in their second language, and then tend to transfer features from it to their ancestral language. These are the kinds of changes that have been mistakenly characterized as cases of structural borrowing in the work of Thomason and Kaufman and others. A well-known case in point is that of Asia Minor Greek, which underwent significant changes at all levels of structure under the influence of Turkish. Thomason & Kaufman (1988) claim that such changes were due to structural borrowing, arguing that, "if Turks did not shift to Greek, all of the interference must be due to borrowing" (1988: 218). This overlooks the strong possibility that bilinguals, especially those that were Turkish-dominant, played a key role in introducing these changes (Winford 2005: 408). Contemporary situations involving change in a maintained ancestral language also challenge Thomason & Kaufman's conception of what borrowing involves. Smits (1998) also criticizes their approach for failing to distinguish the effects of borrowing from those of imposition in the case of Iowa Dutch. Speakers of this language were bilingual in English, which gradually became their dominant language. Consequently, Iowa Dutch began to incorporate various structural elements from English at the phonological and syntactic levels, but with relatively limited transfer of English vocabulary. This is precisely what van Coetsem's model would predict to occur as the result of imposition from the more dominant language, English, on the less dominant ancestral language, Dutch.

Another framework that fails to make correct predictions about contact induced change because it fails to take linguistic dominance into account is that of Johanson (2002), who distinguishes between two broad categories of contact-induced change – global and selective code-copying (2002: 291). According to Johanson, code-copying is the result of two distinct mechanisms, which he refers to as "adoption" (which he equates with what others call "borrowing") and "imposition". At first glance, it would seem that Johanson's distinction between adoption and imposition is equivalent to van Coetsem's distinction between borrowing and imposition, especially since, like van Coetsem, Johanson also appeals to "dominance relations" to distinguish adoption from imposition. However, Johanson's interpretation of dominance is based on the socio-political status of the languages, not on degrees of proficiency, as in van Coetsem's framework. As a result, his conceptions of both borrowing and imposition are radically different from van Coetsem's. He defines the two mechanisms as follows:

> In the case of adoption, speakers of a sociolinguistically-dominated code A insert copies from a sociolinguistically-dominant code B. In the case of imposition, speakers of the sociolinguistically-dominated code A insert copies from it into their own variety of the sociolinguistically-dominant code B. (2002: 290)

This equation of each transfer type with a particular *social* dominance configuration differs fundamentally from van Coetsem's psycholinguistically-based association of each transfer type with a different *linguistic* dominance configura-

tion. Johanson's approach therefore suffers from a deficiency similar to that of Thomason & Kaufman's framework, in that it treats any form of transfer from a socially dominant to a subordinate language as a case of borrowing, while any form of transfer in the opposite direction is labeled imposition. Johanson deliberately rejects any attempt to explain contact phenomena in psycholinguistic terms:

> …changes due to code-copying will be discussed exclusively in terms of observable linguistic structures. It will not be claimed that copies are psycholinguistically produced or processed in the steps discussed. (2002: 287)

Such an approach, like Thomason & Kaufman's, is unfortunate in that it assigns many instances of contact-induced change to the wrong category of adoption (that is, borrowing), when they are really cases of imposition in van Coetsem's sense of the term. In the following section, I discuss how van Coetsem's framework offers a unified approach to a wide variety of contact phenomena that have been classified in very different ways, and argue that they can be assigned to one or the other of the two major psycholinguistic mechanisms of borrowing and imposition.

3 Toward a unified classification of contact phenomena

In this section, I discuss how van Coetsem's model allows us to achieve a consistent classification of disparate language contact phenomena as cases of either borrowing or imposition.

3.1 Contact phenomena due to borrowing

A cursory glance at the literature on contact-induced change soon reveals that there is no clear consensus on how borrowing should be defined, or how it can be distinguished from other mechanisms of change. Indeed, some scholars use "borrowing" as a cover term for all kinds of contact-induced change. Thus Aikhenvald (2002), following Trask (2000: 44), defines borrowing as "the transfer of features of any kind from one language to another as the result of contact". For Aikhenvald, then, borrowing covers a broad range of phenomena, including cases of "direct diffusion", that is, the transfer of overt forms, as well as "indirect diffusion", the transfer of categories and patterns (Aikhenvald 2002: 4). Most scholars define borrowing more narrowly as transfer of phonetic substance of some kind or another, or "material transfer" (MAT) (Matras & Sakel 2007; Heine & Kuteva 2005: 6). Classifications like these tell us little about the actual processes (linguistic and psycholinguistic) that are involved in borrowing. By contrast, van Coetsem's approach defines borrowing as a psycholinguistic mechanism by which speakers introduce materials from an external source language (SL) into a recipient language (RL) in which they are more proficient, and in doing so, preserve the more stable domains of the RL. This explains why bor-