Published in: The International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, 2nd edn (Elsevier) 2015, pp. 300-306.

# Language Contact

**Brian D Joseph,** The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA




## Abstract

With examples drawn from a variety of languages but especially those found in the Balkans, this article discusses language contact from a variety of perspectives. The author first places contact between speakers of different languages in its sociolinguistic context, then briefly traces the history of the study of language contact, followed by a discussion of the mechanisms of language contact, its manifestations, and its effects.


## Introduction

Although language exists in the minds of individual speakers, it is also very much a social phenomenon, involving more than one speaker engaged with another in acts of communication. Thus, speakers of a language, any language, (except, of course, those with a small number of speakers who are not in a position to talk with one another) are always interacting with other speakers. Generally, the interaction takes place between speakers of the same language, but what does 'same language' mean here? It is known that no two speakers of what is ostensibly the same language speak exactly identically, and that, moreover, the line between different languages and different dialects of the same language is often very hard to draw and is generally open both to interpretation and to external manipulation, for example, for political or nationalistic purposes.

Thus in the normal course of language use, contact between speakers of nonidentical language systems takes place again and again. Contact between speakers of different dialects is at one end of a continuum of degree of identity in such situations; at the other end is contact between speakers of different languages. Moreover, even pairs of different languages may show different degrees of similarity, when one is set in opposition to another, so that Russian and Ukrainian are in many ways more similar to each other than either is to Hindi or to Thai. Linguists usually refers to such contact situations as 'language contact' or 'dialect contact,' as the case may be, even though it must be emphasized that the contact is between speakers in concrete communicative situations and not between languages or dialects as systems in the abstract. Moreover, even where one might recognize a construct such as a 'macrolanguage' to subsume all varieties of a given speech form or in cases where there is a standard language that is the default that one thinks of when referring to 'language X,' the speaker-to-speaker contact that is generally characterized as 'language contact' actually involves a dialect, that is, the particular variety of the language, the specific dialect, that each speaker is using in that communicative encounter.

The study of language contact has a long history, inasmuch as a mixing in of words and even other linguistic elements was recognized by ancient observers; the Romans, for instance, were aware of the presence of Greek words in their Latin, and certain spelling conventions, such as the use of the letter *y*, were used at one time by Romans writing Latin to mark words of Greek origin. And, as a true science of language emerged in the West in the nineteenth century, through the determination of the history of various classical languages of Europe, especially Latin and Greek, and their genealogical – a term often used now instead of the more traditional 'genetic,' because of the unwanted biological implications of the traditional term – relationship to other languages in Europe, such as Gothic and Irish, and in Asia, such as Old Persian and Sanskrit, the distinction between 'inherited' forms and structures, i.e., those passed down through regular language transmission, and 'borrowed' forms and structures, i.e., those that diffused into a language from an external linguistic system, took on a special significance. This distinction was a key part of the reasoning behind the establishment of regular sound correspondences between two or more languages (and the recognition of regular sound changes that follows from the identification of such correspondences) and of the demonstration of language relationships. To elaborate briefly, the point is that once one is able to isolate across two or more languages words and/or morphemes that are cognate, i.e., that have sprung from the same source and are inherited into each of the languages in question, and that by virtue of their cognacy show systematic correspondences of sound between them, it becomes possible to argue that forms that do not fit the patterns of correspondence may be later entries from some language into one or more of the languages being compared. For instance, a comparison of Latin *dent-* and English *tooth* reveals two consonant correspondences, $d \sim t$ and $t \sim \theta$, that recur in many other words (e.g., ***d**ecem* ~ ***t**en*, ***d**omus* 'house' ~ ***t**imber* ('building' in old English), *tres* ~ ***th**ree*, *terra* '(dry) land' ~ ***th**irst*, inter alia) and that therefore provide a basis for determining that matches like ***d**ent-* ~ ***d**ental* or ***t**riplus* ~ ***t**riple* are due to contact-based influence, despite the identity of the relevant elements; indeed, some might say 'because of' rather than 'despite,' on the assumption that with matchings that are identical in one set and nonidentical in another set, the nonidentical ones are more likely to reflect true cognacy and the identical ones more likely to reflect a contact-related development.

This distinction was in part reflected in the controversy in the nineteenth century between the family tree modeling of language relationships, as espoused by August Schleicher ('*Stammbaumtheorie*,' cf. Schleicher, 1853), and the wave theory modeling ('*Wellentheorie*') of Johannes Schmidt (cf Schmidt, 1872). Schleicher's model reflected system-internal innovations that caused breaks in speech communities and ultimately



International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, Second Edition, 2015, 300–306

resulted in splits into multiple dialects and eventually multiple languages, while Schmidt's model reflected innovations that diffused across the (relatively clean) lines of descent of the Stammbaum model, thus marking changes that involved contact between speakers of differentiated speech communities, i.e., that spread through dialect or language contact. Although Schmidt's contact-based model seems to be at odds with Scheicher's line-of-descent model, they are really modeling different kinds of linguistic innovations, essentially changes induced by system-internal factors (Schleicher) and those induced by system-external factors (Schmidt). The importance of recognizing system-external factors is thus set against what is known about language-internal paths to differentiation; as the example of *tooth*/*dental*/*dent-* above shows, one can only understand what is due to contact by having a clear picture of what is inherited (and vice versa, one might well say, so that what is inherited becomes clear(er) once what is due to external influence is identified).

Nonetheless, despite the early importance that the recognition of contact between languages has played in the study of language in general but especially the study of language change, it is fair to say that in recent years, the study of language contact has come into its own, aided by the emergence of the study of pidgin and creole languages as a distinct subarea within linguistics on the one hand, and the recognition of the importance of bi- and multilingualism on a psychological and social level on the other. There is now a separate subdiscipline of 'contact linguistics,' complete with textbooks (e.g., Thomason, 2001; Winford, 2003; Matras, 2009), handbooks (e.g., Goebl et al., 1997/2008, Hickey, 2010), specialized studies (e.g., Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 2002), focused collections (e.g., Thomason, 1997; Siemund and Kintana, 2008), and the like. In what follows, the key concepts and constructs associated with the study of language contact are presented, by way of illustrating and explicating how vital the recognition of language contact is to the understanding of language in general, and how pervasive the effects of language contact can be.

## Mechanisms of Language Contact

Language contact must begin with different language systems, and thus with some degree of bilingualism (using this as a cover term for any number of languages involved) either on an individual basis, where one speaker has abilities in two (or more) different languages, or on a societal basis, where groups of speakers of different languages live coterritorially, interacting with one another in the community at large and existing side by side (to be understood figuratively and broadly, so as to cover as well cases in which different language groups are essentially segregated in different parts of a city or region). In cases of individual bilingualism, especially when the speaker in question has a nativelike command of both languages, the language contact can be said to take place in the mind of the speaker. In societal bilingualism, however, the contact takes place between different speakers so that there truly is a social dimension to the contact. But in such a situation, in order for speakers of different languages to interact linguistically, at least one must have to some degree learned the language of the other, and in that phrase 'to some degree,' the seeds of language change through language contact are to be found. It is important to emphasize 'linguistic' interaction, because made-up and highly iconic gestures can be a basis for some communication, much as picture writing can be in the absence of a shared writing system; such gestures would foster communication between groups but without affecting their languages.

That is, in most instances of contact between speakers of different languages, one of the speakers involved is less than fully proficient in the language being used, typically having learned the language as a second language, an add-on to already well-entrenched language abilities. This second-language learning will often have come in adulthood.

At this point, an aside, but an important one, is in order. It is a common observation that younger children and perhaps even teens seem to be able to gain a native or nativelike command of a second language in ways and to a degree that older adults cannot; rather, adults seem generally to struggle with gaining such abilities. And, it is common, though somewhat controversial, to explain this observation in terms of a 'critical period' developmentally for language acquisition that allows younger speakers to gain a native command of a given language; such a period is usually thought to last into one's early teens or thereabouts, so that one could distinguish between the presumably perfect acquisition of a native language and the less-than-perfect command that typically comes with language learning later in life. While this hypothesis is doctrine among some linguists, there are adults who gain such a fine command of a second language that they can pass as native speakers, suggesting that other factors may be involved in second-language acquisition and that the occurrence of differential outcomes for child and adult language learners is not a purely biological developmental matter. That is, differential learning outcomes may not be an effect specific to the learning of language but could be due to differential motivations for learning on the part of the different groups, e.g., just for communication or for social indexing as well, or differential general learning abilities and strategies employed by the different individuals in the different groups.

This said, second-language learning for adults and even for many bilingual children will necessarily involve the second language being learned through the filter of an already existing language system, the learner's native language. This means that a speaker's native language can have an effect on a second language that one comes to speak later in life, after the native language is solidly in place in one's mind. These effects are often referred to as 'substratum effects' (the native language being a substratum that underlies production of a secondarily acquired language) or as 'interference' or 'transfer' effects (the native language patterns interfering with or transferring onto the production of the secondarily acquired language). Such substratum/interference/transfer effects can be observed in the difficulties second-language speakers can have learning to use elements with no direct analog in their native language. At the level of sound, for instance, one can note the persistence of native pronunciation patterns into a second language, i.e., speaking with an 'accent,' as when English speakers have trouble with the voiced velar fricative ([ɣ]) of modern Greek, and pronounce a name like [andiɣóni] ('Antigone') as [andigóni], or Greek speakers have trouble with the voiceless palatal

fricative ([ʃ]) of English, and pronounce a name like [ʃejn] ('Shane') as [sejn], since these sounds are not part of the speaker's native language phonological inventory. Similarly, Russian speakers have trouble learning to indicate definiteness and indefiniteness in English through the use of the articles *the* and *a(n)*, since Russian has no such morphemes, relying instead on word order to express such discourse-sensitive notions.

Such difficulties in second-language learning are ubiquitous and almost inevitable, given that there is always a first language in place when an older speaker learns a second language. Moreover, these effects are important to note, as they give an indication of how a language in the broad sense could be affected by contact. The operative phrase here is 'in the broad sense,' since such substratum interference generally has no effect on the grammars of *native* speakers. Rather, the target language is changed only in the mouths (and minds) of those acquiring and using it secondarily; the French spoken with an American English accent by a university student studying French as a foreign language does not affect in any way the French spoken by a Parisian or by a Quebecois(e). Nonetheless, such interference might be relevant for contact-induced change in a couple of ways.

First, if the numbers of second-language users and their demographic concentration are sufficient, interference on an individual basis, repeated in speaker after speaker coming at the learning of a second language, perhaps out of necessity due to conquest or trade encounters or forced – or even voluntary – relocation, with the same first language background, can lead to the emergence of a new dialect of the target language, and thus to change in the overall makeup of that language. This has been the case with the emergence of Indian English, for instance, and, for that matter, with most so-called 'New Englishes' (see Schneider, 2003).

Second, a powerful force in language contact is accommodation (see, e.g., Giles, 1973; Giles and Johnson, 1987; Sachdev and Giles, 2004, among many other works, for discussion of accommodation), the process by which speakers alter their behavior, in this case their linguistic behavior, in the direction of that of their interlocutor(s), partly to enhance communication and partly to avoid uncomfortable encounters and to promote the saving of face for all participants. Thus a native speaker might well adjust his or her pronunciation of particular words in the direction used erroneously by a nonnative second-language speaker so as not to embarrass the nonnative speaker or draw attention to his or her error. Or, the native speaker might avoid complex syntactic constructions on the assumption that they might be too difficult for the second-language speaker to understand or respond to. In this way, the usage of the native speaker and the second-language speaker might converge in certain respects on the second-language speaker's usage, moving in a direction away from the native norm, or might reach some sort of 'compromise' variety between the two language forms. If the interaction is just a one-off event, there is really no effect on the target (native) language, but if such encounters are commonplace, and again if the numbers of second-language speakers are high enough, there could well be an overall effect on the usage of the native language speakers, especially in mixed company involving both native speakers and second-language speakers.

Another type of interference effect arises in cases in which a speaker is obliged in the society at large to use a language other than his or her native language on a regular basis, to the extent where the second-language patterns affect the native language patterns for that individual. Such effects can be called 'reverse interference' (see Joseph, 2009; Friedman and Joseph, 2015: Chapter 3), since it is the reverse of the more usual substratum situation described above. Cook (2003: 1) calls it 'backward transfer,' also 'reverse transfer', but 'reverse interference' is preferable because it does not always involve the transfer of features per se, but can involve just some influence (as with the Portuguese-on-English example given below).

Although not as well studied as substratum interference, reverse interference is no less real. A well-known case has to do with voice onset time (VOT), as described by Major (1992), who discovered that native speakers of English living in Brazil, i.e., in a Portuguese-dominant environment, showed VOT in their English stops that approximated but did not necessarily match exactly the Portuguese VOT, thus a sort of compromise between English and Portuguese VOT. Similarly, Hussein (1994) demonstrated that native Arabic speakers immersed for many years in an English-dominant environment had English-like vowel lengthening before voiced stops in their Arabic. Such 'reverse' effects also show up in speech perception; Caramazza et al. (1973) found that French–English bilinguals perceived stops in both languages in terms of the VOT of their second language, English, even though they did not show reverse production influence from English into their French, suggesting that this overall phenomenon is perhaps more complex than might first be supposed. A final example shows that reverse interference effects can be found in syntax as well as in phonology, for Young People's Dyirbal (YD), as described by Schmidt (1985: 230), shows evidence of English word order in the productions of YD speakers, saying "the exceptionally-free T[raditional]D[yirbal] word order is rigidified in YD as an A[gent]-V[erb]-O[bject] pattern as in English."

As mechanisms of change through language contact, interference (substratum/transfer) and reverse interference are not completely distinct. They have in common, of course, the fact of one language affecting another, but it may be a matter in each of the dominant language affecting the lesser one; 'dominant' here does not mean socially dominant, but rather cognitively or psychologically dominant in the perception of the individual speakers. Thus, what might make it possible for a speaker's native language to be affected by a secondarily learned language is that the speaker uses the second language in a wide range of contexts, almost to the exclusion of the native language. That is, native language attrition may be involved with the second language becoming the speaker's default language. In this way, the social dimension of bilingualism and the individual dimension converge, make possible change within the individual, and therefore change within the social group as well.

## Manifestations of Language Contact

As the discussion in the previous section indicates, the main manifestation of language contact is the influence of one language system over another. The most straightforward effect is addition to the lexicon, what is traditionally called 'borrowing,' producing 'borrowings' or 'loanwords.' Terminology referring to 'borrowing' or 'loans' is widely used, but

is infelicitous for various reasons. For one thing, the donor language does not 'lose' anything and is not diminished in any way and 'borrowed/lent' items/features are not returned. One might make an exception to this latter claim in the case of reborrowings, where a word passes from one language into another and then, at a later stage back into the original donor language, as with English *tennis*, originally from French *tenez*! 'hold! receive!,' but now the source of present-day French *tennis*; however, even in such a case, there is really only a historical oddity to marvel at, not an overt decision by speakers to give back and thus repatriate some word or other. Furthermore, as traditionally used, 'borrowing' was (almost) exclusively lexical in nature (as suggested also by the other term, 'loanword'); linguists have come to realize, though, that more can be passed ('borrowed/lent') between languages than just lexical items, as is discussed more fully below. Despite the shortcomings of the traditional terminology, its use is commonplace, and not likely to change any time soon.

Loanwords have been classified in various ways. One classification schema focuses primarily on the form of the loan. Haugen (1950), for instance, drew a difference between 'importation' and 'substitution,' where the key distinction is whether markers of foreignness are present (in 'importations') or not (in 'substitutions'). English borrowings from Norman French with initial *v-*, like *veal*, would be importations, since the French sound was maintained more or less as is, even though at the time of borrowing, [v] was not found word-initially in English. A recent borrowing into English from (Mexican) Spanish such as *taco*, with aspirated [$t^h$] in the English in place of a Spanish unaspirated [t], which does not occur in initial position in English, would be an example of a substitution.

There can also be classification based primarily on the content of the loan, as in the schema of Bloomfield (1933). Bloomfield's distinction was between, on the one hand 'cultural borrowings,' those arising via the exchange, often mutual, of terminology for culturally based objects between speakers of different languages representing different cultures, as with many English words from American Indian languages, such as *moccasin*, from an Algonquian language designating at first just the soft leather shoe worn by the Indians, and on the other hand 'intimate borrowings,' those not obviously linked to cultural objects, such as *veal* noted above. Additionally, there can be classification focusing primarily on the motivation for the loan, as in the schema of Hockett (1958), who distinguished between 'need borrowings,' echoing Bloomfield's cultural type, but with the motivation of 'needing' a word for a (new) cultural item at issue, and 'prestige borrowings,' where the motivation is the 'prestige' that the borrowing language speakers accord to material from the donor language.

These typologies have been quite influential, but are not without some problems. For one thing, by focusing on form, Haugen's classification does not build in the social context for the loans, even though there is almost always the social dimension to borrowing of contact between speakers. An exception to this latter statement must be made for so-called 'learnèd borrowings' from an earlier, often (perceived as) stylistically elevated, stage of a language, as seen, for instance, in Latin borrowings into Romance languages, such as Spanish *digito* 'digit, number' from Latin *digitum* (here Spanish also has the form that developed by regular sound changes from *digitum*, namely, *dedo* 'finger'), and also in the Bulgarian and Russian use of Church Slavonic words, the adoption into Modern Greek *dimotiki* (low-style, colloquial language) of *katharevousa* (high-style, ancient-Greek-based) words, or Sanskritisms in modern Indo-Aryan languages (so-called 'tatsama' words). Moreover, the types listed above are not necessarily discrete; a cultural/need loan might be undertaken for reasons of (Hockettian) prestige or be associated with (Bloomfieldian) intimate contact. Also, noncultural/nonneed loans are not always a matter of prestige, at least not obviously so. For instance, the Albanian dialect of Greece known as Arvanitika, spoken in Greece for some 600 years, is the source of the diminutive suffix *–zə* that occurred in the early twentieth century at least in the Greek town of Megara, in Attica, as in *liγaza* 'a little,' formed from Greek *liγa* 'a little' with the Arvanitika diminutive added on; this occurred even though Albanian, and Albanians, have never been accorded much overt prestige by Greek speakers.

One may do well, then, to recognize a type of loanword that goes beyond these classificatory boundaries and focuses on the milieu in which the borrowing takes place. Friedman and Joseph (2014, 2015), for instance, have suggested that the medium of conversation must be recognized as crucial in borrowings and that in face-to-face interactions of an ongoing and sustained sort, various types of conversationally rooted borrowings transcending need or prestige and emerging just from repeated conversational encounters will occur. Such loans can be referred to as 'ERIC' loans, an acronym for 'essentially rooted in conversation' (that also honors Eric P. Hamp, historical linguist and contact linguist (and Balkanist) par excellence). Discourse-based items such as confirmatory words, hedges, attitudinal markers, and the like can be borrowed in such circumstances. In the Balkans, for instance, one finds 'yes' passing from Slavic (*da*) into Romanian and from Greek (*malista*) into Aromanian as well as negatives being borrowed, as with the Greek prohibitive negator *mi* 'don't…!' and the negative word *oxi* 'no' entering Southern Aromanian (as *mi* and *ohi*).

Further, there are some forms that are inextricably tied to conversation. For instance, a vocative element signaling unceremonious address, rather like 'hey you' in English, has spread all over the Balkans from a Greek starting point (with most forms deriving ultimately from the ancient Greek *mōré*, vocative of 'foolish'), as discussed in Joseph (1997); a sampling of the relevant forms is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Turkish | *bre, bire, be* |
| Albanian | *ore, or, mor, more, moj, ori, mori, moré, mre, voré, bre, be* |
| Aromanian | *More, mori, bre, be, or …* |
| Romanian | *bre, mă, măi* |
| Bulgarian/ Macedonian | *more, mori, bre, be, or …* |
| Romani | *more, mori, bre, be, or …* |
| Greek | *moré, bre, vre, re, aré, maré, mańí, oré, voré, or, mor, mo*, etc. |

Also, there are exhortatives, rather like English 'c'mon,' that have spread widely, such as Albanian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian *ela* 'c'mon' from Greek *ela* 'c'mon,' or the widespread *(h)a(γ)de*, from Turkish *(h)ay de*.

Another classificatory schema for loanwords has to do with what is referred to as 'borrowability,' and it is suggested that there are some words that are less likely to be borrowed. At least as far back as Swadesh (1950) and his list of basic vocabulary items, linguists have worked with the assumption that a core of basic lexemes would be more resistant to borrowing than nonbasic items; this core varies from linguist to linguist, but includes items such as primary body parts ('head,' 'foot,' 'mouth,' etc.), omnipresent aspects of the natural world ('sun,' 'water,' 'cloud,' etc.), basic verbal actions ('eat,' 'say,' 'sit,' etc.), immediate kinship terms ('father,' 'mother,' 'brother,' etc.), and various closed-class or grammatical forms such as numerals, pronouns ('I,' 'this,' etc.), adpositions, complementizers, connectives, and the like. Still, it is possible to find examples of the borrowing of such items: kin-term loanwords occur among languages of the Balkans, e.g., Turkish *baba* 'father' ⇒ Greek *babás*, Albanian *baba*; Greek *patéra* ⇒ Aromanian *patera*; Turkish *dayı* 'maternal uncle' ⇒ Albanian *dajë*, Macedonian *daja*, as do pronominal loans, e.g., Greek *m(u)* 'my' ⇒ Aromanian *–m;* Turkish *bu* 'this' ⇒ Ottoman-era Edirne Greek *bu* 'this'; postpositions, e.g., Turkish *karşı* (*karşi* in Balkan Turkish) 'opposite' ⇒ Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Ottoman-era Edirne Greek *karshi* (spelled differently in the various languages so that 'karshi' here is a cover form for various similar-sounding realizations of the Turkish word; it is noteworthy that the Aromanian and Greek forms were used as postpositions, while in the other languages, the form was adapted to the native pattern of prepositional use); numerals, e.g., Greek *efta, oxto, enja* '7, 8, 9' ⇒ Romani *efta, ohto, enna/enja*; complementizers, e.g., Turkish (<Persian) *zira* (std), *zere* (dial) 'because' ⇒ Bulgarian and Macedonian *zer* (with variants *zerem, zare, zerja, zeri*); as well as connectives, e.g., Macedonian *i* 'and' ⇒ Aromanian and Romani *i*.

Some linguists have seen constraints on borrowing as tied to the grammatical nature of the element, with bound morphology, both derivational and inflectional, being hard to borrow. Yet once again, counterexamples can be found. The Turkish agentive/occupational suffix *–çI/-cI* (the symbol *–I* here represents a high vowel that harmonizes for frontness and rounding with the final vowel of the stem that the suffix attaches to) has spread all over the Balkans (cf Greek *taksi-dzis* 'taxi driver,' Macedonian *lov-džija* 'hunter'), and the Turkish plural suffix *–lar/-ler* still occurs in present-day Albanian (e.g., *baballar* 'fathers,' *efendiler* 'sirs') and could be found in wider use as well in nineteenth-century Bulgarian.

One element of the debate over constraining borrowing has focused on whether only concrete material can be borrowed or whether structural aspects of a language can also be affected by contact with another language. Clear examples of structural patterns passing from one language to another, sometimes running counter to trends in place in the borrowing language, however, can be found. Turkish borrowed finite complementation with the complementizer *ki* from Persian, in contradistinction to the otherwise nonfinite-only complementation patterns in the language, and postpositional borrowing into prepositional languages is noted above, with Turkish *karşı* and in Ottoman-era Edirne Greek with Turkish *gibi* 'like' also. And, going beyond just the borrowing of the syntactic requirements of a lexical item along with the item itself, it has been argued that the wholesale replacement of nonfinite complementation by finite complementation in the Balkans, a characteristic found especially strongly in Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Macedonian, and Romani, and also in western Rumelian dialects of Turkish in contact with Greek and Bulgarian, is due to intensive contact among speakers of these languages, with modeling and copying of finite structure, even down to details as to the kinds of complementation (indicative as well as subjunctive), and accommodation to nonnative varieties both playing a role in the transfer of innovative patterns from one language to another (see Joseph, 1983/2009 for discussion).

Seeking constraints of a purely linguistic nature on borrowing and on transfer across languages more generally, therefore, may be an exercise in futility. Rather, it may well be, as Thomason and Kaufman (1988) claim, that under the right social conditions (e.g., having to do with intensity of contact), anything can be borrowed. The prevalence and apparent ease of lexical borrowings, therefore, as well as the seeming greater difficulty in borrowing bound morphology and structural patterns, may simply be a function of the fact that the social conditions leading to the intense contact needed for borrowing of morphology and syntax arise less often than the casual contact needed for lexical borrowing.

As a final point regarding lexical borrowing, it should be noted that besides loanwords per se, there are other kinds of lexical effects arising from language contact. In particular, contact can lead to loan translations, also known as 'calques,' in which the structure of a word in the source language is copied in the borrowing language but realized with native language material. For instance, Latin *compassio* 'compassion' was the model for German *Mitleid*, based on an equating of *com-* with *mit-* and *passio* with *leid-*. Even phrases can be calqued; English *it goes without saying* is a calque on the French *il va sans dire*, where the odd diathesis of the English (in particular, passivelike meaning but not passive form, i.e., not '… without being said'), can be attributed to the French model (where such diathesis is normal). It perhaps goes without saying here that calquing requires a certain degree of bilingualism on the part of the recipient language speakers, for otherwise the morpheme-by-morpheme or word-by-word identifying and translating would not be possible. A more subtle kind of lexical effect is seen in 'loan blends,' or 'hybrid' forms, where a slight or partial effect can be detected; for instance, in the Greek of southern Albania, the adjective *ekonomikós* 'economic,' with initial *e-* instead of the expected *i-* (as in standard Modern Greek, *ikonomikós*), seems to be a result of influence from Albanian, where the corresponding adjective is *ekonomík* – the placement of the stress in Greek reveals that this is not just a wholesale borrowing from Albanian but rather shows Albanian initial vocalism grafted onto the Greek word. Similarly subtle, but no less real, is contact-induced 'iso-semy,' where meanings shift in one language under the influence of the semantics of parallel forms; for instance, Greek *anixto-*, literally meaning 'open(ed),' is used with color terms to mean 'light-' (e.g., *anixto-kokino-* 'light red'), apparently due to the influence of the parallel use of Turkish *açık* 'open,' and also 'light-' with colors.

## Effects of Contact

One common outcome of contact is simplification, and particularly striking in this regard is the creation in certain contact situations of pidgin languages - somewhat streamlined and highly simplified versions of linguistic systems put to use for rudimentary but essential communication, for instance, when commerce is involved, between groups of speakers having no common language between them. But contact can also lead to complexification, not just when pidgins are expanded functionally to other situations and become elaborated grammatically as creoles, accommodating to new functions, but also when borrowing brings in new structural possibilities alongside existing structures and adds expressive possibilities to a language. Thus it is probably safer to give the most typical outcome of contact-induced change as convergence between the languages involved. The term 'convergence' is used here to refer to an outcome of similarity between two languages, but it can also, sometimes somewhat confusingly and thus unfortunately, be used for the process by which such similarity arises. Convergence means that via borrowing, interference, transfer, calquing, and blending, languages in contact come to be more like one another along particular parameters, whether it is a matter of shared sounds or sound patterns, shared structures, shared words, shared phraseology, or whatever. The convergence is not necessarily unidirectional, of course, as the discussion above indicates, but convergence it is.

In some instances, the convergence is so great and to such a pervasive degree that the languages affected by contact seem to share a significant proportion of their structure. In such cases, especially where there is multilateral and multidirectional multilingualism and more than just casual contact, but rather sustained contact on an ongoing intimate, conversational basis, one can find a whole group of languages that come to share structure as well as lexical items. Such widespread areal convergence is often referred to as a 'sprachbund' (a borrowing from German) or 'linguistic area,' and while several sprachbunds (some linguists borrow the German plural here, *Sprachbünde*) have been identified around the world, e.g., in South Asia, in the Pacific Northwest of North America, in the Amazon, and elsewhere, the best known and most studied such convergence zone is the Balkans, where languages alluded to repeatedly herein – Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Macedonian, Romani, and (Western Rumelian dialects of) Turkish – converge not only on numerous lexical items of a noncultural sort but also on numerous points of structure including:

1. a reduction in the nominal case system, especially a falling together of genitive and dative cases;
2. the formation of a future tense based on a reduced, often invariant, form of the verb 'want';
3. the use of an enclitic (postposed) definite article, typically occurring after the first word in the noun phrase;
4. analytic adjectival comparative adjective formations;
5. marking of personal direct objects with a preposition;
6. double determination in deixis, that is a demonstrative adjective co-occurring with a definite article and a noun (thus, 'this-the-man');
7. possessive use of dative enclitic pronouns;
8. the use of verbal forms to distinguish actions on the basis of real or presumed information source, commonly referred to as marking a witnessed/reported distinction but also including nuances of surprise (admirative) and doubt (dubitative);
9. the reduction in use of a nonfinite verbal complement ('infinitive') and its replacement by fully finite complement clauses;
10. the pleonastic use of weak object pronominal forms together with full noun phrase direct or indirect objects ('object doubling'); and
11. the formation of the 'teen' numerals as DIGIT-'on'-TEN.

And there are far more convergent features when one looks just at the Balkans in very localized pairs or triples of languages rather than aiming for a broader coverage. This has led some researchers, most notably Friedman and Joseph (2015), to argue that even two languages can form a sprachbund, if enough convergence is observed, and that the difference between intense contact involving two languages and the sprachbund sort of convergence effect is a matter of difference of degree not difference of kind. Again, the social conditions on the ground are the key to the outcome, not some predetermined or arbitrary limit or constraint that a linguist might want to impose.

For all the fact that contact so often leads to convergence, there are contact situations in which the outcome is divergence between the languages involved, or at least, a failure to converge. In the Balkans, even with all the convergent forces at work, and even with considerable shared structure between Romani and other Balkan languages, Romani phonology has maintained its distance from the phonology of other coterritorial languages. In particular, Romani still has its voiceless aspirated stops, and thus diverges from the other languages in the region as being the only language in the Balkans with distinctively aspirated stops. It is not that phonology is immune to contact effects: the Aromanian spoken in Greece, for instance, has adopted Greek fricatives in loanwords without nativizing (substituting for) them and the fricatives have spread into some native Aromanian words even; the same can be said for some of the Macedonian dialects in Greece and Albania). Rather, it is the relative social isolation of Romani speakers and the one-way bilingualism that characterizes interactions the Roma have with speakers of other languages may have helped to promote the maintenance of a distinctive Romani character through its phonology, with the social factors therefore contributing to divergence as an outcome of contact. Once again, the social dimension cannot be ignored in a full consideration of what goes on in a language contact situation, and may be more of a determinant than anything purely linguistic in nature.

## Conclusion

To sum up, it must be admitted that contact between speakers is a powerful force in shaping languages and thus language contact is an important synchronic fact about speakers' lives as well as an important force in language change, leading to what is referred to as 'externally driven' or 'externally motivated'

change. But in a sense it must be seen as intrinsically connected to internally driven change, what Andersen (1973) refers to as 'evolutive change,' not wholly divorced from it (Andersen (1973) refers to contact-induced change, or at least one manifestation of it, namely, dialect contact, as 'adaptive' change; Labov (2007) uses the rather apt terms 'transmission,' for internally driven change, and 'diffusion,' for externally motivated change). That is, establishing a genealogical relationship between languages is only possible if the correspondences observed between languages that are due to contact (borrowing) can be sifted out so that the inherited correspondences can be detected. Similarly, the contact-induced correspondences stand out only once a reasonably clear picture is developed of what the inherited material in a given language is. Thus the two types of historical connections between languages, a genetic/genealogical relationship and a contact relationship, are complementary, not competing, ways of modeling language history, and can be seen as two sides of the same coin, what Hamp (1977) has called the 'twin faces of diachronic linguistics,' as both are needed in the elucidation of the sources of similarities and differences between languages observable today. Even with the emphasis here on the Balkans (due in large part to this being the region where the author's expertise lies, though as a hotbed of language contact, the Balkans represent one of the best exemplars from which to draw general lessons about contact between speakers of different languages), it should be clear that the recognition of language contact enriches not only the historical understanding of languages but also the synchronic understanding.

*See also:* Areal Linguistics; Biological Preconditions for Language Development; Bloomfield, Leonard (1887–1949); Dialectology; Foreign Language Teaching and Learning; Language Acquisition; Language Development, Theories of; Multilingual Language Development; Pidgin and Creole Languages; Second Language Acquisition.

## Bibliography

Andersen, Henning, 1973. Abductive and deductive change. Language 49, 765–793.
Bloomfield, Leonard, 1933. Language. Holt, Reinhart and Winston, New York.
Caramazza, Alfonso, Yeni-Komshian, Grace H., Zurif, E.B., Carbone, E., 1973. The acquisition of a new phonological contrast: the case of stop consonants in French-English bilinguals. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 54, 421–428.
Cook, Vivien, 2003. Introduction: the changing L1 in the L2 user's mind. In: Cook, Vivien (Ed.), Effects of the Second Language on the First. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 1–18.
Friedman, Victor A., Joseph, Brian D., 2014. Lessons from Judezmo about the Balkan Sprachbund and contact linguistics. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 226, 3–23.
Friedman, Victor A., Joseph, Brian D., 2015. The Balkan Languages. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Giles, H., 1973. Accent mobility: a model and some data. Anthropological Linguistics 15, 87–105.
Giles, H., Johnson, P., 1987. Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 68, 69–99.
Goebl, Hans, Nelde, Peter H., Stary, Zdenek, Wölck, Wolfgang (Eds.), 1997/2008. Kontaktlinguistik/Contact Linguistics/Linguistique de Contact. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung/An International Handbook of Contemporary Research/Manuel international des recherches contemporaines. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1997: 1. Halbband (vol. 12.1)/2008: 2. Halbband (vol. 12.2).
Hamp, Eric P., 1977. On some questions of areal linguistics. In: Whistler, K., et al. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley, pp. 279–282.
Haugen, Einar, 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. Language 26, 210–231.
Hickey, Raymond (Ed.), 2010. The Handbook of Language Contact. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, NJ.
Hockett, Charles F., 1958. A Course in Modern Linguistics. The Macmillan Company, New York.
Hussein, Lutfi, 1994. Voicing Dependent Vowel Duration in Standard Arabic and its Acquisition by American Students of Arabic (Ph.D. dissertation). Ohio State University.
Joseph, Brian D., 1983/2009. The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (reissued in paperback, 2009).
Joseph, Brian D., 1997. Methodological issues in the history of the Balkan Lexicon: the case of Greek *vré/ré* and its Relatives. In: Friedman, Victor, Belyavski-Frank, Masha, Pisaro, Marc, Testen, David (Eds.), *Balkanistica* 10 (Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Zbigniew Gołąb, March 19, 1923–March 24, 1994), pp. 255–277.
Joseph, Brian D., 2009. Broad vs. Localistic dialectology, standard vs. Dialect: the case of the Balkans and the drawing of linguistic boundaries. In: Tsiplakou, Stavroula, Karyolemou, Marianna, Pavlou, Pavlos (Eds.), Language Variation – European Perspectives II: Selected Papers from the 4th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 4), Nicosia, June 2007. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 119–134.
Labov, William, 2007. Transmission and diffusion. Language 83, 344–387.
Major, Roy C., 1992. Losing English as a first language. Modern Language Journal 76, 190–208.
Matras, Yaron, 2009. Language Contact. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Myers-Scotton, Carol, 2002. Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Sachdev, Itesh, Giles, Howard, 2004. Bilingual accommodation. In: Bhatia, Tej K., Ritchie, William C. (Eds.), Handbook of Bilingualism. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 353–378.
Schleicher, August, August 1853. Die ersten Spaltungen des indogermanischen Urvolkes. Allgemeine Zeitung für Wissenschaft und Literatur, 786–787.
Schmidt, Annette, 1985. Young People's Dyirbal: An Example of Language Death from Australia. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Schmidt, Johannes, 1872. Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen. Weimar, H. Böhlau.
Schneider, Edgar, 2003. The dynamics of new Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth. Language 79, 233–281.
Siemund, Peter, Kintana, Noemi (Eds.), 2008. Language Contact and Contact Languages. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
Swadesh, Morris, 1950. Salish internal relationships. International Journal of American Linguistics 16, 157–167.
Thomason, Sarah G. (Ed.), 1997. Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
Thomason, Sarah G., 2001. Language Contact. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
Thomason, Sarah G., Kaufman, Terrence, 1988. Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics. University of California Press, Berkeley.
Winford, Donald, 2003. An Introduction to Contact Linguistics. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.