

A PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE ON CONTACT-INDUCED LANGUAGE CHANGE: Dynamics in interlinguistics¹

Michael Meeuwis

1. Introduction

Since the 1970's, the study of contact-induced language change has been given new impulses by scholars who feel the need for a theoretical synthesis of the available data. The earlier lack of a systematization of the wide range of types and degrees of linguistic interference revealed in the large number of case studies, had led to several unwarranted generalizations on language change, genetic affiliation and the impact of contact. In these generalizations, the assumption persisted that language contact is a rather exceptional phenomenon, or that in cases where it does occur it cannot have a really significant influence.² While being based on too little evidence, this idea also follows from a standard structuralist belief in the stability and imperviousness of specific language systems. Thomason & Kaufman's *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics* (1988) is without doubt one of the most valuable efforts to meet the mentioned need for an encompassing reconsideration of the data on language contact.

In about the same period, but in a different corner of linguistics, a comparable kind of discomfort was felt. Mainly in the wake of the linguistic-philosophical tradition of speech act theory, linguists had turned to the study of language *use*, moving away from the dominant concentration on language as a *structural system*. The discipline they established was called 'pragmatics'. But 'pragmaticians' came to realize that pragmatics had developed into an extremely diversified field of study, with a galaxy of phenomena within its scope. Indeed, pragmatics was expected to host all linguistic issues that could not be handled by traditional disciplines such as syntax and semantics. This wide diversity of phenomena to be covered inevitably went along with a high variety of methodological and terminological angles, with incomparability of the findings as

1. I am grateful to Jef Verschueren for reading and discussing earlier versions of this paper, and for his warm encouragements. Thanks are also due to Jan Blommaert for suggestions. Neither of them, of course, is accountable for the way I have interpreted their recommendations.

2. Although implicitly present in much of the genetic linguistic tradition, a few more explicit avowals of this attitude are to be found in Gulstad (1974), Vennemann (1974: 351ff), Dyen (1974), and in Vildomec's survey of the field (1971: 67ff).

a deplorable result. In much the same way as for interlinguistics,³ awareness of this situation called for the search for a general theoretical framework. Such a 'frame of reference', designed for comparability across different branches with different methodologies and terminologies is what Jef Verschueren pursues in his *Pragmatics as a theory of linguistic adaptation* (1987).

In this framework, the 'pragmatic perspective' is not restricted to language use in microsituations of face-to-face communication. The model is intended to fit the study of macrolevel issues such as language change as well. This brings me to the central issue of this paper. Contact-induced language change being my primary concern, I want to investigate how this matter can be approached 'pragmatically'. Starting from Verschueren's pragmatic model, the adequacy of the 'coherent frame of reference' proposed will be checked in view of contact-induced language change. While trying not to deviate from the basic 'pragmatic perspective', I will propose adjustments necessitated by the problems that arise.

In subsection 1.1. I will introduce Verschueren's pragmatic perspective. The next subsection (1.2.) presents Thomason & Kaufman's framework for contact-induced language change, which I will use as a starting point for my outline of the pragmatics of such change. Section 2., then, sketches this outline. Since Verschueren does little more than to present the fundamental parameters needed in the pragmatic study of language (1987: 16-17), concrete applications and clarifying examples will be inevitable in my discussion. In section 3. I will address a specific and rather disturbing problem met in the process of elaborating the pragmatic framework to make it fit language contact phenomena; this problem will be referred to as the a-dynamic and a-historic manifestation of diachrony.

1.1. *The pragmatic perspective*

Rather than treating it as an umpteenth separable branch of linguistics, Verschueren (1987) views pragmatics as a perspective, a specific way of approaching a wide range of linguistic phenomena. This perspective is functional in the sense that it approaches linguistic phenomena in the light of language (in) use. This concentration on use implies that reference has to be made to non-linguistic factors as well as linguistic ones. Interdisciplinarity is thus an inevitable methodological prerequisite. An essential concept in this pragmatic-functional model is linguistic choice. Language use is seen as a constant making of choices in order to comply with communicative needs. This process is called *linguistic adaptation*. The range of possible choices constitutes the *variability* of language, a second central notion. Thirdly, there is *negotiability*: the property that linguistic

3. The term 'interlinguistics', which I also adopted in the subtitle of this article, is used -- amongst others -- by Pieter Muysken in his state-of-the-art article (1984).

choices do not have fixed function correlates, in the sense that a particular communicative need may be fulfilled by a diversity of linguistic devices, and vice versa.

Verschuieren distinguishes between *microprocesses* and *macroprocesses* of adaptation (1987: 45). Macroprocesses transcend the daily context of communication between individuals or groups of individuals. The microprocesses of adaptation are subdivided into 'acquired' and 'developmental' microprocesses. The former are processes of adaptation occurring in adult speech, the latter are the ones occurring in language acquisition. There are 'synchronic' macroprocesses and 'diachronic' macroprocesses. The synchronic macroprocesses represent a number of classical topics of sociolinguistics such as bilingualism and diglossia. Phenomena such as pidginization and language change belong to the diachronic macroprocesses. It will be clear that my attention in this article goes to the diachronic macroprocesses.

Further, the processes of adaptation can be viewed from five angles. First of all, *objects of adaptation*, i.e. what language gets adapted to. Then there are the *levels of adaptation*, or the actual levels of linguistic structuring at which the adaptation processes take place, ranging from the overall sign system to the smallest phonetic patterns. The third angle, *stages of adaptation*, involves the temporal dimension of the processes. Fourthly, there are *degrees of adaptation*, accounting for the degree of consciousness a specific linguistic choice carries. The fifth angle, *functions of adaptation*, explores the way in which adaptation processes are used in the course of verbal interaction. The importance of these distinctions is that every pragmatic approach to language has to take into account these five elements. They serve as the heuristic cornerstone of every pragmatic investigation.

In elaborating his model of the pragmatic perspective, Verschuieren in the first place scrutinizes acquired microprocesses, the day-to-day interactions occurring in adult speech. The different angles of the pragmatic approach (objects, levels, stages, degrees, functions) are thoroughly worked out with respect to these microprocesses. But the macroprocesses (as well as the developmental microprocesses) are at each turn treated summarily with reference to how they differ from (or correspond with) the previously explored acquired microprocesses. They clearly do not receive the same direct and careful analysis. It should therefore not be surprising if the model turned out to be more readily applicable to microsituations of direct interaction than to macroprocesses as language change. In approaching phenomena such as language change one soon runs into fundamental questions; it is not even immediately clear what exactly it is that gets adapted. My suggestions are to be found in section 2. But let me first present the framework for contact-induced language change that I will use.

1.2. *A framework for contact-induced language change*

Referring to an overwhelming amount of evidence, comprising instances of all gradations of linguistic interference, Thomason & Kaufman (1988) can convincingly tackle longstanding assumptions concerning the purity of languages as well as wide-spread beliefs concerning linguistic constraints on interference. Their stance is that contact-induced language change is not an exceptional case in the history of the world's languages, and that any structural resistance to interference can be overruled by external, social factors, among which intensity of contact is the most important one. At the level of explanation this means that reference solely to formal-linguistic aspects will be insufficient and that an integration of factors of the sociohistorical and sociolinguistic type will be crucial. But Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 47) observe that also sociohistorical information on its own cannot account for the entire story. Specific linguistic factors, although not those traditionally proposed such as the degree of 'structuredness' of linguistic paradigms, but rather typological (dis)similarity between the two languages, do indeed codetermine the linguistic outcome with respect to the pervasiveness of interference. So the ultimate truth is to be found in a combination of internal, linguistic and external, sociolinguistic information. Thomason & Kaufman formulate this combination as "the principle of multiple causation" (1988: i.a. 57), a principle that allows them to move away from the usual uncausal approaches to linguistic change. A linguistic result of language contact is the product of the combined action of several (types of) factors, internal and external.

Thus, the degree of pervasiveness will reflect the equilibrium between the external and internal factors. The higher the typological distance (at any linguistic level: phonology, morphology, etc.) the stronger the intensity of contact will have to be to allow considerable interference. But this picture is still too simplistic: the mechanism of counterbalance does not apply in exactly the same way for all types of language contact. And this is exactly what prompted Thomason & Kaufman to conceive a distinctive framework for contact-induced language change. It is this distinctive framework that I will be starting from in my search for a pragmatic approach to language contact.

Thomason & Kaufman's framework makes a fundamental distinction between two types of language contact (1988: 35-64): *borrowing* and *substratum influence through language shift*. Borrowing is "the incorporation of foreign elements into a group's native language" where the native language is maintained but altered (1988: 37). The first elements to be adopted are lexical items. Language shift occurs when "a group of speakers shifting to a new language fails to learn that language perfectly" and introduces features of the native language into the new language (1988: 39). In this case the lexicon of the target language (TL) is fully adopted, but the grammar of that TL is affected by elements of the

previously spoken language.⁴ As anticipated, the two types differ with respect to the mechanism of counterbalance. This will be further explained in the main section of this paper (section 2.).

The validity of this distinctive framework is apparent from its applicability to the massive number of cases Thomason & Kaufman (1988) present. Moreover, an analogous distinction was independently, but with equal cogency, proposed by Frans Van Coetsem in the same year (Van Coetsem 1988). Despite its unquestionably high methodological and practical value, however, some cases of linguistic interference seem to slip through the theoretical meshes of the framework's net. As studies - mainly in the field of second language acquisition research - have indicated, the process of language shift can also, in addition to the classic transfer direction from mother tongue to TL, involve an introduction of TL-features into the native language of the shifters (see Py 1982, 1986, Sharwood Smith 1983, and contributions to Dorian (ed.) 1989). Interference in language *attrition* or *obsolescence*, as this phenomenon is usually called, also appears in the second language of previously fully bilingual speakers, after they have returned to the environment of their native language for a considerably period of time (Cohen 1975; Berman & Olshtain 1983). These two types of interference in attrition do not seem to fit into Thomason & Kaufman's borrowing-shift diptych, however appealing it might be to include the first type under borrowing (as hinted at by Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 42) and the second type under shift. From the attrition case studies (especially Berman & Olshtain 1983 and Dorian (ed.) 1989) it can be deduced that the linguistic interference features in attrition do not correspond with the interference features involved in borrowing and language shift. The very nature of the process seems to be different. 'Forgetting' appears to be the crucial matter, and transfer (in addition to overgeneralization, avoidance, paraphrase, etc.) is merely one of the compensatory strategies to overcome by the loss of linguistic skill (Færch & Kasper 1983).

Regardless of the foregoing comments, I value the fundamental distinction between borrowing and substratum interference through shift, as advanced by Thomason & Kaufman and Van Coetsem, as one of the most perspicuous and at the same time powerful tools for the study of language contact. Thus, building on the distinction between borrowing and shift I will now pass on to an exploration of the possibilities for a pragmatics of contact-induced language change.

4. Note that in the case where also the grammar of the target language is perfectly adopted, the community has full proficiency in the target language and thus no linguistic interference is involved. At least, this is what is implied in Thomason & Kaufman's reasoning. One could indeed ask the question as to where *pragmatic* interference comes in. I will go into this when dealing with interference through shift.

2. The pragmatics of contact-induced language change

2.0. Preliminaries

Evidently, when approaching macroprocesses such as language change, an adjustment of the pragmatic model is already required for its most basic notion, 'linguistic choice'. In order to be suitable not only for microcommunicative contexts, but for language change as well, it is clear that this concept should be interpreted in a sense which expands 'choice' beyond the personalistic, intentional meaning it tends to carry for microcommunicative events. At the macro-level it becomes virtually synonymous with 'linguistic adaptation' as such, though there are no macrolevel processes without microlevel choices.

2.1. The pragmatics of borrowing

First of all, in the pragmatic framework, we have to define what it is that is getting adapted. One could argue that if language A borrows from language B, the borrowed item gets adapted to the phonology and structure of A. Thus the word *spaghetti* is altered in that it receives the English phonological and morphological rules while 'losing' its Italian patterns. There is a flaw in this argumentation which may be due to an inaccurate conceptualization of linguistic foreign influence imposed by the metaphor of 'borrowing'. When an item is borrowed it obviously does not 'leave' the source language, unlike when I borrow my father's car. In the source language nothing really happens, not even to the borrowed item: in Italian, *spaghetti* remains *spaghetti*, whatever the English decide to do with it in their language.⁵ On the other hand, there is only one car, and if I'm using it, my father is left without. Thus, if language A borrows from language B, the focus should be on language A. Language A is getting altered. Considering language A as 'that which gets adapted' is in line with the definition of borrowing mentioned above. Language A's "complex set of interrelated lexical, phonological, morphosyntactic, and semantic structures" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 11) is maintained, and therefore we can still call it language A after the process of borrowing, though through that process of borrowing language A is altered.

5. This is not to deny the existence of contact situations, such as Sprachbund, where mutual influence is involved.

2.1.1. *The objects of adaptation*

What are the objects of adaptation, i.e. what does the language get adapted to? Totally in line with his method of treating macroprocesses by referring to the differences they exhibit with respect to microprocesses, Verschueren summarizes the objects of adaptation for language change as follows:

"At the macro-level of analysis, the objects of adaptation are reduced to a subset of those needed for the microlevel. [...] some of the objects of adaptation mentioned [in connection with microprocesses] are irrelevant (e.g. aspects of personality and mental states, except possibly in a largely metaphorical collective sense). Others (e.g. aspects of social context and culture) are clearly operative at the macro-level. A third category requires reinterpretation; e.g. 'Time' should be seen as 'Historical time' rather than as 'Time of utterance', 'Available time,' etc." (Verschueren 1987: 74)

I will try to modify this picture on the basis of Thomason & Kaufman's framework. In introducing their model I already alluded to some factors determining the linguistic outcome of language contact. These determinants include both linguistic and sociocultural ones. It was said that the final degree of interference is the product of these counterbalancing factors. Let me first try to describe them more fully.

1. *Typological distance and universal markedness.* Thomason & Kaufman demonstrate that most of the proposed linguistic constraints on foreign influence fail when confronted with empirical evidence. The formulated linguistic constraints were based on assumptions of stability in highly structured subsystems, or they were expressions of an alleged universal directionality in language change. Instead, the linguistic factors that effectively co-determine the outcome are what Thomason & Kaufman call *typological distance* and *universal markedness*. Typological distance has to do with the fact that "the transferred features are more likely to be those that fit well typologically with corresponding features in the recipient language" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 54). For instance, in morphology interference is most likely to involve new means of expressing functional categories which were already present in the borrowing language. Both Ethiopic Semitic and Cushitic possess a causative category in their verbal derivation system. This functional congruence has allowed the substitution of the original Semitic causative marker for the Cushitic marker (1988: 54 and 135).

A second relevant linguistic factor, which is interrelated with the first one, is what they call 'universal markedness' (1988: 49ff). Universally marked features are those that are hardest to perceive and to produce for the speakers of a specific language. Linguistic distinctions (at all levels, not only the phonological) that are easily perceived by the shifting or borrowing community and/or that are easy to produce are more likely to be transferred. Thomason & Kaufman adduce the example of the Salishan language Flathead (1988: 51). This language exhibits a phonological distinction between /k_w/ and /q_w/, and between /m/ and /m'/. For

an English speaker the former distinction is hard to perceive, the latter difficult to produce. In a contact situation this might result in a process of phonetic association, after which the English only retain /k_w/ and /m/. That is, unless the intensity of the contact between the communities requires otherwise. Indeed, as mentioned before, the impact of these two linguistic factors is easily overruled by those of the sociocultural type, which constitute the next object of adaptation to be discussed.

But an additional remark is called for. Typological distance and universal markedness are notions which take into account both languages involved in the contact, the recipient as well as the donor language. This has some important advantages. When looking for the elements or phenomena a language gets adapted to in language change through borrowing, the first thing to come to mind as an evident object of adaptation is undoubtedly the donor language: what the borrowing language gets adapted to is the donor language. This viewpoint would be too restrictive in that it could not account for the fact that --to take up my rather simple example again -- *spaghetti* looks different in different languages. In keeping with this latter observation, one could decide to switch to the other side by asserting that the borrowing language is what (an item of) the donor language gets adapted to. The fallacy of this reasoning has been pointed out above. Only a version which does not take one of the contact languages as the object of adaptation, but rather the relative linguistic (dis)similarity between them, can account for the fact that *spaghetti* looks like /spə'geti/ in English and like /spə'ɣeti./ in Dutch (which lacks a voiced velar stop in its phoneme system). A second advantage of having 'hypostatized' relative linguistic distance as an object of adaptation lies within the theoretical exigencies of the pragmatic perspective. Within the model I use, languages themselves can hardly be seen as ingredients of the speech event (i.e. objects of adaptation), since it focuses on adaptation processes that take place *in* languages.

2. The socio-cultural-political situation of the speech communities involved. In the introduction, I mainly mentioned 'intensity of contact' as the sociolinguistic factor (co)determining the pervasiveness of interference. This was a simplification, in that I used it as a cover term. Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 72) propose that their notion of 'cultural pressure' or 'intensity of contact' should be understood as any combination of the following factors (without ambitions of being exhaustive): (a) the numeral relationship: the more speakers there are in community B, the stronger and more penetrating the influence will be; (b) the sociopolitical dominance of community B over A; and/or (c) the degree of intimacy of the actual (not the linguistic) contact between the two communities: whether the contact pervades daily life or is restricted to the context of work. As a fourth sociocultural factor constituting 'cultural pressure', Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 72) mention the element of (d) time.

The question as to how time influences the outcome of contact-induced language change is all but simple. One aspect of time that undoubtedly exerts

some influence on the process of language change is 'length of time'. There exists a correlation between the duration of contact between two communities and the pervasiveness of the resulting interference: the longer the communities are in contact, the more pervasive the interference is likely to be. This rule, however, only holds all other things being equal. Indeed, it is not hard to conceive of a pair of cases of borrowing in which case 1 exhibits more extensive borrowing than case 2, although there is a longer time of contact in the latter than in the former. The reason may be found in one or more of the three sociocultural factors mentioned above: number, dominance and intimacy. For instance, the use of the donor language in case 2 might be restricted to labor settings, whereas in case 1 it pervades daily life as well. As a matter of fact, Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 72) place length of time under the cover notion of 'cultural pressure', the epiphenomenon of any combination of the four factors (number, dominance, intimacy, and time).

Now, how can time come up as an object of adaptation in the pragmatic model? The linguistic outcome of a contact situation is a function of the length of time in the same way as it is a function of the other sociocultural factors and the linguistic factors. Hence, 'length of time' constitutes a valuable object of adaptation on a par with the others, and to be situated amongst (and interacting with) the other sociocultural factors of number, dominance, and intimacy. Time needed a somewhat more thorough treatment than the other three, because an essentially temporal phenomenon such as language change requires an accurate notion of time. A few more remarks about it will have to be made later on.

But let us first have a closer look at how the general sociocultural factor of 'cultural pressure' operates. Two clarifications have to be made. A first one involves the determinants of the quality of 'cultural pressure'. The degree of cultural pressure was said to be a result of the interaction between four factors: dominance, intimacy, number, and length of time. Cultural pressure as such is in fact an epiphenomenon of these four elements. Now, the list of four items is to be seen as demonstrative rather than exhaustive. To take one example, attitudes towards languages and foreign language influence also play a role. They are, for instance, manifested in language policies, among which we find the *Académie française*'s 'Franglais'-phobia as a(n) (in)famous case of purist language ideology. But attitudinal perceptions, such as snobbism, can also constitute a promoting factor in borrowing (see e.g. Goyvaerts 1988 on Zairean Indoubil).

A second clarification concerns the dominance of 'cultural pressure' over the first object of adaptation, the purely linguistic factor. As repeatedly stated above, the second object of adaptation overrules the first one. Let me elucidate this by means of an example, the increasing pressure exerted by Russian on Asiatic Eskimo (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 32-33). At the initial stage, the pre-Soviet period, Russian loanwords were highly adapted to Eskimo phonology and syllable structure. Words such as *bljudce* (saucer), *çay* (tea) and *paçka* (bundle) became *pljusa*, *saja* and *paskaq* in Asiatic Eskimo, where the unknown /ç/ and initial /b/ were replaced by the closest Eskimo sounds, /s/ and /p/ respectively. At this stage, when the degree of sociocultural contact was not at all intense, factors

such as 'typological distance' and 'universal markedness' clearly had a say. At a later stage, in the Soviet period, Eskimos had daily contact with Russians and were taught in Russian schools. At this stage, the same loanwords were realized as follows: *bljutca*, *çay* and *paçka* (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 33). Russian sounds and syllable structures were kept, the linguistic factors of typological distance and universal markedness had been overruled by contact intensity.

The relationship between sociocultural and linguistic determinants is a rather complex one. In the introduction I referred to this as a mechanism of counter-balance. But how exactly does it work? In the case of borrowing, the importance of linguistic factors is inversely proportional to degrees of cultural pressure or intensity of contact: the more intense the pressure of the (combination of the) four sociocultural factors, the less influential linguistic structure will be. Thomason & Kaufman distinguish five gradations of contact intensity at the sociocultural level: casual contact, slightly more intense contact, more intense contact, strong cultural pressure, and very strong cultural pressure. At the stages of lesser contact intensity, linguistic factors will have an important influence on linguistic interference: low typological distance will allow more pervasive interference, high distance will function as an impediment. The more intense the contact gets, the less significant the influence of the linguistic elements will become. When intensity of contact has reached the fifth stage, namely very strong cultural pressure, linguistic factors may have no bearing at all: "literally everything goes" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 91).

The gradations of contact intensity in borrowing do not only have correlates in (the degree of importance of the linguistic factors for) the final degree of interference. These gradations are also accompanied by differences in the types of linguistic features (lexical or grammatical) that are affected (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 74ff). But this phenomenon will be treated under levels of adaptation (2.1.2.).

Let us at this point go back to the pragmatic model. For objects of adaptation we now have (1) the typological distance and universal markedness between the two languages involved; (2) the sociocultural phenomenon of cultural pressure, being a combination of at least four factors, (a) number, (b) political relations, (c) intimacy, and (d) length of time. We have seen that the sociocultural factors determine the impact of the linguistic factor. For the pragmatic model this has as an implication that the extent to which one object of adaptation exerts its influence (ranging from zero influence to full determination), depends on the quality of a different object. Also in Verschueren's pragmatic account of communication at the microlevel, some objects may influence the importance of others. Thus the importance of an object such as 'speaker's sex' (1987: 65) may vary according to the type of social context (1987: 69). Similarly, some elements can be excluded from the set of objects of adaptation, solely by force of the quality of a different object. In a case where 'the speaker's position in the social world' (1987: 66) is such that the speaker's profession is newsreader for a radio station, another potential object of adaptation, namely 'bodily

posture', will simply be irrelevant. Adaptation processes of all types, micro as well as macro, exhibit some interaction between the objects of adaptation. This interaction results in a kind of 'equilibrium' which may involve the complete overruling of some potential objects. But in the case of contact-induced language change we observe a clear pattern (one specific object of adaptation, cultural pressure, always determining to what degree or whether the linguistic factor will be an object of adaptation), whereas for microsituations the prominence of an object is variable from case to case.

The dominance of the sociocultural factor is not a complete mystery. The sociocultural factor is more than just an object of adaptation, a landmark against which language gets adapted. As a matter of fact, it also *promotes* linguistic interference, and can thus be said to have a causal, triggering influence in the process. Language contact, as a phenomenon, is undeniably in the first place a sociocultural matter. It is sociocultural and sociolinguistic factors, and not factors of the purely linguistic type, that bring communities⁶ into contact. The linguistic factors do not have such a triggering influence on interference. They can, so to speak, only await contact, the context that makes it possible for interference to happen. Typological similarity does not *promote* interference, it merely *allows* or at best *facilitates* it.

The picture for objects of adaptation for borrowing now looks as follows. Six elements have been identified as the 'things' language gets adapted to. Two are of the strict linguistic type, namely typological distance and universal markedness. The other four are of a sociocultural or sociolinguistic nature. These are the numeral relationship between the two communities, the sociopolitical dominance of one community over the other, the degree of intimacy of the contact, and the duration of the contact. The four sociocultural factors closely interact to establish the epiphenomenon of 'cultural pressure'. As such, this can be seen as one general factor in the determination of language change, one object of adaptation. The two linguistic factors too are interrelated and hence can be said to be one object of adaptation. The two objects of adaptation we are left with, then, are 'cultural pressure' and 'relative linguistic distance'. These two objects, as shown above, do not stand unrelated to each other.

Before closing the issue of objects of adaptation, I want to indicate some remaining problems with our treatment of time. As said before, language change is above all a temporal matter, however trivial this may sound. My search for a notion of time usable as an object of adaptation, has led to the more specific issue of 'length of time'. A borrowing language can be said to be adapted to this 'length of time' in that a different duration of contact will yield a different

6. ... or just their languages. Note that languages can come into contact without the corresponding communities ever having been in actual, physical contact with each other, e.g. through their writings. This is how Standard English borrowed certain syntactic features from Latin, such as the restriction of negatives to one per clause. But even in these cases, what brings the languages in contact is a social trigger.

linguistic outcome. This factor of 'length of time' operates as a closed unit, characterized by its external boundaries. It is an exactly delimited, measurable thing which in an almost space-like manner (Lukács 1971: 90) varies according to *size*: in one case of borrowing the 'length of time' is larger than in the other. This closed notion of 'length of time' lacks temporality in the sense of progression of time. Time does not proceed inside the boundaries of this 'length'. In fact, nothing happens between the boundaries. Hence 'length of time' cannot function as a true trigger (see the discussion on triggers above) but only as an a-posteriori unit, and a static unit at that.⁷ Thus the notion leaves us with an a-temporality that violently contrasts with the very essence of language evolution. The arrow of time with its irreversible progression is neglected.

A presentation of the objects of adaptation for a phenomenon such as language change, with such a notion of time should not satisfy us at all. Indeed, we have to look for an integration of real time (i.e. the time arrow) into the process of language change. The same requirement can be detected in Verschueren's account of time in the pragmatic model. As the quotation at the beginning of this section indicates, Verschueren includes time as an object of adaptation for language change, provided some "reinterpretation" is brought in. This reinterpretation states that whereas at the level of microprocesses time constitutes an object of adaptation in the sense of 'time referred to' (e.g. in greetings such as "good morning", and in deixis (1987: 60-61)), in the case of language change "Historical time" is the relevant notion. "Historical time" is without doubt time in progress, 'temporal time'. I will look for such an integration of real time in the pragmatics of contact-induced language change below (section 3).

2.1.2. *The levels of adaptation*

In the pragmatic model, the levels of adaptation denote "any level of linguistic structuring at which adaptation processes are at work" (Verschueren 1987: 77). Every adaptation process involves 'adaptation features': "any feature of language at any level of linguistic structuring, that is coadaptable with any object of adaptation or that can be affected by any adaptation process" (1987: 77). Since it is the borrowing language and not the (items of the) donor language that is to be considered the adapted language (see the discussion above), 'levels of linguistic adaptation' are the actual 'levels of linguistic structuring' at which the adaptation process of borrowing is at work (e.g. the lexical or the syntactic level) in the borrowing language. The notion of 'adaptation features' seems less useful in the present context. The very item that is borrowed is new for the borrowing

7. Or, as time physicist Ilya Prigogine would have it, time's role is reduced from an 'operator' to a mere 'parameter' (1980).

language, and can thus hardly be said to be an 'affected' language feature in the borrowing language. Nonetheless, it would be too rash to radically exclude, on that basis, the notion of 'adaptation features'. If we did, we would not be able to account for an essential property of contact-induced language change, the fact that after the change some linguistic elements are there which were not present before. 'Adaptation features' can be viewed as *signifying change in the levels of linguistic structuring*. In other words, specific innovations are relevant in that they signify modification for the borrowing language, which remains our ultimate target of study.

Now, how can the actually affected levels of linguistic structuring and particular linguistic features be identified? When sketching the dominance of the sociocultural factor over the linguistic factor in the objects of adaptation (see 2.1.1), I claimed -- in passing -- that the degree of contact intensity does not only determine the degree of interference, but that it also influences the selection of the particular linguistic levels to be affected by the contact. As Thomason & Kaufman indicate (1988: 74ff), 'casual contact' only involves lexical borrowing. The scientific and technological loanwords from English in many languages count as an example for this process. They are hardly -- or not at all -- accompanied by structural or phonological interference. The second gradation involves what they label "slight structural borrowing": a few syntactic and phonological properties from the donor language may be found in the loanwords. Thus a Huastec dialect (Mexico) borrowed some inflectional affixes and unfamiliar phonemes such as /f/ and /ɸ/ from Spanish for use in Spanish loanwords. The third gradation is accompanied by "slightly more structural borrowing". Nahuatl is a good instance: in addition to a considerable number of phonemes as well as derivational suffixes, Nahuatl borrowed numerous function words, including conjunctions and pronouns from Spanish. Under conditions of 'strong cultural pressure', the fourth grade, "moderate structural borrowing" is involved. For example, in Estonian the original possessive pronominal suffix was substituted by an analytic possessive construction from German. The fifth grade is characterized by "heavy structural borrowing". An example of this fifth category is to be found in Asia Minor Greek. Let me briefly elaborate on this case study of Asia Minor Greek as an illustrative example for the scale of correlated interference features which I have just sketched.⁸

Asia Minor Greek is a Greek dialect which is characterized by substantial borrowing from Turkish (the information for this case study was derived from Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 215-222). On the contact-intensity scale (see 2.1.1.) the case of Asia Minor Greek is an instance of 'very strong cultural pressure' (object of adaptation). The correlation at the linguistic level (levels of adapta-

8. It should be noted that no compartmentalization is suggested by this scale. The borrowing process at one stage does not have to be completed before features correlated with the subsequent stage can begin to penetrate: lexical borrowing goes on while the first syntactical elements are coming in. But there is an implicational relationship in that features situated 'higher' on the scale are not borrowed before some features 'lower' on the scale are.

tion) is 'heavy structural borrowing'. Both the lexical and the structural level of Greek have been pervasively affected. At the lexical levels, the borrowed features include content words (e.g. *kizmeci* 'fate') as well as function words (e.g. *eyer* 'if', *icin* 'because', *mi* (interrogative particle)). At the structural level, the penetrating phonological interference can be exemplified by the adoption in the Greek dialect of Turkish phonological processes such as vowel harmony. In Turkish the vowels of a suffix harmonize with the last vowel of the stem the suffix is attached to (the back vowels /a/, /u/, /o/, /ɯ/ form one harmony set, the front vowels /e/, /i/, /ü/ and /ö/ form another). In Greek, which lacks this process of vowel harmony, the plural suffix for nouns in *-os* is *-iri*. In Asia Minor Greek, this suffix *-iri* is often realized as *-uri* after stems with a back vowel. For instance, *artupus* ('man'), plural *artupuri*, versus *klefcis* ('chief'), plural *klefciri*. Both are native Greek words: the adoption of the foreign phonological rule is not restricted to loanwords. A striking example of interference at the morphological level is the adoption of agglutinative patterns of noun and verb declension. In Greek, as an Indo-European inflectional language, the inflectional suffixes carry a kind of portmanteau function: one suffix indicates several aspects of declension at once. Turkish is an agglutinative language: the suffix morphemes all have one single declensional or derivational denotation and they are used in combination. In Asia Minor Greek, the inflectional system in some cases has had to give way to an agglutinative pattern. An example is: *neka* ('wife'), the genitive singular is *neka-yu*, the nominative plural is *nek-es*, the genitive plural is a combination of these two morphemes: *nek-ez-yu*. Finally, as an example of syntactic interference in Asia Minor Greek, there is the matter of word (or constituent) order. Genitive constructions with layered possessors (e.g. 'the jeweller's wife's room') follow the head in Greek ('*to domation tis yinekas tu xrisoxou*': 'the room of the wife of the jeweller'), whereas in rigidly prefield Turkish they precede the head. Asia Minor Greek has borrowed the prefield construction: '*quyumji enekas oda*' ('of the jeweller of the wife room').

Let us now turn to the relevance of the scale of correlated interference features for the pragmatic model. As mentioned, 'casual contact' is only accompanied by lexical borrowing. From the second gradation of cultural pressure onwards, structural borrowing comes in. 'Structural borrowing' involves influence at the phonological, morphological and syntactic levels. In their review of the literature on alleged linguistic constraints on interference, Thomason & Kaufman (1988: chapter 2) argue that among the structural traits of languages no subsystem or level can be said to be more resistant to foreign influence than any other. When structural borrowing is involved all of the three levels may be affected. The only difference between the different stages is the degree of pervasiveness. For instance, the second gradation of cultural pressure ('slightly more intense contact') may involve some instances of postfield positioned adjectives in a language which was originally prefield. In the fourth grade of contact intensity this principle of postfield government will be a much more decisively integrated part of the language in terms of productivity. This implies that the only prediction that can be made on the actual linguistic level at which the adaptation

process will operate, will concern the distinction between the lexical level and the structural level. More profound identifications of linguistic features will be an empirical matter.

We can conclude that the levels of adaptation are primarily determined by the object of adaptation called 'cultural pressure'. The only practical prediction that can be made concerns the distinction between lexical borrowing and (lexical+)structural borrowing.

2.1.3. *The stages of adaptation*

In the pragmatic model the notion of stages of adaptation accounts for "the temporal dimension of adaptation processes" (Verschueren 1987: 103). Verschueren's interpretation reads that there are several manifestations of this temporal dimension.

First of all, stages can be distinguished 'inside' every adaptation process. At the level of microprocesses such as face-to-face communication, this notion of stages can be found in the "dynamics of verbal interaction" (1987: 104, and 1991), consisting for instance in the interplay between conversational implicatures and presuppositions. The second manifestation is to be situated 'outside' or 'between' adaptation processes. Every process of adaptation forms part of an overall behavior, and in this overall behavior they are themselves arranged in a certain chronological order (1987: 103). Thus the main problem appears to be the identification of adaptation processes: we first have to find every separate process of adaptation before we can look for stages internal to them and/or their respective chronological positions.

Identifying processes of linguistic adaptation may be a more or less straightforward issue in microcommunicative contexts, where every unit of interaction counts as an empirically observable manifestation of such processes. But how is this to be undertaken in macroprocesses of adaptation such as language change? Some hints can be detected in Verschueren's text. Perhaps the observation of stages 'inside' the adaptation process underlies the following reasoning (Verschueren 1987: 105),

"Lexical borrowing, to take just one example, may start with an individual case of code-switching which then gets repeated, copied, and generalized, leading to the general adoption of the foreign item into the language, and ultimately to incorporation in such a way that the foreign origin is no longer transparent for the speakers of the language in question."

The adaptation process is the process of lexical borrowing, the internal stages are the phases of 'linguistic integration' going from individual codeswitching to general adoption.

An articulation of the 'external' stages, i.e. between different adaptation processes, can be detected in Thomason & Kaufman's scale of five gradations of contact intensity (see 2.1.1.). In this sense, the different grades are each represented by a separate adaptation process. When demonstrating the subordination of the linguistic factor to the sociocultural factor (see 2.1.1.), the example of Russian interference in Asiatic Eskimo was adduced. This particular case of borrowing is undeniably linked with the external notion of stages of adaptation. We saw that the pressure Russian exerted on the Eskimo community was not constant over time. This changing gradation of contact intensity correlated with reinforcing linguistic interference. Russian linguistic interference in Eskimo can clearly be said to have occurred in different stages.

Every adaptation process, and accordingly each 'external' stage, is thus demarcated in correlation with degrees of contact intensity, i.e. the varying quality of the sociocultural factor. This means that an object of adaptation, cultural pressure, operates as a criterion to distinguish adaptation processes and the external stages. This observation further reinforces the potency of the sociocultural factor: we have seen that as an object of adaptation, the sociocultural factor regulated the participation of another object of adaptation, to wit the linguistic factor; when discussing levels of adaptation, I pointed out that these are determined by the gradation of contact intensity; now it also turns out that, from the angle of stages of adaptation, the same object of adaptation plays a determining role (at least with respect to the external stages).

It should be clear that the study of linguistic change through contact, as exemplified by Thomason & Kaufman's work, is primarily a matter of external stages. Investigating contact-induced language change involves an inquiry at the macrolevel of language change. The investigation of a phenomenon such as the actual process of the integration of a borrowed item is not the concern of the linguistic branch I am mainly dealing with in this paper. Rather, it concentrates on the products of language contact, taking the integrated linguistic features as its starting point and thus skipping the integration process. The study of the linguistic integration process is traditionally considered to belong to a distinct field of research, mostly sociolinguistics (see Ohala 1974: 357 for an explicit statement of this position).⁹ Thus, as this paper has contact-induced language change as its topic, of both manifestations of the stages of adaptation the one at the external level deserves our primary attention.

This position leads to some cumbersome observations in relation to the notion of time. A closer look at the two different manifestations of stages of adaptation reveals that time is present at two levels: there is a sense of time at the internal level (the adaptation process itself contains stages), as well as at the external level (the adaptation processes follow each other in succession). The problem with this binary appearance of time has to do with the way these two notions relate to each other. Time at the external level consists in the diachronic

9. Such investigations of actual integration processes of borrowed items can be found, for instance, in Poplack, Sankoff & Miller 1988, and in Mougeon, Beniak & Valois 1984.

succession of different adaptation processes. But this means external time is realized by putting closed systems on a diachronic arrow. These systems *themselves* lack any notion of time: they are synchronic systems. What this approach to external diachrony actually does is to stop the time for the adaptation processes themselves -- which should sound familiar (cf. the earlier discussion at the end of 2.1.1.). This flagrantly contradictory realization of time is all but satisfactory for the study of a quintessentially temporal phenomenon such as language change. As Fabian (1983: 55-56) argues, the placing in succession of synchronic, a-temporal stages does not give to diachrony the meaning of history, but rather eliminates time. As indicated in connection with time as an object of adaptation, a reintegration of 'real time' in language has to be accomplished. A proposal in this direction will be made in section 3.

2.1.4. *The degrees of adaptation*

'Degrees of adaptation' in our current pragmatic model correspond to degrees of consciousness or degrees of 'accessibility' with which adaptation processes operate (Verschuieren 1987: 107). In the microprocesses of day-to-day communication, a discussion of such phenomena involves, amongst other things, notions such as implicitness, indirectness and metaphoric use. With respect to language change, Verschueren's account implies several instantiations of degrees of consciousness (1987: 110-111).

One of them can be detected in the above quotation on the process of linguistic integration in borrowing, i.e. "that the foreign origin is no longer transparent for the speakers of the language in question". The notion of consciousness, in this context, refers to the extent to which the speakers of the borrowing language are aware of their language being affected. Consciousness of this kind is a rather important matter in some issues of interlinguistics. For instance, for some scholars (e.g. Carol Myers-Scotton 1983, 1988, and 1990) the question as to whether a linguistic item is recognized as being of foreign origin, and thus 'strikes' the native speaker when it is used, or whether it forms, on the other hand, an integrated and unobtrusive part of the language, is significant in the distinction between codeswitching and borrowing. This concept of consciousness, however, applies in the first place to what I have called (2.1.3.) the process of 'linguistic integration' in borrowing. As mentioned before, the ambitions of this paper primarily concern contact-induced language change, which, in contrast to the integration process, is situated at a macrolevel of diachrony.

Verschueren alludes to a second manifestation of 'degrees of consciousness', which is in fact situated at the macrolevel of change. Language contact and language change can be brought about by very deliberate (i.e. conscious) decisions at the level of language planning and policy. This is where the influence of ideology on the direction of language change comes in. The fact that this

influence of ideology can be most decisive is not a common locus in the literature, in spite of some striking examples. Fabian (1986) illustrates how the Kiswahili variant spoken in the southern Shaba province of the former Belgian Congo, was in fact the product of a very conscious colonial ideology and policy. He argues that this pidginized Kiswahili was artificially introduced by the Belgian colonial administration to achieve maximal control over the colonized. Here, the influence of ideology on language change is of the most radical nature. It would be an understatement to say that ideology has 'altered' or 'influenced' a previously established direction of linguistic change. There was no linguistic basis at all for the appearance of the Kiswahili variant in the region. Ideology is the very cause of the actual emergence and establishment of the new language.

The fact that Verschueren includes a manifestation of consciousness at the level of motivating factors of language change such as politics and language planning, has some significant consequences for the pragmatic model. As a determining factor of linguistic change, language planning in fact belongs to the objects of adaptation, to be placed, in the case of contact-induced language change, under the notion of cultural pressure. This means that in applying the model of pragmatics, delineating the degree of consciousness is not only relevant with respect to the adaptation process itself ('what is going on'), but applies to objects of adaptation as well. These objects of adaptation for which consciousness is relevant are not restricted to phenomena such as language planning and ideology. The case of Zairean Indoubil, mentioned above, in which attitudinal perceptions appear to be crucial, will also require reference to consciousness in the objects of adaptation.

Thus, when we wish to approach contact-induced language change pragmatically, we should not restrict the description of degrees of adaptation to the adaptation process itself. The deliberateness and consciousness of some of the objects of adaptation can be a crucial matter in some cases of language contact. Consequently, describing the degree of consciousness of the object also constitutes a cardinal component of a good pragmatic approach to language contact.

2.1.5. *The functions of adaptation*

In the pragmatic model, the term 'functions of adaptation' denotes the way in which "adaptation processes are used or exploited 'strategically' in the course of verbal interaction." (Verschueren 1987: 113). In verbal interaction, a distinction can be made between surface functions (e.g. presuppositions are typically used to establish a starting point of common knowledge) and strategic functions (e.g. the same presupposition can be used to share new information in a 'hidden' way so that the information is more difficult to deny). This approach to the functions of adaptation is clearly microprocess-oriented. The only way this notion of functions can make sense in the study of contact-induced language change, seems to be in

relation with conscious and deliberate interventions in language change. As said above, this will in the first place be connected with the objects of adaptation.

As Verschueren suggests (1987: 114-115), language policy can be investigated in its surface functions as well as in its strategic functions. Notions such as ideology, deeper political considerations, colonial ambitions and the like will be a matter of strategic functions. The surface functions of language policies involve the "rational arguments adduced" (1987: 114). This distinction implies a(nother) tight association with the degrees of adaptation: the surface functions are the readily accessible motives, the strategic functions the less accessible ones. In the case of Shaba Kiswahili in the Belgian Congo (see above) the surface functions can be described as follows. The Belgian colonial authorities presented as their intentions the promotion to a useful *lingua franca* of a Kiswahili substrate already present in the region. Fabian points out that such a substrate never existed. The language was 'introduced' by the Belgians -- and this brings us to the strategic functions -- on a totally artificial basis, to establish a means of control over the colonized.

Any pragmatic approach to contact-induced language change will need a description of the functions of adaptation in terms of surface functions as well as strategic functions. Describing the functions of adaptation will necessarily involve reference to the objects of adaptation and to the degrees of adaptation.

This is where my account of the pragmatic perspective on borrowing ends. The following is a recapitulation of the findings and implications. First of all, what does it mean to approach a linguistic phenomenon pragmatically? As Verschueren (1987: 117) summarizes: "A pragmatic perspective on any linguistic phenomenon, property, structure, or process (...) requires its investigation in terms of objects of adaptation, levels of adaptation, stages of adaptation, degrees of adaptation, and functions of adaptation". Verschueren also indicates that it is rather crucial to "intertwine the various aspects" in an explicit manner (1987: 117). Now, what does it mean to approach a case of contact-induced language change such as borrowing pragmatically? As a starting point, the definition of borrowing and its placement in a framework opposing it to substratum influence through language shift, requires an overall focus on the borrowing language. As for the objects of adaptation, two elements have to be described. These are (1) the linguistic element, in terms of relative distance, and (2) the sociocultural element, in terms of cultural pressure. This cultural pressure is itself an epiphenomenon of diverse types of sociolinguistic and sociocultural conditions, of which the list proposed above is selective rather than exhaustive. This second object, cultural pressure, has determining control over the first. This implies that a consideration of the two objects should not treat them separately but always in terms of their mutual interaction. The potency of the second object of adaptation also requires that this element be scrutinized rather thoroughly. Its dominance is further indicated by its influence on the levels of adaptation and the stages of adaptation, which is an additional argument for requiring attention to the intertwining of the several angles in the pragmatic approach. With respect to the

levels, the main distinction appears to be between the lexical and the grammatical, the rest being a matter of pervasiveness and empirical attestation. As for the stages, it was argued that --in principle-- we have to distinguish between stages within the adaptation processes, and stages represented by adaptation processes vis-à-vis each other. This distinction, however, brings about a problematic notion of time, which cannot be passed by indifferently in dealing with a basically temporal issue such as language change. A proposal to settle this problem of a-temporal time will be made below (see section 3.). Just like the stages of adaptation, the degrees of adaptation call for a twofold treatment in a pragmatic approach to borrowing. First, there is the degree of accessibility of the linguistic changes for the speakers of the changing languages. Second, accessibility and consciousness can be crucial qualifications of objects of adaptation as well, in terms of the impact of ideology, language policies and all other manifestations of language attitudes, on language change. The description of the functions of adaptation, finally, also lead us to language policies and is thus tightly related to the degrees of adaptation.

I will now turn to the second type of contact-induced language change in the Thomason & Kaufman framework, substratum influence through language shift. Many observations made in the account of borrowing will also be relevant to language shift, although some essential divergences will appear.

2.2. The pragmatics of interference through language shift

According to the definition (see 1.2.), the perspective in an inquiry of language shift should be on the language the speakers shift to. If speakers of language A shift to language B, B is the actually affected language, and in the pragmatic model, the 'thing' that gets adapted.

2.2.1. The objects of adaptation

The objects of adaptation for language shift are generally speaking the same as for borrowing, viz. (1) the linguistic factor, and (2) the sociocultural factor. The linguistic factor involves (a) universal markedness and (b) typological distance. The first of these elements predicts that "shifting speakers are likely to fail to acquire marked features of the TL" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 51). Likewise, a typological match between linguistic subsystems of the contact languages will facilitate interference. Also the sociocultural factor can be maintained for inter-

ference through shift, although a reinterpretation of the concept 'cultural pressure' is needed.

This reinterpretation of 'cultural pressure' includes that in cases of language shift it is generally to be envisioned as 'accessibility/availability of the target language', because language shift in the first place involves the learning of a new language by a community. Availability of the target language is, however, a function of the same factors as those mentioned for cultural pressure in borrowing, such as intimacy of contact (when the use of the language pervades daily life, it is more accessible) and the relative sizes of the two groups (the more speakers there are of the TL, the more accessible this TL will be). Although it should be borne in mind that there are cases in history of conquerors being absorbed linguistically, the third factor, sociopolitical dominance, does not have to be ruled out. In those cases where it is clearly the conquered community that abandons its language, the degree of political dominance will surely influence the degree of TL-accessibility for the dominated community. As Thomason & Kaufman suggest (1988: 119-120), time, our fourth factor in the concept of cultural pressure, is also relevant for language shift. For instance, the longer the contact between the communities before the influenced group actually begins to shift to the TL, the higher the probability that the shifting group will become fully bilingual. When they then make the actual shift, the influence of their previous language will be much more reduced. Note that the notion of time is again nothing more than 'length of time'. Progression of time is not at issue. Time is a bounded unit, qualified by a specific 'amount'. This notion of time is a static one, denying the very essence of the temporal dimension.

As was said for borrowing, this list of four sociocultural factors does not aspire to exhaustiveness. Again, at least the notion of language attitudes could be added. The importance of the learner's attitudes towards the target language in second language acquisition and their role in interference is now commonly accepted (see, e.g., the case studies reported in Spolsky 1969 and Gardner & Lambert 1972). Less clearly acknowledged is the influence of the native speakers' evaluation of the foreigner/learner in the second language learning process. Ryan (1983) points out that maintaining native language features in one's second language can protect the foreigner from being evaluated along all the sociolinguistic norms and expectations of the TL-community, and can for instance relieve him or her of any responsibility for impolite behavior. Most interesting insights in this respect are advanced by Karol Janicki (1986). He interprets second language performance by foreigners/immigrants as primarily a matter of social roles, in which the foreigner's expressive freedom is restricted by certain 'linguistic rights' imposed upon him or her by the native speakers of the host community (for a similar viewpoint, see Harder 1980: 268-269). Native speakers, for instance, evaluate as undesirable the use of slang or obscenities by the immigrant, as well as the expression of personal feelings or opinions on sociopolitical issues internal to the host country, whereas a slightly diverging pronunciation may be appreciated as charming. The significance of such host-attitudes for

linguistic interference is not hard to trace once we recognize that the foreigner may be inclined to conform to the standards he or she is being evaluated by.

The way in which the two objects of adaptation interact is different in cases of language shift. In the case of borrowing, the interaction between the objects of adaptation was shown to be based on a principle of counterbalance: the influence of the linguistic factor decreased as cultural pressure increased. In the case of language shift, the picture is less clear. The influence of linguistic factors in this more drastic type of language contact is always more limited than it is in borrowing, even in the less pervasive cases. Linguistic interference in language shift takes less time, sometimes as little as a generation (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 41 and 119ff). And the linguistic factors are nearly always overruled, so that it is hard to establish their influence on the final result. The fact that the degree of interference is always rather high also means that there is not as spectacular a diversity in gradations as in the case of borrowing. Thomason & Kaufman only distinguish two degrees of linguistic interference in shift: "slight interference" and "moderate to heavy interference" (1988: 121ff). In 'moderate interference' and certainly in 'heavy interference' the influence of linguistic factors in determining the linguistic outcome is reduced to zero, just as in the fifth grade of the borrowing scale (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 53).

The influence of the second object of adaptation, cultural pressure, is thus paramount. A striking observation is that in language shift the cultural pressure (in terms of TL accessibility) is *inversely* related to the linguistic result of contact. The stronger the cultural pressure, the less linguistic interference will appear. Since high cultural pressure from the dominating community implies high availability of the TL for the shifting speakers, those shifting speakers will introduce only few elements of their native language into the TL. In the above distinction between 'slight interference' and 'moderate to heavy interference', the former is connected with high accessibility of the TL, and the latter with low accessibility. This means that the process of linguistic interference through language shift can be completely halted: when the contact is extremely intense, the speakers will learn their TL perfectly, and there will hence be no interference at all (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 41 and 111). The process of interference stops when the grammar of the TL is perfectly acquired: the shifting speakers have reached full proficiency in the TL. As mentioned above (see note 5), one could raise the question as to where *pragmatic* interference comes in. This will be treated in connection with the levels of adaptation (2.2.2.).

The objects of adaptation for language shift can thus be summarized as follows. Two main objects are involved: relative linguistic distance and cultural pressure. The first object contains the same elements as in borrowing, i.e. universal markedness and typological distance, although its impact is much more restricted in language shift. The second object, the epiphenomenon of cultural pressure, is first of all to be understood in terms of TL-accessibility. This notion of accessibility is to be taken as broadly as possible to accommodate quite diverse conditions such as practical availability and language attitudes. Finally, in language shift the interaction between the two objects of adaptation will not be

as clearly identifiable as in borrowing, and the dominant second object of adaptation is inversely related to the degree of linguistic interference.

2.2.2. *The levels of adaptation*

For the levels of adaptation less can be predicted than in the case of borrowing, because of the lower diversity in gradations of interference in language shift, and because of the high degree of pervasiveness in all cases. In Thomason & Kaufman's account of language shift the lexicon of the TL is always fully adopted. Thus, lexical interference never occurs. Substratum influence through language shift starts with structural interference. For borrowing I stated that the only relevant distinction between levels of linguistic structuring to be affected was the one between lexicon and grammar. At the grammatical level, all subsystems were said to be equally prone to being affected and that there were only differences in pervasiveness. Since no lexical interference is involved in language shift, there is no differentiation of affected levels of linguistic structuring left. The degree of cultural pressure will determine --albeit inversely-- the pervasiveness of interference, which will from the very beginning include phonology, morphology and syntax. When TL-accessibility is high, there will be 'slight structural interference'. This involves phonological, syntactic and minor morphological features. With low TL-accessibility, the correlated degree of linguistic interference is 'moderate to heavy'. This is characterized by more examples of phonology and syntax and, in addition, interference in inflectional morphology as well (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 121). Again, it is impossible to make more specific predictions about the outcome of interference. Linguistic results appear to differ considerably even between cases quite similar in terms of accessibility. With respect to the levels of adaptation this means that most questions remain empirical.

An example of 'slight interference' through shift is the influence of Hungarian on a northern Serbocroatian dialect. Hungarian speakers shifting to the Serbocroatian dialect failed to learn the complex accent patterns of the TL, and introduced the fixed stress from Hungarian into that TL (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 62 and 122). The Finnic influence in Lithuanian is a good example of 'moderate interference'. Lithuanian acquired three new cases in its inflectional morphology, the illative, the allative and the adessive (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 242-243).

In the same way as for borrowing, Thomason & Kaufman present an overwhelming amount of data concerning linguistic influence motivated by shift. However (as mentioned in note 5 and above), pace a minor hypothetical allusion to prosody and 'accent' (1988: 42), there is hardly any reference to *pragmatic* interference. Although Thomason & Kaufman repeatedly argue for the penetrating power of interference leaving no grammatical subsystem unaffected, they seem to imply that interference only occurs with respect to the 'classical four': lexicon, phonology, morphology and syntax. This shortcoming is not only to be

blamed on Thomason & Kaufman. As is more and more commonly accepted (see, e.g., Romaine 1989: 53, Prince 1988: 505), pragmatic interference has been unjustly ignored in interlinguistics. However, some linguistic transfers of a pragmatic kind have been attested.

In the field of borrowing (in the strict sense imposed by the framework) very little has been published that is of direct pragmatic relevance. Perhaps Winter's account of stylistic borrowing in Russian can be considered a study of 'pragmatic borrowing' (Winter 1973: 144). Winter mentions how Russian developed a scientific style independent of an already existing literary mode under the influence of scientific German. A clearer case of pragmatic borrowing is without doubt Prince's account of Slavic influence in Yiddish (Prince 1988). She argues that Yiddish borrowed a Slavic pragmatic procedure to put propositions into focus position and mark them as presupposed. Prince illustrates how these discourse functions are used with native Yiddish syntactic constructions, so that there can be no question that the focus-presupposition patterns represent a true case of pragmatic borrowing.

In studies of substratum influence in language shift, pragmatic interference is significantly better represented. First of all, pragmatic influence is frequently attested in the well-established tradition within second language acquisition research concentrating on Hymesian sociolinguistic competence (e.g. Holmes 1978; Holmes & Brown 1977; Loveday 1982; Scarcella et al. (eds.) 1990), and on speech acts in particular (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1982; Cohen & Olshtain 1981; Rintell 1979; Wolfson 1981). Still within second language learning studies, a few more recent publications report on the transfer of information structuring devices (Rutherford 1989, Trévisse 1986). Second, pragmatic interference in language shift has been attested by scholars involved in the discipline of intercultural communication (e.g. Gumperz 1982, 1990, and Gumperz (ed.) 1982; Chick 1985; Scollon & Scollon 1981, 1983), although the aspect of transfer is usually not explicitly elaborated in these studies. Finally, in a case of first language attrition in shift, the typological problem child in Thomason & Kaufman's framework (see 1.2.), Tao & Thompson (1991) have recently observed the adoption of backchanneling strategies.

For Thomason & Kaufman, the process of substratum influence through language shift seems to terminate where the shifting speakers know all the *formal* aspects of the TL. Thomason & Kaufman thus imply that proficiency in a language is achieved when one masters all these formal aspects. However, intercultural communication studies, in particular the ones by Gumperz, demonstrate that speakers can master all the purely linguistic (formal) aspects of the target language, appearing in that way to be perfect bilinguals, while they stick to their native pragmatic system (e.g. with respect to elements "signaling discourse cohesion" (Gumperz 1990: 223-224) such as prosody, deixis, interjections, and the like). The pragmatic differences between their version of the TL and the original version, forms the basis of numerous misunderstandings in interethnic communication. It is important for the study of contact-induced language change to

observe that the process of interference does *not* end where Thomason & Kaufman thought it did, i.e. at the level of formal proficiency.

The incorporation of pragmatic interference has some significant implications for the theory of contact-induced language change. As studies à la Gumperz demonstrate, pragmatic differences do not disappear as the intensity of contact increases. Interlocutors mostly ignore the precise reasons for communicative misunderstandings caused by the differences in pragmatic systems. In perfectly good faith, they may make a valiant attempt to overcome the communicative breakdown by unconsciously using a more accentuated form of their pragmatic system, a potential communicative tragedy. The more frequent the contact, the more stubborn and accentuated the adherence may be by the speakers of the shifting language to their own pragmatic system. This means that whereas lexical and grammatical differences gradually disappear as contact gets more intense, the opposite may happen at the level of pragmatic interference.

In the application of the pragmatic model to cases of linguistic influence through language shift, the description of the levels of adaptation will be a more extensive enterprise than in the case of borrowing, because interference in language shift is as a rule stronger than in borrowing. Second, this description will by definition only involve the structural layering of the language, not the lexicon. Within this structural level variability will only be correlated with pervasiveness, which is regulated --albeit inversely-- by the degree of cultural pressure, one of the objects of adaptation. Rather few predictions on the actually affected linguistic features can be made. Finally, the levels of adaptation and the range of adaptation features for language shift (and contact-induced language change in general) should be extended beyond the purely core-linguistic elements. The transferability of paralinguistic and pragmatic phenomena should be taken into consideration as well.

2.2.3. *The stages of adaptation*

The two manifestations of stages of adaptation established for borrowing, occur in language shift as well. First of all, there are stages internal to an adaptation process. This involves the microlevel of the actual integration process of the interfering features. Most innovations will start with an idiosyncratic 'error' due to imperfect learning (in the broad sense, cf. attitudes and availability). This error can either be corrected and disappear, or it can spread and get established in the new language of the shifting speakers, who might view it as a genuine property of the TL. A further step may be that also the native speakers of the TL adopt the new feature in their version of the language.

Thomason & Kaufman include this last step in their definition of language shift (1988: i.a. 39), although I doubt whether that is necessary. We can still speak of language change even if the original speakers of the TL retain exactly

the same language as before. The TL can be said to have changed *because of the way in which it is spoken by the shifting community*, and the label of 'substratum influence through language shift' is still appropriate. The result of such an imperfect learning without affecting the native language of the TL community is a split into two versions of the same language. This is what is involved when we talk about different 'Englishes' or 'Frenches' throughout the world. This kind of divergence of the same original language can form the basis for serious communicative breakdowns in international and intercultural communication (see Gumperz 1982 and Gumperz (ed.) 1982, B.B. Kachru (ed.) 1983, among many others). Appreciating this, the study of substratum influence through language shift could make a considerable contribution to the field of intercultural communication. As the recent edition by Scarcella et al. (1990) suggests, it seems that scholars in second language acquisition and students of intercultural communication are becoming more and more aware of the fact that their fields of investigation are closely intertwined.¹⁰

The second manifestation of stages of adaptation is to be found in the temporal succession of processes of adaptation. In language shift this could, for instance, be accounted for by distinguishing degrees of TL proficiency. The number of interference features will decrease as the TL becomes more accessible. This implies that even features already stabilized in the new version of the TL may disappear ('decreolization'). The distinguishable steps represent distinct adaptation processes, and we are thus dealing with what I have previously called the 'external' stages of adaptation. It is clear that the idea of diachrony expressed in this account of the external stages shows the same deficiency was the case in the treatment of borrowing. Diachrony is nothing more than a result of arranging static, synchronic entities in a successive order, and this undermines the introduction of 'real time'.

Again, a conclusion can be drawn about the potency of the second object of adaptation, cultural pressure. Apart from its impact on the other object of adaptation and on the levels of adaptation, it also appears to regulate the (external) stages of adaptation.

2.2.4. *The degrees of adaptation*

In the same way as in borrowing, also in language shift a connection can be made between the degrees of adaptation and the stages of adaptation. Degrees of consciousness are relevant for the integration process at a micro level: to what extent are speakers aware of the spread and establishment of innovative features in the TL? In this connection, it might be interesting to know whether the

10. This is not to deny the existence of earlier, less explicit integrations of both fields, such as Jenny Thomas's excellent contributions (e.g. 1983, 1984).

speakers are aware of the errors they make, which constitute one potential source of interference (on metalinguistic awareness in second language acquisition, see e.g. Sharwood Smith 1981).

The notion of degree of consciousness also applies at the macrolevel of language shift. The factors determining the linguistic outcome of language shift, or even the very causes of language shift, can represent a specific degree of consciousness. The earlier observations concerning the possible impact of language planning and ideology on the direction or actual occurrence of interference in language contact, hold for language shift as well. For instance, in industrialized countries with a high number of immigrant workers, decisions at the level of language planning can be taken to force the immigrant communities to integrate linguistically as quickly as possible, and even to ban the use of their original language. If the linguistic immersion is successfully carried out over a short time span, substratum interference through language shift will be minimal. There are also determining factors of language shift with a specific degree of consciousness that *foster* linguistic interference. When dealing with the objects of adaptation, it was pointed out that imperfect learning (low accessibility) is in some cases a matter of attitudinal perceptions of the TL, and that interference can be a result of evaluations on behalf of the hearer as well (cf. the studies by Ryan, Janicki and Harder, cited above).

Both ideology in language planning and attitudes belong to the objects of adaptation. Thus, when we are treating the degrees of adaptation in a pragmatic approach to language shift, the search for degrees of consciousness should be carried out not only with respect to the actual adaptation process, but with respect to the objects of adaptation as well.

2.2.5. *The functions of adaptation*

The functions of adaptation will deserve the same treatment in language shift as in borrowing. Their most relevant contribution will be in the area of conscious objects of adaptation such as language planning. The distinction between surface and strategic functions can be maintained. A most interesting field for investigating these functions is certainly the branch of educational policies in bilingual programs for immigrant workers. For instance, immigrant children in Bavaria receive highly inadequate instruction in German. In school these children are taught in their first language and in total isolation from the German children (Romaine 1989: 219-220). The strategic function of this policy related to (potential) language shift is the hidden intention of leaving the door open for a repatriation of these immigrants. As a surface function, the Bavarian authorities could adduce noble motives such as the preservation of cultural traditions.

A pragmatic approach to language shift is not fundamentally different from such a perspective on borrowing. One of the basics is the systematic interrelation of the different angles constituting the pragmatic approach. The functions of adaptation cannot be described without reference to the degrees of adaptation. Just like in borrowing, consciousness and surface/strategic functions are crucial notions when dealing with the impact of ideology and language planning on language shift. Neither functions nor degrees can be described without reference to the objects of adaptation. In turn, these objects of adaptation have an undeniable influence on the levels and stages of adaptation. The main points to recall about the objects of adaptation are that the linguistic factor is of much less importance than it is in borrowing, that TL-accessibility is the most crucial notion when talking about 'cultural pressure', and that the degree of linguistic interference is inversely related to cultural pressure. For the levels of adaptation it was argued that an adequate account will be mostly an empirical matter. Furthermore, it was suggested that the possibility of pragmatic interference should be appreciated, for it can be quite significant in the study of intercultural (mis)communication. Finally, also in language shift two different manifestations of stages of adaptation should be reckoned with: internal stages and external stages. The problematic notion of time involved in the 'timeless' external stages remains. In the following section I will advance a possible way to overcome this fundamental problem of a-dynamism and a-historicity in interlinguistics.

3. Pragmatics and (a-)dynamic diachrony

The problems encountered with time in a pragmatic model for borrowing and language shift can be summarized as follows. First of all, no really dynamic time appeared to be included among the objects of adaptation. The only notion of time present was the static unit of 'amount of time' (which in se remains a valuable object). Since the objects of adaptation denote the factors that influence the linguistic outcome of a contact situation, the absence of dynamic time among these objects implies that real time has no role to play whatsoever in contact-induced language change. Contact-induced language change is thus left without any kind of dynamism. Second, 'timelessness' has been detected with respect to the stages of adaptation, which, ironically, are the very carriers of the temporal dimension of adaptation processes. As we were engaged in considering language change as a macrophenomenon in which only the products of the change are relevant, diachrony in the stages of adaptation was merely a manifestation of a successive order of synchronic units. These synchronic units themselves lack any notion of time; they are extracted from their historical situation and are in that sense not just synchronic, but 'a-chronic'. Diachrony in contact-induced language change can seemingly only be talked about by negating internal time within the adaptation processes. It is exactly this negation of internal time that makes

diachrony an a-historical notion. By this negation, time is reduced to an outcome. Time is not inherently present in the diachrony, but it is a mere 'result' of a methodology of sequencing.

A way out of the quandary of a-historicity and a-dynamism in diachrony can already be suggested. In order for real time to find its way back into language change, the establishment of a connection between internal time and external time is a precondition. This means that the study of contact-induced language change may not be restricted to the 'overarching', macrolevel of change. Contact-induced language change should not be approached solely from the point of view of the linguistic products, the results of the change. An investigation into the actual interfering process is to be incorporated. This investigation has to be carried out 'directly', i.e. it may not rest on indirect deduction from the study of the (static) products of language contact. What we need is a 'discourse-centered approach' to interference, to use Joel Sherzer's (1987) terms. The incorporation of the actual interference process will clearly allow us to do away with the a-historicity of time as expressed in the stages of adaptation. But also the problems with 'length of time' can be tackled, as concentration on the process rather than on the product will 'dynamize' the arrow of time, and turn time into a trigger (or operator) rather than a parameter measurable only a posteriori.

Now, what does all this mean for the pragmatic perspective? If we want to study contact-induced language change pragmatically, and if the study of contact-induced language change needs an incorporation of the microlevel or on-going interference into the study of the macrodevelopment of language change, we cannot but choose a pragmatic perspective for the approach to the actual discourse-centered investigation as well. Indeed, it is quite evident that if we want to do away with the time-eliminating separation of the microprocesses from macrochange, we should at least approach both with one and the same model. What I am suggesting is not two separate applications of the pragmatic model, one for the macrophenomenon of language as outlined in the foregoing sections of this paper, and one for the actual process of linguistic interference in discourse. Rather, in order to comply with the demand for an integration of the micro- and macroaspects, the phenomenon is considered one reality and both aspects have to be approached with one unifying pragmatic frame of reference. The account of a pragmatic model of borrowing and language shift, as elaborated in the foregoing sections of this article, still holds as a frame of reference for the pragmatics of contact-induced language change. What I want to argue is that the microissue has to be approached in such a way that it *fits* in the overall pragmatic perspective, i.e. the fundamental principles of the pragmatic perspective have to be respected.

As was indicated in the introduction, to apply a pragmatic perspective to any language phenomenon means that language is to be considered in view of its functionality. The study of the microprocesses of linguistic interference in communication has to take 'language use' as a central issue. This implies an interdisciplinary approach: reference to other than linguistic conditions will be indispensable. Furthermore, the ultimate aim must be to cope with 'linguistic

choice'. Hence, motivations for interference must be discovered, and these must be searched for with reference to use and extralinguistic conditions. Finally, the three pivotal notions 'adaptability', 'variability' and 'negotiability', needed to understand the making of choices, should form an integrated part of the investigation.

Before turning to what I believe counts as a good example of such an approach, the following comment should be added. When concentrating on discourse motivations for linguistic interferences, we are actually inquiring into the motivations which prompt one individual, at a very specific moment (the moment of discourse interaction), to adopt foreign elements in his or her speech. I take the problem of the conclusive incorporation of new elements in the *langue* of the speech community as ultimately reducible to such questions of discourse motivations, given that the incorporated elements will be those individual innovations that have yielded some kind of felicity in the discourse and/or for which several individuals share the same motivation to realize the change. As a starting point, I hereby adhere wholeheartedly to Benveniste's Latin motto *nihil est in lingua quod non prius fuerit in oratione* (1966: 131), and I follow Keller's insights (1982, 1985) considering language change at the level of the *langue* as the unintended collective consequence of individual, intended actions. In other words, though language change is not the result of direct human intention or design¹¹, it is still the resultative effect of human actions.

I think Fabian (1982) provides us with a proper illustration of the proposed discourse-centered approach to interference, with loyalty to the fundamental principles of the pragmatic perspective. Fabian scrutinizes the French lexical interferences in Shaba Kiswahili in post-colonial Zaire. He explicitly renounces any approach that would take an a-posteriori list of loans as its starting point to conjecture about motivations for, or channels of borrowing (1982: 18). Fabian analyzes actual texts and conversations, and thus chooses to deal with the "lexicon-in-action instead of the lexicon qua wordlist" (1982: 37). His main concern is to account for the variability in occurrences of the French loanwords.

Fabian first shows that a great number of the loanwords cannot be accounted for with reference to lexical gaps: they all have equivalent Kiswahili counterparts in the lexical knowledge of the speakers, and many of these equivalents even occur in the same texts. Fabian argues that the variability in incidence of loans is a function of performative and stylistic motivations. For instance, French loanwords are sometimes introduced to signal the multilingual competence of the speaker (1982: 27). Another function of such loanwords can be to create the effect of mocking the pretensions of a parvenu (1982: 30). He furthermore demonstrates that Swahili speakers sometimes use French loans to establish a specific atmosphere representing "life in the big city" (1982: 31). These motivations for the introduction of French loans cannot be understood without reference to the social and sociolinguistic situation in multilingual post-

11. However, remember the example of the radical impact of ideology in the Shaba Kiswahili case (Fabian 1986).

colonial Lubumbashi, and Fabian does indeed not hesitate to situate these communicative deeds within the larger context of an modern urban African society.

Fabian qualifies the entire range of stylistic motivations for borrowing as "poetic borrowing". Fabians methodology is clearly interpretive, and it takes full account of the central notion of 'negotiability'. Negotiability implies that the making of choices is not a mechanical enterprise being carried out on the basis of fixed rules. There is no straight form-function correlation: the same communicative functions can be fulfilled by the most diverse linguistic choices, and the same linguistic choice does not always serve the same function. I think the only sound methodology to do justice to this principle of negotiability is an interpretive one.

Fabian's account is an analysis of communicative behavior. This communicative behavior, however, is representative for a specific Kiswahili variant. This variant is not at all instable, but it is characterized by conventionality and recognizability. The speakers share a common ground of understanding and recognition (Fabian 1982: 36ff), and the code functions as a consistent means of communication for a specific community. All this is to say that the relevance of his study transcends the strict area of the microprocesses of interference, and can readily be incorporated into a broader (pragmatic) investigation of macrolevel language change.

We can conclude that Fabian's account meets the requirements for a pragmatic approach to the linguistic interference process at the microlevel. It is this kind of investigation (concentrating on use and motivations for linguistic choices, with similar attention to interdisciplinarity, and with a genuine appreciation for variability, adaptability and negotiability) that we need to be able to incorporate the account of microprocesses into a general pragmatic approach based on our coherent frame of reference. This incorporation will ultimately mean a significant enrichment for the field of interlinguistics. The doors towards historical and dynamic diachrony will finally be open.

4. Conclusions and further suggestions

In this paper, contact-induced language change has been my primary concern. I have examined how such change could be approached from a pragmatic point of view. To that end, Verschueren's frame of reference was taken as a starting point, because it is a relatively comprehensive model for the pragmatic study of linguistic phenomena. On the basis of Thomason & Kaufman's distinction between borrowing and substratum influence through shift, I have tried to adapt Verschueren's pragmatic frame of reference to the needs of the study of contact-induced language change. In particular, a descriptive framework required for an approach to language contact to be 'pragmatic' was elaborated. This elaboration

involved an identification of what should minimally be referred to. Thus I hope to have opened the way to an inclusion of the field of contact-induced language change within the scope of pragmatic language studies.

There are numerous advantages of a pragmatic approach to language contact phenomena. First of all, it offers an approach in which language is in the first place considered in view of its functionality and contextuality, two major factors in language change and language contact. Secondly, thanks to the incorporation of a notion of 'consciousness', it can account for the forceful impact which a factor such as ideology and deliberate choice can have on language change. Finally, the pragmatic perspective was shown to be able to give language change the dynamism and historicity it is entitled to.

In discussing (in section 3.) the implications for the pragmatic perspective of the shift from the macroplane of the product to the microsituation of discourse, it was claimed that also the microsituation should be approached from the pragmatic perspective. I argued in this context that the fundamental principles (language use and its motivations, interdisciplinarity, adaptability, variability, and negotiability) should be respected. However, the same section revealed that it was precisely one of the methodological ingredients of the very pragmatic model I was using, namely the stages of adaptation, that appeared to lie at the basis of the time problem. Therefore, if we propose to solve the time problem by focusing on actual interactive discourse, we should be careful to promote the temporal dimension of adaptation processes, from the secondary role it now seems to play in the model, to the central property of dynamics which is implied by the concept of 'adaptation' (especially in the preferred sense of 'co-adaptation').

References

- Benveniste, E. (1966) *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berman, R. & E. Olshtain (1983) Features of first language transfer in second language attrition. *Applied Linguistics* 4:2, 222-234.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982) Learning to say what you mean in a second language: a study of the speech act performance of learners of hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics* 3:1, 29-59.
- Chick, K. (1985) The interactional accomplishment of discrimination in South Africa. *Language in Society* 14, 299-326.
- Cohen, A.D. (1975) Forgetting a second language. *Language Learning* 25, 127-138.
- Cohen, A.D. & Olshtain, E. (1981) Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: the case of apology. *Language Learning* 31:1, 113-134.
- Dorian, N.C. (ed.) (1989) *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyen, I. (1974) Genetic classification and affix reconstruction: the PIE ending of the genitive singular of *o-* stem nouns. In J.M. Anderson & Ch. Jones (eds.) *Historical linguistics*, vol. 2. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 123-140.

Fabian, J. (1982) Scratching the surface: observations on the poetics of lexical borrowing in Shaba Swahili. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24:1, 14-50.

Fabian, J. (1983) *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fabian, J. (1986) *Language and colonial power: The appropriation of Swahili in the former Belgian Congo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Færch, C. & G. Kasper (1983) Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds.) *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman, 20-60.

Gardner, R. & W. Lambert (1972) *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Goyvaerts, D.L. (1988) Indoubil: a Swahili hybrid in Bukavu. *Language in Society* 17, 231-239.

Gulstad, D.E. (1974) Reconstruction in syntax. In J.M. Anderson & Ch. Jones (eds.) *Historical linguistics*, vol. 1. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 117-158.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. (1990) The conversational analysis of interethnic communication. In R.C. Scarcella, E.S. Andersen & S.D. Krashen (eds.) *Developing communicative competence in a second language*. New York: Newbury House, 223-239.

Gumperz, J.J. (ed.) (1982) *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harder, P. (1980) Discourse as self-expression: On the reduced personality of the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics* 1:3, 262-280.

Holmes, J. (1978) Sociolinguistic competence in the classroom. In J.C. Richards (ed.) *Understanding second and foreign language learning: Issues and approaches*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 134-116.

Holmes, J. & D.F. Brown (1977) Sociolinguistic competence and second language learning. In R.W. Brislin & M.P. Hamnett (eds.) *Topics in culture learning 5*. Honolulu: East-West Center, 72-82.

Janicki, K. (1986) Accommodation in native speaker-foreigner interaction. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.) *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 169-178.

Kachru, B.B. (ed.) (1983) *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Keller, R. (1982) *Sprachwandel*. Tübingen: Francke.

Keller, R. (1985) Towards a theory of linguistic change. In T.T. Ballmer (ed.) *Linguistic dynamics: Discourse, procedures and evolution*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 211-237.

Loveday, L.J. (1982) Communicative interference: a framework for contrastively analyzing communicative competence exemplified with the linguistic behaviour of Japanese performing in English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 20, 1-16.

Lukács, G. (1971) *History and class consciousness*. London: Merlin.

Mougeon, R., Ed. Beniak & D. Valois (1984) *Variation in the phonological integration of loanwords in a bilingual speech community*. Toronto: Centre for Franco Ontarian Studies.

Muysken, P.C. (1984) Linguistic dimensions of language contact: the state of the art in inter-linguistics. *Revue québécoise de Linguistique* 14, 49-76.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1983) The negotiation of identities in conversation: a theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44, 115-136.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1988) Code switching as indexical of social negotiations. In M. Heller (ed.) *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 151-186.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1990) Accounting for structure in Swahili/English codeswitching. *Working Papers in Kiswahili* 9.

Ohala, J.J. (1974) Experimental historical phonology. In J.M. Anderson & Ch. Jones (eds.) *Historical linguistics*, vol. 2. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 353-390.

Poplack, S., D. Sankoff & C. Miller (1988) The social correlates and linguistic consequences of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26:1, 47-104.

Prigogine, I. (1980) *From being to becoming: Time and complexity in the physical sciences*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Prince, E.F. (1988) On pragmatic change: the borrowing of discourse functions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12:5/6, 505-518.

Py, B. (1982) Interlangue et dégénérescence d'une compétence linguistique. In A. Trévisé (ed.) *"Encrages", numéro spécial: Acquisition d'une langue étrangère* 2. Paris: Université de Paris VIII, 76-86.

Py, B. (1986) Native language attrition amongst migrant workers: towards an extension of the concept of interlanguage. In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.) *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon, 163-172.

Rintell, E. (1979) Getting your speech act together: the pragmatic ability of second language learners. *Working Papers in Bilingualism* 17, 97-106.

Romaine, S. (1989) *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Rutherford, W. (1989) Interlanguage and pragmatic word order. In S.M. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.) *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163-181.
- Ryan, E.B. (1983) Social psychological mechanisms underlying native speaker evaluations of non-native speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5, 148-159.
- Scarcella, R.S., E.S. Andersen & S.D. Krashen (eds.) (1990) *Developing communicative competence in a second language*. New York: Newbury House.
- Scollon, R. & S.B.K. Scollon (1981) *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Scollon, R. & S.B.K. Scollon (1983) Face in interethnic communication. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and communication*. London and New York: Longman, 156-188.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1981) Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics* 2:2, 277-294.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1983) On first language loss in the second language acquirer: problems of transfer. In S.M. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.) *Language transfer in language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Sherzer, J. (1987) A discourse-centered approach to language and culture. *American Anthropologist* 89, 295-309.
- Spolsky, B. (1969) Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. *Language Learning* 19, 271-283.
- Tao, H. & S.A. Thompson (1991) English backchannels in Mandarin conversations: a case study of superstratum pragmatic 'interference'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16, 209-223.
- Thomas, J. (1983) Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4:2, 91-112.
- Thomas, J. (1984) Cross-cultural discourse as 'unequal encounter': towards a pragmatic analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 5:3, 226-235.
- Thomason, S.G. & T. Kaufman (1988) *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Trévisé, A. (1986) Is it transferable, topicalization? In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.) *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon, 186-207.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1988) *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Vennemann, T. (1974) Topics, subjects and word order: from SXV to SVX via TVX. In J.M. Anderson & Ch. Jones (eds.) *Historical linguistics, vol. 1*, 339-376.

Verschueren, J. (1987) Pragmatics as a theory of linguistic adaptation. First working document drafted for the International Pragmatics Association in preparation of a Handbook of Pragmatics. *Ipra Working Document 1*.

Verschueren, J. (1991) A pragmatic model for the dynamics of communication. In I.Z. Zagar (ed.) *Speech acts: Fiction or reality?* Ljubljana: IPrA distribution centre for Yugoslavia, 37-48.

Vildomec, V. (1971) *Multilingualism*. Leiden: Sijthoff.

Winter, W. (1973) Areal linguistics: some general considerations. In Th.A. Sebeok (ed.) *Current trends in linguistics, vol. 11: Diachronical, areal, and typological linguistics*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 135-148.

Wolfson, N. (1981) Compliments in a cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly* 15:2, 117-124.