Symposium

Language Contact and the Dynamics of Language: Theory and Implications

10-13 May 2007

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

(Leipzig)

ABSTRACTS

Peter Bakker (Aarhus University)	*Rethinking structural diffusion.*	II	Certain types of syntactic and morphological features can be diffused, as in convergence and metatypy, where languages take over such properties from neighboring languages. In my paper I would like to explore the idea that typological similarities in the realm of morphology can be used for establishing historical, perhaps even genetic, connections between language families with complex morphological systems. I will exemplify this with North America, in particular the possible connections between the language families of the Northwest coast/ Plateau and those of the eastern part of the Americas. I will argue on the basis on typological similarities, that (ancestor languages of) some families (notably Algonquian) spoken today east of the continental divide, were once spoken west of the continental divide. This will lead to a more theoretical discussion about diffusion: is it really possible that more abstract morphological features such as morpheme ordering can be diffused? As this appears to be virtually undocumented, we have to be very skeptical about such diffusion. This means that mere morphological similarities between morphologically complex languages should be taken as evidence for inheritance rather than the result of contact.
Cécile Canut (MoDyCo, CNRS, Lacis, Montpelllier III)	*Parole et Agencements.*	III	Si la notion de contact, en sociolinguistique notamment, a permis de remettre en cause un certain nombre de précatégorisations en matière linguistique, et en tout premier lieu une vision monolithique des langues et des pratiques plurilingues, permet-elle de décrire le réel du langage ? Au moyen d'une métaphorisation pluridimentionnelle floue (est-ce l'action par laquelle deux entités se touchent, ou l'état, le résultat de l'action qui est visée par ce terme?), cette notion suppose donc les langues comme des "corps" homogènes et séparés. En la comparant à la notion de feuilletage (Nicolaï), nous proposerons une réflexion sur les présupposés essentialistes de la notion de contact en fonction des conditions de production discursive dans lesquelles s'est réalisée sa conceptualisation
Bernard Comrie (MPI-EVA, Leipzig, University of California Santa Barbara)	*What does WALS tell us about the diffusion of structural features?*	II	
Nick Enfield (Max Planck Institute, Nijmegen)	*Conceptual tools for a natural science of language (contact and change).*	III	Echoing Sperber (1999), this paper argues that the right approach to language contact is an epidemiological one (Enfield 2005). The paper draws attention to the paradox of language genealogy: if language's temporal and spatial distribution works on an epidemiological model (taking 'items' as the unit of analysis), why does the genealogical model (which takes whole 'languages' as the unit of analysis) approximate the facts so effectively, so often? 'Language contact' is simply a special case of the normal situation of language in any setting: i.e., individuals in social settings, encountering and reproducing patterns of signifying behavior, where the success or failure of any such pattern of behavior (e.g. a word) as a fashion at the 'system' level will be determined by principles of social diffusion of innovation, well established in sociology. There are significant challenges, however, aligning an epidemiological model with

			traditional views in linguistics. How can a set of mutually 'detachable' items (words, etc.) aggregate so systematically and interdependently, resulting in what we call 'languages'? I discuss two sources of inward-driving order: first, the trade-off between strength and number of relationship ties in a social network, and second, certain linguistic structural mechanisms which we may group under the heading of 'item-utterance fit', the most important being that any given 'item' is deployed and encountered not alone but within a grammatical context, which constrains its structural fit and evokes a larger grammar, fragment by fragment. There are of course no real events of 'languages coming into contact', and the pitfalls of this non-literal way of talking need to be more explicitly recognized in research on language contact. The paradox of language genealogy will only be solved when we work through the logic of it with a constant eye on the natural, causal processes involved. *References* Enfield, N. J. 2005. Areal linguistics and mainland Southeast Asia. *Ann. Rev. Anth*. Vol. 34. Sperber, D. 1999. Conceptual Tools for a Natural Science of Society and Culture. *Radcliffe-Brown Lecture in Social Anthropology*.
Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Erin Shay (University of Colorado)	*Language-internal versus contact-induced change: the case of split coding of person and number. a Stefan Elders' question.*	II	The aim of this study is to establish a methodology for distinguishing between language-internal change and contact-induced change. We have taken as a test problem a phenomenon that is relatively rare in languages of the world but that occurs in a few languages belonging to different linguistic families. When languages displaying such a phenomenon are spoken in the immediate vicinity of each other, the sharing of similar structures may likely be interpreted as manifesting borrowing of structures across linguistic families. The structures that we examine involve the split coding of person and number of the subject, where a pronoun preceding the verb codes person and a suffix to the verb—usually the same suffix for all person—codes number. This phenomenon has been observed in the Siouan and Caddoan languages of North America. It has also been observed in two Central Chadic languages, Gidar and Giziga, and in Mundang, an Adamawa language (Niger Congo) spoken in the same geographical area of Northern Cameroon. Although the structures found in the Chadic languages resemble the structures found in Mundang with respect to the order and functions of their constituents, we demonstrate that they represent products of internal development in each family rather than instances of borrowing. We demonstrate that the presence of similar coding means in unrelated languages may result in the emergence of similar structures for coding the same functions.
Françoise Gadet (Modyco, Paris 10)	*Variation and contact.*	III	When « contact » is intended as a process taking place between speaking human beings, and not solely between languages, it can be said that all speakers are constantly « in contact » ; and contact will be thought of as the usual regime of language process, which is not to be considered as radically different in so called monolingual communities and in bilingual (or plurilingual) communities. A consideration which had lead André Martinet to characterize the speaker as a locus of « battlefield », in his well-known preface of Weinreich *Languages in contact* (1953) : battlefield between languages, or between styles or genres. In this communication, we are going to discuss about what would imply a battlefield : does it help us to understand the linguistic phenomenon usually thought of as « variation » in what is described as one language ? The communication will consider variation in the French language.
Anthony Grant (Edge Hill (Lancaster University)	*Contact-induced change and the openness of "closed" morphological systems: some cases from*	I	In this paper I draw upon data from both Native North America and Latin America discuss some assumptions about the ability of languages to adopt, absorb, assimilate and productively use morphological elements(especially bound and cliticised ones) which originate in other languages, and the consequences this may have for genealogical classifications which assign primacy of evidence to morphological features. Illustrative data are drawn from a number of indigenous languages, including members of the Jaqi/Aymaran family and from work by myself and others on Pearl Lagoon Basin Miskitu, a hitherto barely described

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>native America.</td><td></td><td>Misumalpan language of Nicaragua whose structure and lexicon have been profoundly reshaped as the result of contact with Western Caribbean Creole English.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (MPI-EVA, Leipzig)</td><td>Loanword typology: the cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability.</td><td>II</td><td>Linguists have often made impressionistic observations about lexical borrowability: Different semantic types of words appear to be borrowed more readily and more often, whereas others tend to be more stable. However, these intuitions have never been tested, and lexical contact typology is still at the impressionistic stage of 19th century structural typology. In this talk, I report on an attempt at gathering relevant data on a large scale in a collaborative project, called "Loanword Typology" (initiated in 2003, to be completed in 2008). A long word list of 1460 words, based on the Intercontinental Dictionary Series, was translated into about 35 languages, and detailed information on known loanwords was provided by experts on the languages and their history. I discuss the project's methodological choices and first results.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Bernd Heine (Universität zu Köln) & Tania Kouteva (Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf)</td><td>Identifying instances of contact-induced grammatical replication.</td><td>II</td><td>While it is fairly easy to establish that lexical material has been transferred from one language to another, this is hard when it comes to grammatical replication where no form-meaning units are involved: For a number of reasons it is essentially impossible to "prove" that language A has replicated a grammatical structure on the model of language B. In the paper I argue that there nevertheless are ways of establishing that such processes have in fact taken place. Looking at a wider range of cases of contact-induced grammatical replication, I will propose a catalogue of diagnostics that are of help in establishing whether or not a given linguistic grammatical change is or is not due to language contact.</td></tr>
<tr><td>John Holm (University of Coimbra)</td><td>Creole typology and substrate typology.</td><td>II</td><td>This paper seeks to cast light on two major questions about creole languages. The first is whether creole languages in general share structural similarities that could be said to constitute a typology. Although there has been mounting evidence in recent years that they do not, especially when creoles of the Atlantic area are compared to those of Asia and the Pacific, the question is still open as to what degree particular groups of creoles reflect the typological similarities of their superstrate and substrate languages, thus forming typological groups of their own. Thus the second major question, perennial in the field, must also be dealt with: to what degree do creoles reflect the structure of their superstrate and substrate languages.
Thus this study first compares the typology of six creole languages with Portuguese and/or Spanish superstrates and various African, Asian and Pacifie substrates, considering the 97 morphosyntactic features surveyed in Holm and Patrick, eds. (forthcoming). The point is to quantify structual similarity within groupings, particularly by superstrate and substrate. The lowest percentage of parallel constructions occurs between the two creoles which share the same substrate but which have two different superstrates, while the highest percentage of parallel constructions occurs between two creoles that share both a superstrate and a substrate.
To deal with the second major question regarding the influence of substrate typology on creole typology, there is next a comparison of the same 97 grammatical féatures of a particular creole (Guinée-Bissau Creole) with those of its superstrate (Portuguese) and one of its substrate languages (Balanta). The results are tabulated not by areas of syntax but by the patterns of the presence or absence of the features (e.g. present in all or none of the languages or only in the creole, etc.) to find what these patterns reveal about the validity of theoretical assumptions about the sources of creole features. It is found that a feature is most likely to occur in a creole when it is found in both parent languages, somewhat less likely to occur in the creole when it is found only in the substrate, and considerably less like to occur in the creole when it is found only in the superstrate:
Percentage of features by potential source
<table>
<tr><td>Feature totally absent</td><td>11.2%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Miscellaneous</td><td>5.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Feature found in the creole only</td><td>9.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Feature found in the creole and its superstrate</td><td>11.2</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

			<table><tr><td>Feature found in the creole and its substrate</td><td>29.6</td></tr><tr><td>Convergence</td><td>32.7</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>99%</td></tr></table>
Claire Lefebvre **(**UQAM - Université du Québec à Montréal**)**	*Relabelling : a major process in language contact.*	I	The problem of language contact may be taken up from two opposite angles : the processes at work in language contact situations or the end-results of the processes. This paper concentrates on one process : relabelling. Relabelling is a mental operation that consists in assigning a lexical entry of a given language, L1, a new label taken from another language, L2. It is shown that this process may yield different end-results depending on the extent of its application across lexicons. This general approach enables us to discuss in a unified way the contribution of a single process to the make up of various language varieties arising in different language contact situations, and thus to make links between a number of contact phenomena and situations that otherwise would remain foreign to each other. The first part of the paper will show that processes referred to in the literature as misascription, calquing, relexification, paralexification or Full Access all fall within the definition of relabelling. The second part of the paper will document de fact that the process of relabelling may apply in a wide range of language contact situations. For example, it may apply in simple situations of language contact, in L2 acquisition, in the creation of urban vernaculars (e.g. Singapore English), in the creation of mixed languages (e.g. Media Lengua), in the creation of mixed languages involving language shift (e.g. Romani), in the creation of pidgin languages (e.g. Solomon Islands Pidgin), and in the creation of creole languages (e.g. Haitian Creole). Although the same process is at work in these various situations, the end-result is not the same across the various situations. The third part of the paper will be dedicated to showing that the different outputs observed depend upon a major variable : the extent of relabelling across the lexicons involved. For example, in a simple contact situation, a few lexical items undergo relabelling. In the initial stage of L2 acquisition, the whole lexicon is relabelled; the properties of each lexical entry may be revised as acquisition progresses. In the creation of mixed languages such as Media Lengua, all the major category lexical items are relabelled but functional categories are not. In the creation of pidgin and creole languages all lexical items, including functional categories, are relabelled.
Léglise (CELIA, CNRS, Paris)	*Explaining language contact phenomena in a dynamic synchronic / prospective diachronic perspective: discussion of a methodological frame.*	I	Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, Thomason, 2001, Winford, 2003 who can be seen as founders in Contact Linguistics propose theoretical and methodological frames to apprehend linguistic contact results in a historical approach of reconstruction of the contact setting. These diachronic perspectives (which identify linguistic, typological and social factors as important inputs), do take into account social factors but as not much of the data is available - not much socio-historical complex data is involved in the analyses in order to explain the linguistic results of a previous contact. Looking at contemporary language contacts, in a synchronic perspective, change the researcher object and lenses: the complexity of the data involved is obvious (complexity of linguistic phenomenon - with its variations and the complexity of social practices) and contact phenomenon shall be analyzed as process and not as stabilized results Taking examples of the emergence of variations and of new language varieties due to language contacts in French Guiana, we will propose and discuss the appropriateness of a methodological frame (inspired by the socio-historical approaches but “adapted” to synchrony).
Patrick McConvell (AIATSIS, Canberra) & Felicity Meakins (University of	*Mixed languages as outcomes of code-switching: recent examples from*	I	Gurindji Kriol has grown out of a mixture of the grammar and lexicon of a traditional Indigenous language and a creole variety (Kriol) in the last 30-40 years. The pattern of hybridisation of mixed languages in such cases is largely predictable from code-switching constraints. One of the features of Gurindji Kriol also found in other hybrid languages in Australia and elsewhere (including Michif) is a Nominal-Verbal split. The N-V split relates to the grammatical typology of the ‘old’ source language – where it is dependent-marking like

Melbourne)	*Australia and their implications for the past.*		Gurindji, then there is a split in which nominal grammar is retained from the old language; where it is head-marking, there is retention of verbal grammar from the old language. An attempt is made to predict what languages created by this kind of process in the past would look like.
Pieter Muysken (Radboud University Nijmegen)	Out of the raritätenkabinett? An evidence-based approach to language contact studies.	III	In the field of historical linguistics there is increasing awareness that many changes in languages are due to the ecological context in which these languages are spoken, in casu other neighbouring languages, with which they entertain complex and diverse relations. A number of mechanisms of contact-induced change have been postulated to account for this. This paper will try to summarise what is known from the comparative study of language contact settings in current bilingual communities. For which postulated mechanisms do we have concrete contemporary evidence?
Carol Myers-Scotton (Michigan State University)	*Testing the 4-M Model with Contact Data.*	III	The goal of this paper will be to examine the extent to which different types of morphemes from a donor/Embedded Language can or cannot be integrated into a recipient/Matrix Language in language contact phenomena. The implications of morpheme classification under the 4-M model make specific predictions about the acceptance of different types of morphemes by recipient/Matrix Language morpho-syntactic frames (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2006 & forthcoming). For example, those Embedded Language (EL) morphemes that this model calls early system morphemes sometimes appear in morpho-syntactic frames derived from the Matrix language when two languages participate in codeswitching or in some so-called mixed languages such as Michif (i.e. In codeswitching, EL plural markers may come along with their content morpheme heads. Still, this only happens occasionally and certainly not so frequently as EL content morphemes are integrated into a Matrix Language frame. Early system morphemes depend on a head content morpheme for their presence and form (e.g. plural affixes or derivational affixes, as well as determiners in certain languages). In contrast, those morphemes that the 4-M model calls late system morphemes, and especially outsider late system morphemes, are not easily accepted into the morpho-syntactic frame of another language, even in an intense contact situation. Outsider late system morphemes are called outsiders because they depend on information outside the immediate maximal projection in which they occur for information about their presence and form (e.g., subject-verb agreement, case markers). The Differential Access Hypothesis, which is implied by the 4-M model, partly explains this predicted difference (Myers-Scotton, 2002; 2005). It suggests that content morphemes and early system morphemes become salient at an earlier level in language production than late system morphemes. That is, late system morphemes do not become salient until larger constituents in a clause are assembled at the level of the formulator. The prediction studied here is that this suggested difference in how morphemes are accessed has a number of surface consequences (cf. Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2000 on distributions in the speech of Broca's aphasics, codeswitching, and second language acquisition). Of specific interest here is the consequence when two or more languages in the repertoires of bilingual speakers are often used together. *References* Myers-Scotton, Carol M. 2002. *Contact Linguistics, Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: OUP. Myers-Scotton, Carol M. 2005. Supporting a Differential Access Hypothesis: Codeswitching and other contact data. In Judith Kroll and Annette DeGroot (eds.) *Handbook of Bilingualism, Psycholinguistic Approaches*, pp. 326-348. New York: OUP. Myers-Scotton, Carol M. and Janet L. Jake. 2000. Four types of morpheme: Evidence from aphasia, code-switching, and second language acquisition. *Linguistics* 38, 1053-1100. Myers-Scotton, Carol M. and Janet L. Jake. 2006. No chaos allowed: Principles and processes in codeswitching. To appear in Barbara Bullock and Almeida J. Toribio (eds.) *Handbook of Codeswitching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Robert Nicolaï (Institut Universitaire de France et Université de Nice)	*Dynamique du langage et élaboration des langues : quelques défis à relever.*	III	Aujourd'hui l'étude du *multiple*, de la *variabilité* et l'*hétérogène* va de soi dans les recherches sur l'évolution des langues et le changement linguistique. Corrélativement, des modèles évolutionnistes ont été proposés (cf. Lass 1997, Croft 2000, Mufwene 2001, etc.) ce qui suppose d'engager une réflexion sur leur pouvoir de description et leur degré d'adéquation aux phénomènes. Je m'intéresse ainsi aux '*modélisations métaphoriques*' parce qu'elles témoignent de changements importants dans notre perception de la dynamique des langues, et parce que chaque fois qu'on envisage d'exporter un modèle se pose la question cruciale de savoir ce qu'on modélise dans le transfert. Un modèle néo-darwinien va introduire de nouveaux questionnements et conduira à précontraindre et à transformer les problématiques linguistiques. Il importe donc de s'intéresser au risque de surmodélisation qu'il est susceptible d'introduire : cela demande de s'interroger sur certains aspects fondamentaux et nécessaires à l'élaboration du linguistique (*variabilité* dans les langues, *sémiotisation* des formes) mais aussi sur la place des '*acteurs*' dans les procès de communication. En considérant ces aspects on atteint l'interface où, *activement*, les acteurs construisent de l'*unitaire* à partir du *variable*, de l'*hétérogène* et du *multiple*, dans l'espace anthropo-linguistique dont ils sont partie prenante ; ce qui ne veut pas dire que cela résulte d'un procès délibéré. Cette construction se matérialise à travers diverses modalités de saisie des phénomènes. J'en présenterai trois (linéarisation, massification et *Gestalt*) qui illustrent 'l'activisme' des acteurs dans les dynamiques de l'élaboration de leurs langues.
Malcom Ross (The Australian National University Canberra)	*The history of metatypy in the Bel languages.*	I	I have written on a number of occasions about metatypy in Takia, an Oceanic Austronesian language of Karkar Island, off the north coast of New Guinea. I have usually suggested that its metatypic model was Waskia, a neighbouring language of the Trans-New Guinea family(see, for example, Ross 1996). More recently, as a result of work undertaken for the Leipzig-based Loanword Typology Project, I have suggested that Bargam, another Trans-New Guinea language, may have been at least as influential but at an earlier stage (2006b). In both cases I have compared data from a putative metatypic model with data from Takia. In this paper I approach the history of Takia from a different perspective. Takia is a member of the Bel family, a small eight- member group of Oceanic Austronesian languages. All of them reflect the effects of metatypy. Some of these effects are reconstructable for Proto Bel, but others are not and have occurred since the break- up of Proto Bel. This reconstruction of Proto Bel, quite orthodox by the canons of the comparative method, enables us to see the step-by- step development of metatypic features in the daughter-languages and thereby to understand something more of the process of metatypy (for recent accounts of metatypy, see Ross 2006a, 2007). *References* Ross, Malcolm, 1996. Contact-induced change and the comparative method: cases from {P}apua {N}ew {G}uinea. In: Durie, Mark and Ross, Malcolm (eds), The comparative method reviewed: regularity and irregularity in language change, 180-217. New York: Oxford University Press. Ross, Malcolm, 2006a. Metatypy. In Brown, Keith (ed), Encyclopedia of language and linguistics, 2nd edition, 8:95–99. Oxford: Elsevier Ross, Malcolm, 2006b. Takia. Unpublished ms, Loanword Typology Project. Max Planck Institute For Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig. Ross, Malcolm, 2007. Calquing and metatypy. Journal of Language Contact 1.
William Samarin (University of Toronto)	*Convergence and the retention of marked consonants in Pidgin Sango.*	I	Pidgin Sango challenges allegations that the sound inventories of pidgins are small and that in language contact sound change "often" leads to loss or assimilation in phonemic distinctions (Mülhäusler 1986; DeGraff 2001). Sango has retained almost the whole phonological system of Ngbandi, on which it is based. This is explained, not by substratal influence—the systems of co-territorial Ubangian languages of the Banda and Gbaya groups—but by similar systems of

			several West African and central Bantu languages spoken by the workers and soldiers who were brought to the Ubangi river basin by Belgian colonizers in 1887 and subsequently, and who, with the indigenes, very quickly created a new language despite variable social relations.
Carmen Silva-Corvalán (University of Southern California)	The limits of convergence in language contact.	I	I will discuss the contact situation between English and Spanish in the USA, a situation characterized by both maintenance of the minority language (Spanish) and shift to English. Of relevance to understand the linguistic phenomena that develop in this situation of societal bilingualism is the fact that the minority language is constantly being revitalized (strengthened) by interaction with large groups of immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries. In this context of societal bilingualism an oral proficiency continuum develops in the two languages. This *continuum* ranges from standard or unrestricted Spanish to an *emblematic* use of Spanish and, vice versa, from unrestricted to emblematic English. At the individual level, the continuum reveals *dynamic* levels of proficiency in the subordinate language and different degrees of convergence with English. Speakers can be located at various points along this continuum, but it is in principle possible for an individual to move or be moving toward (hence `dynamic' level) one or the other end of the continuum at any given synchronic stage of his life. I will identify some of the linguistic changes that affect the minority language at different points in the proficiency continuum (or different stages of attrition), and will argue that in this particular contact situation convergence is constrained by the structure of the minority language undergoing change.
Norval Smith (University of Amsterdam)	*Substrate phonology, superstrate phonology and adstrate phonology in creole languages.*	I	The phonological effects themselves resulting from creolization can be attributed solely to language contact phonology, rather than any kind of simplification processes. Many creole languages possess very complex(portions of) phonology. When we know enough about the languages involved in the formation of a particular creole - which we usually don't - it turns out that all aspects can be explained solely from the mixture of linguistic inputs involved (pace the relevant sociolinguistic factors). The conclusion is then that creole phonology differs in no way from the phonology of other types of contact language. I will illustrate this with data from Surinam and Jamaica.
Andrée Tabouret-Keller (CNRS, Strasbourg)	*Langues en contact", persistance et intérêt d'une métaphore.*	III	L'emploi de l'expression *language contact* date d'il y a un demi-siècle (Martinet, 1953) mais elle n'a jusqu'ici été ni remplacée ni abandonnée. Ses contextes d'emploi ont cependant changé : nous parlons de la langue aujourd'hui en des termes différents que ceux des années 1950. L'objet de cet exposé est d'examiner ces changements, en précisant le rôle de la métaphore du *contact langagier et linguistique* dans la construction des représentations, des descriptions et de l'analyse des situations linguistiques complexes. On essayera de préciser les valeurs et la place que peuvent prendre aujourd'hui les notions de contact dans les nouveaux paradigmes des sciences du langage et de répondre à la question de savoir si la métaphore *language contact* conserve sa pointe de créativité ou bien si nous devrions la remplacer par une autre métaphore et laquelle.
Uri Tadmor (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology)	*Is borrowability borrowable?*	II	Many claims have been made regarding which classes of words are more (or less) borrowable than others. In particular, it has been claimed that members of closed sets, such as numerals and pronouns, are less susceptible to borrowing than members of open sets; that function words in general are borrowed less than content words; and that core vocabulary items are less likely to be replaced by loanwords than specialized ones. These ideas were first formulated based on the analysis of 'Old World' languages. In this paper, I will explore borrowed vocabulary in some languages of Southeast Asia that cast doubt on these generalizations. In these languages, members of closed sets (such as numerals and pronouns), function words in general, and core vocabulary items (like body parts and kinship terms) are at least as borrowable as members of open sets, content words, and specialized vocabulary, respectively. Moreover, it appears that borrowability itself is a borrowable feature. In other words, the fact that, for example, pronouns and body part terms are commonly borrowed throughout Southeast Asia, is due to contact. Many of the data will be drawn from the ongoing project on Loanword Typology at the Max Planck Institute for

			Evolutionary Anthropology.
Sally Thomason (University of Michigan)	*Social vs. linguistic factors as predictors of contact-induced change.*	I	Two claims made by Thomason & Kaufman (1988) have elicited particularly strong reactions from specialists in language contact: first, that there are no absolute linguistic constraints on the kinds or numbers of features that can be transferred from one language to another; and second, that when social factors and linguistic factors might be expected to push in opposite directions in a language contact situation, the social factors will be the primary determinants of the linguistic outcome. Both claims have frequently been challenged in recent years, for instance by Gillian Sankoff, Ruth King, and Carol Myers-Scotton. To some extent the challenges are based on a misunderstanding of our arguments; most seriously, some critics argue that we dismiss linguistic predictors as entirely irrelevant to an analysis of contact-induced change. Since we discussed linguistic as well as social predictors of contact-induced change, it isn't true that, as King 2002 puts it, we claimed that `linguistic factors...play no role' in determining the outcome of language contact (and Sankoff 2001 has a similar statement). In part, however, the objections to our position are based on genuine theoretical and/or empirical disagreements between Thomason & Kaufman and their critics. This paper explores these disagreements in an effort to arrive at a better understanding of the relative importance of social and linguistic predictors in language contact situations. My main conclusions are these: although critics have made impressive contributions toward specifying linguistic predictors, there is still no good reason to abandon the Thomason & Kaufman position (mainly because it was much less extreme than some readers have assumed); and much more work needs to be done to make even rough predictions about the relative impact of particular social and linguistic factors, and their interactions, in particular contact situations.
Mauro Tosco (Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli)	*Do we really need linguistic areas?*	II	Although the concept of "linguistic area" was originally formulated by N. Trubetzkoy as early as 1923, a viable and theoretically sound definition is still missing. The current resurgence of interest in linguistic areas is all the more remarkable since similar and related concepts (e.g., cultural areas and, even more so, the *Kulturkreis* theory in anthropology) are generally viewed with suspicion in social sciences – if not overtly refused (although they have made a comeback in political science; cf. S. Huntington's influential *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, 1996). Building on my paper on the Ethiopian linguistic area (Tosco 2000) and the reactions/addenda to it (e.g., Bender 2003, Crass and Bisang 2004, Bisang 2005), and much in the line of Stolz (2002), I'll argue that the concept of "area" is in principle more interesting in linguistics than in social sciences due to the availability in linguistics of two other unrelated, and much more powerful, tools: genetic classification and typology. Ideally, in order for a linguistic area to be "proved" 1. its members will have to be as genetically diverse as possible; and 2. it will not be possible to account for the area-defining features on the basis of typological tendencies and regularities. Since we cannot expect the members of the area to be maximally different genetically (i.e., totally unrelated), nor the outcome of contact to be maximally irregular typologically (i.e, typologically impossible), real-world areas do not meet these strong requirements. The concept of area may still prove useful in contact linguistics once it is recognized that 1. areaness and membership in language areas are continuous rather than discrete; and 2. language areas may only be defined negatively as a space-based clustering of features which can *not* be accounted for genetically or typologically.
Donald Winford (Ohio State University)	*Processes of creolization and related contact-induced*	I	Van Coetsem (2000:39) expressed dismay that, so far, "Contact Linguistics lacks an adequate conceptual basis on which a synthesis can be built that is well founded. The diversity of contact phenomena and the variety of methodological and theoretical approaches to their description and analysis make van Coetsem's

	language change.		challenge a daunting one. But one area in which significant progress has been made is in the study of the processes and principles underlying creole formation, and their role in other related outcomes of language contact, such as the formation of indigenized varieties of English, French, etc, and in various instances of structural convergence between languages. This paper explores the connections among these varied outcomes of contact, and attempts to show how current theoretical frameworks, including theories of convergence and transfer, have laid the foundation for a unified model of these types of contact induced change.
Petr Zima (Charles University of Prague)	*Contact of speakers and interference of languages.*	I	The paper intends to distinguish between the contact as a phenomenon concerning human individuals and their communication, and the interference as a phenomenon concerning language systems as communication codes. Thus, the former is to be analysed primarily within the disciplinary context of the anthropology of communication, while linguistics as a discipline should be primarily dealing with the latter. Interdisciplinary links obvously exist In both directions, but mixing different disciplinary criteria brought, in this respect, since the establishment of the so-called contact linguistics lots of misunderstanding.