

Language Contacts at the Crossroads of Disciplines

Language Contacts at the Crossroads
of Disciplines

Edited by

Heli Paulasto, Lea Meriläinen,
Helka Riionheimo and Maria Kok

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Language Contacts at the Crossroads of Disciplines,
Edited by Heli Paulasto, Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo and Maria Kok

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Heli Paulasto, Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo, Maria Kok and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6624-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6624-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Language Contacts at the Crossroads of Disciplines: Introduction ix
Heli Paulasto, Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo and Maria Kok

Part I: Crossing the Borders

Chapter One 3
Interlingual Reduction: Evidence from Language Contacts, Translation
and Second Language Acquisition
Leena Kolehmainen, Lea Meriläinen and Helka Riionheimo

Chapter Two 33
Conjunctions in Early Yiddish-Lithuanian Bilingualism: Heritage
Language and Contact Linguistic Perspectives
Anna Verschik

Chapter Three 59
Inflectional Morphology in Interlanguages: Evidence from Decreolization
and Second Language Acquisition
Custódio Martins and Mário Pinharanda Nunes

Chapter Four 89
Languaging: Ways-of-Being-with-Words across Disciplinary Boundaries
and Empirical Sites
Sangeeta Bagga-Gupta

Part II: Translation as Language Contact

Chapter Five 131
The Case for a Common Framework for Transfer-Related Phenomena
in the Study of Translation and Language Contact
Martina Ožbot

Chapter Six	161
Understanding Translated vs. Non-Translated Figurative Idioms: Results of a Questionnaire Survey Esa Penttilä and Pirkko Muikku-Werner	
Chapter Seven.....	191
Dissociation of Linguistic and Cognitive Description in Translation: The Cognitive Figure-Ground Alignment Jukka Mäkisalo and Marjatta Lehtinen	
Part III: Immigrant and Minority Language Communities	
Chapter Eight.....	215
Contact-Induced Levelling: The Beginning Stages of Koineization of English in Japan Keiko Hirano	
Chapter Nine.....	251
Bilingual Speech in Russian-German Language Contact: Findings Based on an Analysis of Natural Conversations in Russian-Speaking Immigrant Families in Germany Anna Ritter	
Part IV: Contact Effects in Language Acquisition and Teaching	
Chapter Ten	283
Measuring Perceptions of Cross-Linguistic Similarity between Closely Related Languages: Finnish and Estonian Noun Morphology as a Testing Ground Annekatriin Kaivapalu and Maisa Martin	
Chapter Eleven	319
The Role of Language-External Factors in the Acquisition of English as an Additional Language by Bilingual Children in Germany Simone Lechner and Peter Siemund	
Chapter Twelve	347
Borrowing Metalanguage: Finnish Past Tense Terminology in Grammar Descriptions and Teaching Maria Kok	

Contributors.....	397
Index.....	403

INTRODUCTION

HELI PAULASTO, LEA MERILÄINEN,
HELKA RIIONHEIMO AND MARIA KOK

The present volume offers a cross-disciplinary view into language contact research, bringing together fresh empirical and theoretical studies from various fields concerning different dimensions of language contact and variation, second language acquisition (SLA), and translation. Although many disciplines within linguistics and other sciences share an interest in language contact phenomena, the related processes and their outcomes, they have developed distinct profiles and research traditions which do not often meet. It is the aim of this book to provide such a meeting point for scholars hailing from different fields to explore languages in contact from multiple perspectives. Discussion and cross-pollination between these related disciplines is needed in order to widen our horizons, learn from the neighbouring research traditions and examine our own through new sets of lenses. The theme of the proposed book arises from CROSSLING, a cross-disciplinary research network founded in spring 2011 at the University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu. The research articles in the volume are the outcome of the international CROSSLING Symposium: Language Contacts at the Crossroads of Disciplines, held in Joensuu on 28 February–1 March 2013.

The juxtaposition of the various disciplines and theoretical viewpoints presented in these articles calls for a re-examination and re-definition of the notion of language contact. This term seems to be mostly understood, at least in the field of contact linguistics, as the encounter of individuals or groups of individuals speaking different languages (see, e.g. Thomason 2001, 1), in other words, as a social phenomenon. Furthermore, language contact is usually approached from a more or less diachronic viewpoint, paying attention to the traces left in the contacting languages. The linguistic effects of contact are manifold and have been referred to by various concepts, such as interference, transfer, borrowing, substrate influence, contact-induced change or, more neutrally, cross-linguistic influence. This kind of view of language contact naturally covers the most

typical topic of research in contact linguistics, i.e. areal language contacts, but it is still quite narrow and excludes many forms of linguistic encounters that belong to other fields of research, such as SLA research or translation studies. Formal and informal means of language acquisition provide the individual with linguistic resources additional to their L1 (or L1s), and speaking a second or foreign language is therefore an activity inevitably characterized by language contact. In the same way, translating and interpreting are forms of language contact where a multilingual individual acts as a mediator between speakers of different languages.

Language contact is an ancient phenomenon: the interactions of people speaking and writing in different languages have moulded nations, ideologies, policies, and—in the process—the structure and lexicon of the languages in question through the ages. In the present-day world of globalization, population mobility and information technology, these themes are as topical as ever, and research on language contacts and cross-linguistic influence has expanded rapidly during the last few decades (for the latest research, see, e.g. Appel and Muysken eds. 2005; Heine & Kuteva 2005; Aikhenvald and Dixon eds. 2006; Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008; Siemund and Kintana eds. 2008; Verschik 2008; Braunmüller and House eds. 2009; Matras 2009; Hickey ed. 2010; Ihemere ed. 2010, 2013; Norde, Jonge and Hasselblatt eds. 2010; Hasselblatt, Houtzagers, and van Paren eds. 2011; Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi eds. 2012; Braunmüller, Höder and Kühl eds. 2014).

Along with the growth of interest, this wider field of research has divided into several branches with very specific foci. In linguistics, language contacts and multilingualism are now being investigated, for example, within historical linguistics, contact linguistics, sociolinguistics, bilingualism research, and second language acquisition research. Furthermore, various forms of language contacts and multilingual encounters are important topics of research in other scientific fields, such as translation studies, sociology, psychology, educational sciences, anthropology, and cultural studies, to name just a few. The research within each discipline is often focused on linguistic phenomena that are shared with other disciplines, but they are viewed from such divergent perspectives that each branch has developed its own tradition and terminology, and hence, dialogue between disciplines tends to be scarce. In consequence of this separation, there are many terminological and even theoretical inconsistencies between fields of research, and methodological knowledge is often not being exchanged. The narrowness of focus has, of course, led to a depth of scientific knowledge within each field which could not have been reached otherwise. However, with the manifold

linguistic phenomena and the versatile nature of actual language contact situations, it is necessary to join forces to be able to see the forest from the trees and to find where our respective traditions could benefit from each other. Special attention needs to be paid to creating dialogue between researchers from different scientific backgrounds and thus widening our perspectives on language contact phenomena. When language contact is re-defined to include the mental or cognitive level of contact between different languages and varieties in the minds of language learners or translators, salient links are created between the different disciplines dealing with this subject matter.

The three most prominent disciplines in this volume are contact linguistics, SLA studies, and translation studies. These disciplines are related to each other through their interest in the encounters of two (or more) languages in the observed communicative behaviour of individuals or in societies, but they have different foci of research. Contact linguistics has traditionally acknowledged that bilingual individuals are at the locus of contact (see Weinreich 1953), but most of the research has nevertheless focused on the social or societal level of language use or on languages as linguistic systems, and what has been investigated most are the contacts of linguistic groups, usually within the same geographical area. The field of SLA research, on the other hand, examines the acquisition of an additional language after the mother tongue. SLA research therefore focuses on the psycholinguistic and cognitive aspects of language contact from the perspective of an individual. Translation and interpreting, then, are special processes of language production which involve the reformulating of a source text in one language into a target text in another language and, consequently, cross-linguistic influence is evident and unavoidable. The focus of translation studies is on the various dimensions of translating and interpreting, e.g. translations and interpretations as texts, translating and interpreting as processes, and the actions or role of translators and interpreters in society.

As contact linguistics, SLA research and translation studies have developed separately, their relevance for each other has typically been recognized only in passing. However, when the concept of language contact is approached from a broader perspective, as described above, this compartmentalization makes little sense, because the objects of research in these fields are in practice intertwined. The linguistic consequences of multilingualism are among the central topics of research in contact linguistics, and the means for an individual to become multilingual is by acquiring new languages. The mechanisms of societal language contact and change are inevitably the outcome of individuals' various means of

language processing and production, and vice versa: individual speakers are influenced by the languages and contact situations they experience in the community around them. Translating and interpreting, then, can be seen as activities typical of multilingual individuals and societies, either as a professional skill or as a natural ability, needed in many kinds of interactional situations. Furthermore, translation tasks are a common and traditional method in language teaching and testing.

The past few years have witnessed an increasing interest in crossing the discipline boundaries and combining different perspectives. For example, in the study of World Englishes and Learner Englishes, the contact-linguistic and SLA aspects have been combined in several studies (e.g. Van Rooy 2006; Nesselhauf 2009; Mukherjee and Hundt eds. 2011; Meriläinen and Paulasto *forthc.*), and the need for dialogue between disciplines investigating contact phenomena has been expressed repeatedly in SLA-related research (see, e.g. Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008, 156; Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008, 234–235; Treffers-Daller and Sakel ed. 2012). In a similar way, the importance of SLA-related aspects has been acknowledged in contact-linguistic literature (Thomason 2001, 146–149; Matras 2009). Also the idea of translation as a mode of language contact has recently been presented in some of the work on translation studies (e.g. Baumgarten and Özçetin 2008; Steiner 2008; Wurm 2008; Amouzadeh and House 2010; Kranich, Becher and Höder 2011). Interestingly, translation has not been given much notice in contact linguistics, although the influence of translated texts on the standard language of the nation may be remarkable (cf., however, Backus 2010). Despite these signals of rapprochement, systematic comparison of translating and other types of language contacts is scarce. All in all, it is clear that the connections between contact linguistics, SLA studies and translation studies are worth strengthening and deepening, and this is also the aim of this publication.

This book is divided into four sections based on contexts of language contact rather than research disciplines, allowing various perspectives to emerge in each section. The first part, *Crossing the borders*, comprises studies which explicitly cross the boundaries of two or more disciplines. Leena Kolehmainen, Lea Meriläinen and Helka Riionheimo begin this section, providing a theoretical meta-analysis of a language contact effect termed *interlingual reduction* (i.e. the reduction or the lower frequency of target-language linguistic items or patterns not shared by both of the languages involved in the language contact situation) in translations, second language acquisition and language contact situations. Interlingual reduction is an example of a phenomenon which has attracted the attention of researchers in all these fields, but they have traditionally examined it

within their own disciplines, separately from one another. The evidence reviewed by the authors shows that all these three contexts of language contact manifest similar reduction phenomena, which may be explained with common underlying bilingual processing effects. Their article demonstrates that a cross-disciplinary approach helps us obtain a more comprehensive view of language contact effects.

The next article by Anna Verschik draws from a case study on an early Lithuanian-Yiddish bilingual. The study places itself on the ground shared by contact linguistics and heritage language acquisition studies, acknowledging the interrelationship of incomplete L1 acquisition, attrition, and contact-induced innovation and change in the language use of a multilingual individual. The case study presents a valuable set of data of contemporary spoken Yiddish, focusing on cross-linguistic influences in the use of conjunctions. Verschik shows that borrowing conjunctions from various languages can be explained through a functional-cognitive approach originating from the field of contact linguistics, according to which utterance modifiers tend to arise from the pragmatically dominant language instead of the language that is sociolinguistically dominant in the heritage language setting. The author further suggests that in order to fully understand the language contact phenomena among heritage language speakers, the perspectives of heritage language acquisition studies and contact linguistics should be combined.

The study by Custódio Martins and Mário Pinharanda Nunes is located at the interface of creole studies and SLA in that it compares L1 Makista creole (at its decreolization stage) and L1 Chinese learners of L2 Portuguese through data derived from fairly similar sociolinguistic contexts. The authors' analysis of perfect and imperfect preterite morphology by these two speaker groups contributes to the study of the confluence of SLA studies and creolistics by demonstrating that similar processes operate behind the later stages of the post-creole continuum and advanced second language acquisition. Their study thus testifies of the fruitfulness of exploring the parallels between these two fields that have, apart from some exceptions, been treated as separate.

Sangeeta Bagga-Gupta challenges some of the views on multilingualism and code-switching that have been taken for granted. According to the writer, clearly defined boundaries between diverse language varieties and modalities may be interesting and helpful notions to the linguist. In practice, however, in the communication of multilingual individuals, their significance is much less obvious. The data in Bagga-Gupta's study consist of everyday instances of spoken, written and signed communication in three authentic settings. Each instance involves the use of multiple

languages and other communicative means, such as diverse orthographies and script systems, pictures and manual signs. The analyses of these situations demonstrate the fluidity of linguistic and discursive boundaries from the user's point of view. Switches between diverse language varieties and modalities are an indication of the skills of language users rather than lack thereof. The study calls for new ways of conceptualizing the activities of the multilingual and multi-modally competent individual.

Part II of this volume focuses on translation as language contact. Martina Ožbot examines the interface of translation and contact linguistics in the context of a single multilingual society, Slovenia, and the areal contacts of Slovene with the neighbouring languages. Her focus is on interlingual transfer phenomena which manifest themselves in different contexts: On the one hand, historical translated literature in Slovene contains transfer effects from German, leading to potential to language change. On the other hand, the present-day Slovene-German and Slovene-Italian bilingual communities display evidence of transfer from the contacting languages which is also echoed in translations by speakers with these language backgrounds. Ožbot finds that the mechanisms of transfer in translation and community-based language contact are similar and should be studied within a joint framework.

Esa Penttilä's and Pirkko Muikku-Werner's study is part of a larger empirical project on the reception of idioms, with a focus on borrowing as one of the many factors that are involved in the process of understanding and interpreting figurative idioms. As idioms translated from English represent a common mode of language contact in many societies today, special attention is paid to the ways in which translated vs. non-translated figurative idioms are understood by native speakers of Finnish. The results of the questionnaire show that the origin of idioms has some influence on the understanding of idioms, but it is not of critical importance: old, very recent and restrictedly used idioms are understood poorly, regardless of whether they are of English or Finnish origin. Thus, in understanding an idiom, translated vs. non-translated origin seems to be one factor among many. In the processes of interpreting, using and spreading translated idioms, the common people's use of idiomatic expressions has a significant role.

In the third article in this section, Jukka Mäkisalo and Marjatta Lehtinen examine the translation process within the framework of Radical Construction Grammar. Their perspective differs from most other articles in this volume in that they do not examine the linguistic outcomes of language contact but address the issue of retention effects in translation. The authors present evidence for their hypothesis that translations are

likely to retain cognitive similarity but not syntactic similarity with the source language structure. These findings suggest a disassociation between linguistic and cognitive levels of the translation process, which provides new insights into translation as a gateway of language contact. The theoretical aims of the article are twofold: The authors bring together cognitive linguistics and translation studies, through which they wish to emphasize the importance of knowing the translation process and especially its cognitive basis in all research on language contact.

Part III comprises studies which explore situations of language contact in immigrant and minority language communities. The authors pay attention to the sociolinguistic circumstances of language contact and its outcomes. Keiko Hirano adds to the range of topics in this volume with the observation that contact influence also takes place within languages and not only across them. She examines the effects of dialect contact in an expatriate community of English-speakers in Japan and shows that similarly to the early stages of new-dialect formation in settlement communities, this Anglophone community, whose members come to Japan from various English-speaking countries on a temporary basis, is subject to subtle phonological levelling. Diachronic change in the production of intersonorant (t) is observed in terms of regional dialects, linguistic constraints and gender variation.

In the following contribution, Anna Ritter examines Russian-speaking immigrants in Germany, with a special focus on the family as a micro-level community where language contact takes place. Her analysis of code-switching and language mixing observed in the speech of bilingual families is combined with sociolinguistic background information on the informants, thus shedding new light on the language choices and linguistic practices within immigrant families. The analysis provides a fresh look into bilingual families' communicative habits, which may have an impact on the development and maintenance of the heritage language in immigrant communities.

Part IV completes the book with a focus on the contexts of SLA and language teaching. Annekatriin Kaivapalu and Maisa Martin explore speaker perceptions of cross-linguistic similarity between closely related languages, Finnish and Estonian. Cross-linguistic similarity as perceived by language users is considered a condition for cross-linguistic influence to occur both in the contexts of second language acquisition and language contact situations, but both the perceptions of similarity and the theoretical nature of the concept are underresearched, especially in the field of contact linguistics. The authors approach the concept by leaning on the previous SLA research on cross-linguistic similarity and drafting a detailed

taxonomy, which is then tried out in the context of Finnish and Estonian. The definition of similarity provided by the authors helps to clarify the mechanisms of language contact, and the study demonstrates that cross-linguistic similarity deserves to be studied much more closely than has previously been done.

Simone Lechner and Peter Siemund combine the perspectives of societal language contact research and second/third language acquisition research. They examine the acquisition of English as an additional language by bilingual children with a migration background in Germany, particularly as regards subject-verb agreement and tense-aspect marking. Their analysis focuses on the influence of language-external factors on the transfer effects, and their findings indicate that although the students' L1 affects the ease of acquisition, their socioeconomic background is a far more salient factor in explaining the frequency of non-target-like features of English. Lechner and Siemund therefore argue that speaking a language other than German is no disadvantage for the students, but that the outcomes of third language acquisition should be examined in combination with language-external, socioeconomic factors.

The article which completes this section and the book takes the concept of "linguistic analysis" on another level by turning research tradition into the object of study. Maria Kok discusses metalanguage (see, e.g. Jakobson 1985, 113–122) as a factor which plays an important role in conscious language contact situations such as the studying and teaching of foreign languages. Metalanguage is required for these forms of language contact, but it is also shaped by them, as in the case of borrowed terms and concepts which are used in constituting grammatical descriptions. In essence, loanwords and loan translations are constructive and useful means of contributing to linguistic metalanguage, but problems may occur if the borrowing process is not monitored. Kok examines two terms in traditional Finnish grammar, *imperfekti* and *perfekti*, in order to demonstrate what happens when the meanings of the borrowed items become obscured and the borrowing process is not under conscious control. Close reading of early descriptions of the Finnish tense system illustrates how these two borrowed items gradually lose their informational value and become pseudo-terms which are counterproductive for the very purpose of metalanguage.

On a final note, the publication of this book would not have been possible without the contribution of many individuals, communities and institutions to whom we wish to offer our warm thanks. First and foremost, we are deeply grateful to the 29 anonymous peer reviewers for their countless useful suggestions and comments, which significantly

added to the quality of each individual article and of the publication as a whole. In the editing process we were also lucky enough to have the assistance of Marja Kilpiö, who carried out the indexing and layout work of the book with an incredible combination of skill, care and speed.

We would like to thank Cambridge Scholars Publishing for kindly accepting to add this book in their publications and our author liaison Carol Koulikourdi for helping us with the publishing process along the way. As for financial support, we—and the Crossling network as a whole—are indebted to The Kone Foundation for our recent scholarly activities, including this book and the preceding symposium in Joensuu. The publication of this book has also been aided by the Academy of Finland (projects no. 258999 and 137479).

If the CROSSLING symposium was a success, it was because of the enthusiasm and the high-quality presentations of the symposium participants, some of which have been selected for the present volume. Thus, last but not least, we wish to thank each author for submitting their articles for this book and working with us towards a common goal. “Cross-linguists”, whether at the University of Eastern Finland or in other parts of the world, share an interest in examining language contact phenomena from wider perspectives and developing this interrelated network of disciplines towards greater synergy. We are very happy and grateful to have had to the opportunity to work and exchange ideas with this community of scholars.

References

- Aikhenvald, Aleksandra Y., and Robert M. W. Dixon, eds. 2006. *Grammars in Contact. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amouzadeh, Mohammad, and Juliane House. 2010. “Translation as a language contact phenomenon.” *Languages in Contrast* 10 (1): 54–75.
- Appel, René, and Pieter Muysken. 2005. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Backus, Ad. 2010. “The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish.” *Working papers in corpus-based linguistics and language education* 5: 225–241. Available online at <http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=113451>.
- Baumgarten, Nicole, and Demet Özçetin. 2008. “Linguistic variation through language contact in translation.” In *Language Contact and*

- Contact Languages*, edited by Peter Siemund and Noemi Kintana, 293–316. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Braunmüller, Kurt, and Juliane House, eds. 2009. *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 8. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Braunmüller, Kurt, Steffen Höder, and Karoline H. Köhl, eds. 2014. *Stability and Divergence in Language Contact: Factors and Mechanisms*. Studies in Language Variation 16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius, Peter Houtzagers, Remco van Pareren, eds. 2011. *Language Contact in Times of Globalization*. Studies in Slavic and general linguistics 38. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva, 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hickey, Raymond, ed. 2010. *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ihemere, Kelechukwu, ed. 2010. *Language Contact and Language Shift: Grammatical and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. München: LINCOM.
- Ihemere, Kelechukwu, ed. 2013. *Language Contact: A Multidimensional Perspective*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jacobson, Roman. 1985. “Metalanguage as a linguistic problem.” In *Selected writings VII. Contributions to Comparative Mythology. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy, 1972–1982*, edited by Stephen Rudy, preface by Linda R Waugh, 113–122. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
- Jarvis, Scott, and Aneta Pavlenko. 2008. *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Kortmann, Bernd, and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi, eds. 2012. *Linguistic Complexity: Second Language Acquisition, Indigenization, Contact*. *Linguae & litterae* 13. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kranich, Svenja, Viktor Becher, and Steffen Höder. 2011. “A tentative typology of translation-induced language change.” In *Multilingual Discourse Production. Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*, edited by Svenja Kranich, Viktor Becher, Steffen Höder and Juliane House, 11–43. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meriläinen, Lea, and Heli Paulasto. Forthcoming. “Embedded inversion as an angloversal: Evidence from Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes”. To appear in *The Oxford Handbook of World Englishes*,

- edited by Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Devyani Sharma. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mesthrie, Rajend, and Rakesh M. Bhatt. 2008. *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mukherjee, Joybrato, and Marianne Hundt, eds. 2011. *Exploring Second-language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging the Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nesselhauf, Nadja. 2009. "Co-selection phenomena across New Englishes: Parallels and differences to foreign (learner) varieties." *English World-Wide* 30 (1): 1–26.
- Norde Muriel, Bob de Jonge, and Cornelius Hasselblatt, eds. 2010. *Language Contact: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Siemund, Peter, and Noemi Kintana, eds. 2008. *Language Contact and Contact Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Steiner, Erich. 2008. "Empirical studies of translations as a mode of language contact. 'Explicitness' of lexicogrammatical encoding as a relevant dimension." In *Language Contact and Contact Languages*, edited by Peter Siemund and Noemi Kintana, 317–346. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine, and Jeanette Sakel, eds. 2012. *The International Journal of Bilingualism. Special Issue: New Perspectives on Transfer among Bilinguals and L2 Users*, 16(1).
- Van Rooy, Bertus. 2006. "The extension of the progressive aspect in Black South African English". *World Englishes* 25 (1): 37–64.
- Verschik, Anna. 2008. *Emerging Bilingual Speech – From Monolingualism to Code-Copying*. London: Continuum.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wurm, Andrea. 2008. *Translatorische Wirkung. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Übersetzungsgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte am Beispiel deutscher Übersetzungen französischer Kochbücher in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang. Available online at: http://scidok.sulb.uni-saarland.de/volltexte/2008/1254/pdf/Wurm_Translatorische_Wirkung.pdf.

PART I:
CROSSING THE BORDERS

CHAPTER ONE

INTERLINGUAL REDUCTION: EVIDENCE FROM LANGUAGE CONTACTS, TRANSLATION AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

LEENA KOLEHMAINEN, LEA MERILÄINEN
AND HELKA RIIONHEIMO

Abstract

This paper provides a theoretical meta-analysis of a frequency-related language contact effect termed here *interlingual reduction*, which has previously been examined in the fields of contact linguistics, translation studies and second language acquisition (SLA) research. Interlingual reduction refers to the reduction or the lower frequency of target language linguistic items or patterns not shared by both of the languages involved in the language contact situation. It has been reported in the literature of all the above fields, but it has been examined within different theoretical frameworks and with differing terminology. This paper brings together these different theories and findings and proposes that the interlingual reduction observed in these fields is one and the same phenomenon with a similar cognitive basis. Such reduction occurs not only in attriting languages but also in the process of translating into one's L1 as well as in L2 speakers' and bilinguals' L1, which suggests that contrary to what has been proposed, interlingual reduction does not solely relate to reduced language skills, but it should be seen as a natural part of bilingual and multilingual language processing and use. This paper is a contribution towards bringing together the fields of contact linguistics, SLA and translation studies in order to advance a cross-disciplinary approach into the study of language contact.

1. Introduction

Various types of language contact situations often give rise to linguistic simplification or reduction phenomena in languages involved in the contact situation. Such phenomena have been widely discussed in fields that share an interest in language contact effects, namely contact linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA) research and translation studies. This paper focuses on one such phenomenon which we have termed *interlingual reduction*, defined here as the reduction or the lower frequency of target language linguistic items or patterns not shared by both of the languages involved in the language contact situation. Similar reduction phenomena have been reported in the literature of all these three fields, but they have been examined within different theoretical frameworks and with differing terminology (e.g. underrepresentation of unique items, underproduction or avoidance, covert interference, interferential reduction and indirect transfer; see Section 2). This theoretical meta-analysis brings together these earlier findings under a single umbrella term, and discusses them by referring to common underlying cognitive processes of L2 speakers and bilinguals. By combining insights from contact linguistics, SLA and translation studies, this paper aims at advancing a cross-disciplinary approach into the study of language contact.

While contact linguistics has traditionally focused on encounters between speakers of different languages at the societal and community levels, language contact may also take place without an areal contact or social interaction. This is the case in translation and SLA, which both involve language contact from the point of view of an individual but may nevertheless have wide-reaching impacts on the language of the whole community. As stated in the seminal work by Weinreich (1953, 1), the locus of language contact is the bilingual individual. The interlingual identifications (i.e., the mental associations between the structures, sounds, words or meanings of two languages; see Weinreich 1953, 7–8) that bilinguals make give rise to cross-linguistic influence, which may, in some contexts, result in contact-induced changes in the language system. Cross-linguistic influence (CLI) is generally defined as “the influence of a person’s knowledge of one language on that person’s knowledge or use of another language” (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008, 1). It may manifest itself in various forms, including, e.g. L2 speakers’ deviance from target language norms, the avoidance or underuse of certain target language forms, the overuse of or preference for other forms, the copying of grammatical patterns or structures from the source language into the recipient language,

and the borrowing of diverse elements, especially lexical items but also bigger units such as idioms, textual features, text types and genres. The phenomenon of interlingual reduction discussed in this paper represents one of the many manifestations of cross-linguistic influence, which is a central phenomenon in all present fields of study.

Despite the interconnectedness of societal and individual levels of language contact, there has been relatively little cross-disciplinary scholarly discussion between contact linguistics, SLA and translation studies. In their seminal work on cross-linguistic influence in L2 learners and bilinguals, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008, 234–235) call for more dialogue between the fields of language contact, SLA, bilingualism and language attrition research, and there appears to be an increasing interest in exploring these interfaces (e.g. Matras 2009; Treffers-Daller & Sakel 2012). However, translation studies do not feature as prominently in earlier literature examining language contacts. One of the few works that incorporate the perspectives of all three fields is the edited collection by Siemund and Kintana (2008). As pointed out by Siemund (2008, 3–11), the field of language contact studies is shifting away from the description of individual contact situations and contact varieties into the comparison of different types of contact situations and their effects. Some earlier studies have thus pointed out parallels between translation studies and SLA as well as translation studies and contact linguistics. Chesterman (2007) draws attention to similar reduction phenomena observed in translation research and SLA. Kolehmainen (2013), in turn, is the first attempt to combine the viewpoints of translation research and contact linguistics in the study of interlingual reduction. Yet we are not aware of any earlier studies that would have compared the outcomes of language contact across all these three areas of research. This is therefore the aim of the present article: to provide a systematic discussion and comparison of reduction phenomena observed in all three fields. We focus on reviewing earlier empirical evidence obtained from the study of translations, second language learners and language contact situations, and on explaining this evidence with theories of bilingual language processing and use. The goal of this discussion is to build a common theoretical basis for future research involving a systematic empirical analysis of similar linguistic phenomena in the contexts of translation, SLA and language contact.

In the following sections we will review earlier empirical evidence of reduction phenomena observed in research into translations, SLA and language contacts, with the aim of pointing out parallels between them. The ensuing discussion summarizes these similarities and attempts to explain them by referring to common underlying bilingual processing

phenomena. The overall purpose of this article is to demonstrate the benefits of a cross-disciplinary approach into the study of language contact phenomena.

2. Interlingual reduction in translation, SLA and language contacts

Interlingual reduction is a phenomenon which has been observed in the fields of contact linguistics, SLA and translation studies, but these disciplines have previously examined it independently from one another, with differing data, terms and theoretical perspectives. The varying terminology that has been used to describe similar reduction phenomena illustrates this very clearly. In translation studies, interlingual reduction has been characterized as *underrepresentation of unique items* (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002, 2004, 2005). In SLA and bilingualism research, reduction phenomena have been studied under the labels of *underproduction*, *avoidance* or *simplification* (e.g. R. Ellis 2008; Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008, 100–101, 192–193), as well as *conceptual restructuring*, *conceptual convergence* and *conceptual attrition* (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008, 156–171). Language contact and attrition studies have varyingly used the terms *negative borrowing* (Sasse 1992; Dorian 2006), *convergence* (Romaine 1995), *covert interference* (Mougeon and Beniak 1991; King 2000; De Smit 2006), *interferential reduction* (Smits 1996), *indirect transfer* (Silva-Corvalán 1994) and *restructuring* (Pavlenko 2004; Schmid 2011). However, these seemingly differing terms appear to refer to similar underlying phenomena. In the following subsections we will introduce earlier findings based on the study of translations, second language learners and contact varieties in order to point out similarities between them.

2.1. Interlingual reduction in translation

Translation, which so far has been somewhat neglected in the study of language contact, is a special contact situation in which the translator moves between two languages and their cultures: on the basis of a text written in one language, the translator produces a new text for a new target audience in another language. Cross-linguistic influence, which in translation studies is usually referred to as *interference*¹, is a natural phenomenon in the process of translation. In this field, interference relates

mainly to the influence of the source text on the properties of the translated text, and it may be regarded as an inevitable phenomenon in translation. Toury (1995, 275) for example characterizes interference as a “law” of translation, a feature occurring regardless of the language pair in contact through translation. According to him, “phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text” (ibid.). Cross-linguistic influence in translations has mainly been examined through corpus-linguistic methods. By studying features, uses and frequencies of linguistic items in electronic corpora, researchers have examined translation-mediated contact effects from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. The source texts have been shown to cause synchronic variation in translated texts, making them different from comparable non-translated texts in the same language. Furthermore, in particular circumstances this kind of translation-mediated language contact has led to permanent contact-induced linguistic changes in the target language, e.g. by introducing new stylistic features or affecting the use of native linguistic items (e.g. Amouzadeh & House 2010; Baumgarten & Özçetin 2008; Becher, House & Kranich 2009).

One outcome of CLI in translation is a reduction or loss of items which are not shared by the source and the target language. In translation studies, this kind of interlingual reduction was first observed by Tirkkonen-Condit (2002, 2004, 2005), who discovered a tendency in translated texts to under-represent certain linguistic items. In her corpus-based studies, Tirkkonen-Condit compared translated texts with non-translated texts in the same language, and her observations led her to formulate the so-called *unique items hypothesis* which predicts a lower frequency of unique items in translations compared to non-translated texts in the same language. In this context, the term *unique item* refers to a linguistic asymmetry between the source and target language in translation: unique items are elements in the target language which lack a direct counterpart in the source language. They can represent any linguistic level, i.e. they can be, e.g. morphological, lexical or syntactic. The attribute *unique* does not mean that the items would be rare. On the contrary, they can be common, frequently occurring items in the target language. According to Tirkkonen-Condit (2004), the reason for their lower frequency in translated texts is the lacking stimulus: as they are missing in the source language, they do not occur in the source text, either. There is thus nothing in the source text which would activate the unique item in the translator’s bilingual mental network and trigger her/him to choose the unique item in the target language. Due to the lack of stimulus, the unique item simply does not

spring to the translator's mind when producing the text in the target language.²

Translation scholars have found strong empirical evidence to support this kind of interlingual reduction, which Laviosa (2008) characterizes as “negative discourse transfer”—the term negative referring here to the opposite of cross-linguistic transfer, i.e. when nothing is transferred from the source text to the target text. Earlier studies have mainly focused on translations into Finnish, but evidence from translations into other languages, too, has been accumulating in recent years. The following discussion presents some central studies and their results.

Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 2005), who was the first to formulate the unique items hypothesis, compared translations from English into Finnish with non-translated Finnish texts. She found that the frequency of particular enclitic pragmatic particles (*-han/-hän* ‘you know’, *-kin* ‘also, too, thus’) and a particular group of verbs expressing possibility and sufficiency (such as *ehdiä* ‘have time to do’, *jaksaa* ‘have strength to do’, *hennoa* ‘have heart to do’ and *viitsiä* ‘have energy to do’) was lower in non-translated Finnish texts. These particles and verbs may be characterized as unique items when compared to English: they do not have direct counterparts in English.

A similar research design was applied in the studies by Eskola (2002, 2004) and Mauranen and Tiittula (2005). Eskola (2002, 2004) investigated the use of certain Finnish infinitive constructions in translations from English and Russian, which she compared with non-translated Finnish texts. She focused on two different types of infinitive constructions which behaved differently in her corpus. Those infinitives with a direct source language equivalent in both English and Russian were over-represented and showed higher frequencies in Finnish translations than in Finnish original texts. Those infinitive constructions, on the other hand, which did not have a counterpart in either source language, displayed untypically low frequencies in translations. Mauranen and Tiittula (2005), in turn, investigated a particular Finnish subjectless impersonal construction (*Jos tupakoi...* [if smokes] ‘if one smokes’) which enables open personal reference and does not have a similar counterpart in Germanic languages. They compared the frequency of this construction in Finnish translations from German and in non-translated Finnish texts, and found support for the unique items hypothesis: the frequency of the impersonal construction was lower in the translated than in the non-translated texts. In addition, Mauranen and Tiittula compared the Finnish translations with the German source texts, which revealed that the translators tended to rely on the

German source text and, consequently, favor personal expressions instead of the typical Finnish impersonal construction.

A somewhat different approach is provided by Cappelle (2012), who studied English translations from German and French. The starting point for this study was the typological difference between the so-called *satellite-framed* and *verb-framed* languages (see Talmy 1991), which is reflected in the linguistic expression of motion events. The target language was English, which is a satellite-framed language, that is, the verb typically encodes the manner of motion and the so-called satellite of the verb (e.g. a prepositional phrase or verb particle) conveys the path of the motion (e.g. *A bird flew into the room*). The source languages in Cappelle's study were German, another satellite-framed language (cf. *Ein Vogel flog in das Zimmer*), and French, which, in turn, is a verb-framed language. In French, path is typically expressed by the verb (e.g. *sortir, entrer, passer*) and the manner of motion is either not expressed (e.g. *Un oiseau est entré dans la pièce* 'A bird entered the room') or is encoded in a separate element (e.g. the gerund). Cappelle's findings showed that this typological difference between the source languages was reflected in the English translations; the English verbs expressing manner of motion were underrepresented in translations from French, but in translations from German similar underuse was not attested.

One might argue that published translations examined in the above described corpus-linguistic studies provide questionable data for the investigation of unique items and interlingual reduction in translations. Published translations are carefully edited and revised, and the editing and revision phases take place after the translation manuscripts have been submitted. In other words, the publication process involves people other than the translator, and thus the published translations do not merely reflect translators' choices but the choices of other actors as well. In addition, corpus data does not provide direct insight into processing factors that may have given rise to the special properties of translated texts (see Neumann 2011, 242). The study of interlingual reduction in translation would hence benefit from other types of research design, especially experimental process research with professional translators and data from interpreting.³

The interlingual reduction predicted by the unique items hypothesis has nevertheless been tested with a different type of methodology by Kujamäki (2004) and Denver (2009), who provide convincing evidence for interlingual reduction in the translation process. Kujamäki employed backtranslations in order to examine translators' lexical choices. The starting point in his study was a Finnish text which entailed Finnish-

specific lexical items describing snow and weather conditions. This text was translated into English and German by native speakers of these languages. In these translations, the Finnish snow and weather lexemes were replaced by less specific English and German words because equally precise translation equivalents do not exist in these languages. In the second stage of the study, Kujamäki asked Finnish translation students to backtranslate these English and German texts into Finnish. The students' lexical choices followed the English and German model: the snow and weather vocabulary was less specific, and the typical Finnish lexical items for snow and weather conditions were absent. This methodological setting gives us an insight into the translation process and the translator's mind by showing that the lack of source language stimulus results in lower frequencies of certain target-language specific items. The fact that Kujamäki employed non-professional translators in the second stage of his study does not diminish the validity of the results; a similar CLI effect is plausible in professional translators' translations in different languages, as shown by the studies discussed above, despite the fact that they relate to published translations and possibly involve other actors in the editing process.

Denver (2009) combines product data with process evidence, and in this respect her research setting differs from the studies presented above. Denver analyzes Spanish-Danish translations in order to investigate the use of the Danish cohesive concessive connector *ellers* 'else'. *Ellers* is a unique item in comparison to Spanish, which does not have a comparable connector. In Denver's data, *ellers* largely behaves in accordance with the unique items hypothesis: it does not appear in the Danish translations from Spanish. What is new in her study is the combination of product data with process data. In addition to translations, Denver examines keystroke logging (*Translog*) and tape-recorded think-aloud protocols (TAP). In her view, the keyboard and TAP data contain no evidence of mental processing which could be related to the inferencing of a concessive relation in places where this relation is implicit in the source text and in which the unique connector *ellers* could appear and make this relation explicit in the target text. In other words, translators' verbalizations in the TAPs and the keyboard activities (i.e. pauses, reformulations, deletions) reveal no traces of activities which would reflect conscious inferencing of implicit source text relations during the translation process. By shedding light on translators' cognitive processes this result is in accordance with Tirkkonen-Condit's (2002, 2004, 2005) original hypothesis: the lacking stimulus in the source text does not lead to conscious cognitive processing