

Chapter 30

Contact and Borrowing

Francesco Gardani

30.1 Introduction

Language contact describes that state of affairs in which speakers of different languages have some kind of linguistic interaction with each other. The circumstances under which this may happen differ in nature and extent and include individual multilingualism, societal multilingualism, and even mere exposure to other languages via, for example, the media or the sacred texts. Thus language contact is a phenomenon which is at the base of potential changes in language, viz. contact-induced change, whose extent may vary considerably depending on the degree of multilingual interaction itself. The study of language contact is therefore of crucial importance to our understanding of the evolutionary dynamics of language. A fundamental process and result of contact-induced language change is borrowing. This has rightly been considered one of the principal sources of language change, along with sound change and analogy (see Anttila 1989; Bybee 2015:248) and consequently it plays a decisive role in the field of contact linguistics. The Romance languages have the potential to contribute substantially to this area of investigation, since they have a wide geospatial distribution, a long history of contact with several typologically diverse languages, and are abundantly documented. As a matter of fact, the Romance linguistic landscape cuts across multiple possible contact setting types, including: contact between languages of one family (Romance) and a different one (non-Romance); contact between languages of the same family; settings in which a Romance language is the recipient language (RL); others in which a Romance language is the source language (SL); settings in which an SL is either a substrate (e.g., Semitic on Sicilian on Pantelleria, see §30.3.3) or a superstrate (e.g., Latin/Romance on Greek in southern Italy in ancient and Byzantine periods) or an adstrate (English on contemporary Italian); locally circumscribed contact (e.g., Raeto-Romance and German); areal formation (e.g., Romance in the Balkans); long-term contact settings, such as those between Spanish and the indigenous languages of the Americas; short-term contact settings originating in migration (e.g., Romanian in contact with Italian in Italy); and finally, settings such as overseas explorations and colonial processes favouring the genesis of creoles (e.g., Portuguese-lexifier creoles). Of course, language contact also concerns and affects sign languages, for which the reader is referred to Quinto-Pozos and Adam (2015) and Zeshan and Webster (forthcoming), for an overview and references. Given these facts, the empirical evidence for contact-induced change involving Romance is abundant, as reflected by an impressive body of published work, although mostly dealing with individual case studies (e.g., Drewes 1994; Breu 2008; Remberger 2011; Ralli 2012; 2013; Dal Negro 2013; Adamou, Breu, Scholze, and Shen 2016; Saade in preparation; 2016).

Another reason for which the Romance family qualifies as an ideal testbed for language contact studies is that the Romance languages are among themselves diverse enough to be appealing for crosslinguistic generalizations and at the same time, homogenous enough to ensure comparability between a Romance ‘common ground’ and all possible sorts of contact languages. However, this great potential has remained largely unexploited in one main respect: the Romance data have not been used in their entirety to test theories of contact-induced language change and in particular borrowing. The present chapter takes up this

challenge and, by drawing on empirical evidence from a broad range of Romance varieties, aims to outline contact-induced grammatical change and provide a critical assessment of the state-of-the-art in research on borrowing as a key mechanism of contact-induced language change and variation.

This chapter is structured as follows. Section 30.2 is devoted to the effects that language contact can exert on grammar and details the difference between innovative and conservative effects, as well as that between addition and loss. Section 30.3 discusses borrowing as the basic mechanism leading to change, distinguishing between RL and SL agentivity, and between matter borrowing and pattern borrowing. The ensuing subsections are dedicated to phonological borrowing (§30.3.1), prosodic borrowing (§30.3.2), morphological borrowing (§30.3.3) and syntactic borrowing (§30.3.4). Section 30.4 discusses the upper limits of borrowing, specifically in terms of areal formation and mixed language genesis. Section 30.5 reviews a number of main predictors of grammatical borrowing by providing evidence, both for and against, involving Romance languages, and Section 30.6 critically addresses issues concerning the so-called borrowability hierarchies.

30.2 Effects of language contact

Language contact typically involves individual users, or a whole speech community, acquainted with at least two languages. The grammatical systems of these two languages might be incongruent, in one way or another, and to different degrees. What happens in this case? In principle, nothing needs to happen to languages in contact, in the spirit of Keenan's (2002) principle of 'inertia' (see also Roberts 2017 and for a critique of Longobardi's 2001 implementation, see Waldken 2012): '[t]hings stay as they are unless acted upon by an outside force or Decay' (Keenan 2002:327). Often, however, contact does affect at least one of the languages in contact. To take one concrete case, several Mayan languages have borrowed vocabulary items from Spanish, displaying consonantal clusters in word-initial position, for example *cruz* /krus/ 'cross'. In Mayan languages, however, word-initial consonantal clusters are not admitted. Therefore, two scenarios are possible: the RL either accepts the phonotactic rule of the SL, that is, the new word is taken over just as it is, or it accommodates the system-incongruent loanword to fit into its own phonological system: the latter scenario is 'phonological accommodation' (Lehiste 1988:2), which is often accomplished by deletion, addition, or recombination of certain sounds. In the case of Spanish *cruz* in the Mayan RLs the second scenario obtained. Accordingly, Ch'ol accommodated the Spanish loanword as *rus* by deleting the initial consonantal segment, and Tzotzil rendered it as *kurus* by breaking the consonant cluster via vowel insertion (Campbell 1996:98). Evidently, phonological accommodation (but also morphological accommodation, see Gardani 2013; 2019) is just an adjustment imposed by the existing phonological system and importantly, it does not lead to any change in an RL. As we will see below, the real manifestation of change in an RL occurs whenever alien forms and patterns are added to the native stock and inventory or are eliminated from it. In other cases, when in an RL variables exist to realize a feature (for instance, when more than one form compete for one and the same output, see Gardani, Rainer, and Luschützky 2019) change can manifest itself through the fact that the weak competitors are maintained under the influence of an SL which has similar or parallel forms and structures, rather than being abandoned in favour of stronger competitors. In our Mayan-Spanish contact case, the alien phonotactic rule was not accepted into the native system,

Thus far, we have seen cases in which language contact has had innovative effects on an RL, in one or another way. However, language contact can also inhibit change, that is, it has conservative effects. It can promote the retention of a grammatical feature, preventing internal developments when variants that are otherwise recessive in varieties not affected by contact are maintained, or conversely, inhibit the emergence of a feature. Enrique-Arias (2010) has shown that contact with Catalan has produced a conservative effect on the varieties of Spanish spoken on the island of Majorca: he observes that a number of features attested in Majorcan Spanish are recessive in general Spanish. One such feature is strict negative concord requiring a preverbal negator even in the presence of a fronted negative polarity item (3a) (data from Enrique-Arias 2010:106f.). Enrique-Arias shows that strict negative concord (as well as other features) was a possible variable of Spanish when the language was introduced into the island (cf. old Spanish in 3c), and convincingly argues that this feature has most likely been retained because of the existence of parallel structures in Catalan (3d).

- | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|
| 3 | a | Majorcan Spanish | En ningún momento no se=ha planteado...
in no moment NEG CL=has planned
'She has at no point considered [resigning].' |
| | b | Standard Spanish | Nadie (**no) ha venido.
nobody NEG has come |
| | c | Old Spanish | nadi no l diessen posada.
nobody NEG =3MSG.DAT give lodging
'[that] nobody should give him a place to rest.' |
| | d | Catalan | Ningú no ha vingut.
nobody NEG has come
'Nobody has come.' |

In a totally different sociogeographic context, the same old Spanish strict negative concord pattern was retained in Paraguayan Spanish (4a) due to contact with Guarani (4b), which employs it as a standard construction (Granda 1991).

- | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|--|
| 4 | a | Paraguayan Spanish | Nada no dije.
nothing NEG say.PST.1SG |
| | b | Guarani | Mba'eve nda-'ei.
nothing NEG-say.PST. 1SG |
| | c | Standard Spanish | Nada dije / No dije nada.
nothing say.PST. 1.SG NEG say.PST.1.SG nothing
'I said nothing.' |

We have seen which general effects language contact can have on an RL. We have, however, not yet asked what mechanisms lead to innovative or conservative effects. As far as conservative effects are concerned, it appears clear that the existence of parallel structures, or identical forms, in the languages in contact has a stabilizing effect and can foster their maintenance. On the other hand, the absence of a feature in one contact language is mimicked in the other. As for innovative effects, however, change occurs mainly through the mechanisms of codeswitching and borrowing, the latter the topic of discussion in §30.3.

Note furthermore that while in this chapter I almost exclusively take a systemic perspective on language change (for a similar perspective, see also Sala 1998; 2013), other authors adopt an activity-oriented approach to contact-induced language change based on an understanding of language as the practice of communicative interaction, organized at the level of discourse, rather than in terms of a system. For example, Matras (2012:22) claims that contact phenomena ‘are the product of language-processing in goal-oriented communicative interaction’ and enable, rather than interfere with, the communicative activity. According to Matras, the bilingual speaker has a more complex repertoire of communicative structures than the monolingual speaker, and is keen to exploit it in its entirety; on the other hand, a bilingual speaker has to select the options that are contextually appropriate and abandon those that are not on the basis of a ‘selection and inhibition mechanism’ (for a critique, see Gardani 2014).

30.3 Borrowing

Probably the most famous classification of mechanisms of lexical and grammatical transfer is the distinction between borrowing and substratum interference proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988): as they explain, borrowing is associated with situations of language maintenance, whereas interference is related to situations of imperfect learning and language shift. Simultaneously, van Coetsem (1988) formulated another dichotomy: borrowing vs imposition (see also van Coetsem 2000). While apparently similar, the two dichotomous pairs are, in fact, fundamentally different. Van Coetsem’s two types of transfer are conceived in terms of agentivity, a concept which is based on the notion of linguistic dominance (Lucas 2015:522 has criticized van Coetsem’s (lack of) definition of ‘dominance/dominant’, while research on language control mechanisms — Costa, Branzi, and Ávila 2016 — provides supporting evidence for the psycholinguistic role of dominance). While the direction of transfer is obviously always from an SL to an RL, the agents of change can be speakers of either language. Borrowing occurs when the agents are dominant in the language *into* which they transfer (RL agentivity), while imposition occurs when agents are dominant in the language *from* which they transfer (SL agentivity). However, in many contact situations RL agentivity and SL agentivity are complementary, and not exclusive. Van Coetsem’s model contemplates a third scenario in which the distinction between the two transfer types is neutralized. Such a case has been identified by Winford (2005:408) in the case of Asia Minor Greek famously described by Dawkins (1916). Winford claims that Greek-dominant bilinguals implemented RL agentivity, while Turkish-dominant bilinguals implemented SL agentivity, at the same time. In addition, at the level of intra-individual bilingualism, ‘some bilinguals may have implemented both types simultaneously’ (for discussion and examples, see van Coetsem 1990:261-64).

Ideally, when studying cases of contact-induced change, one should have to detail the agentivity types at play in each specific case. It goes without saying that, whenever information concerning the dynamics of agentivity is available, it ought to be provided. Unfortunately, the dynamics of language contact are rarely documented in such a precise way as to allow us to know exactly what the mechanism was. Alternatively, one could resort to the differential linguistic outcomes of different contact settings, as predicted, for example, by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:37-45). But these predictions are probabilistic and as such might produce circular judgements. For these reasons, I prefer to operate with ‘borrowing’ as an overarching term ‘to refer to a process whereby a language acquires some structural

property from another language' (Moravcsik 1978:99), whatever mechanism of transfer was at play. While precise demarcations between codeswitching and borrowing are generally regarded as difficult to identify, I concur with Haspelmath (2009:40) that '[c]ode-switching is not a kind of contact-induced language change, but rather a kind of contact-induced speech behavior'. Also, Meakins (2013:187) has pointed to the artificial character of this differentiation, which is likely to mirror the separation between historical linguistics — focusing on language change — and contact linguistics — focusing on the bilingual individual.

The term borrowing is mostly associated with lexical borrowing, i.e., the borrowing of lexical material. No doubt this is the most evident and probably the most frequent type, and the literature on lexical borrowing is enormous (for a selection of inspired studies, see, for example, Hope 1971; Malkiel 1975; Miller 2006; 2012; Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009; Durkin 2014; Queiroz de Barros 2018). However, as the above examples have shown, borrowing may also affect the grammar of an RL. Grammatical borrowing refers to the adoption of grammatical elements and/or patterns of an SL in an RL, given a situation of contact between speakers of two languages. The elements and/or patterns can involve all levels of grammar, phonetics, phonology, prosody, morphology, morphosyntax, and syntax. In this sense, grammatical borrowing is complementary to lexical borrowing. In the following subsections, I will focus on specific subtypes of grammatical borrowing according to the areas of grammar affected by language contact. Before doing so, one central distinction (which, in fact, concerns both lexical and grammatical borrowing) has to be introduced, viz. matter borrowing vs pattern borrowing (adopting the terminology coined by Matras and Sakel 2007b; Sakel 2007).

Matter borrowing is the borrowing of an actual formative along with its meaning/function. It can be exemplified with the Spanish-origin suffix *-s* (5b), which in Bolivian Quechua replaces the native suffix *-kuna* (5c) to encode nominal plural and which is obligatorily used on native Quechua bases (5a) (Bolivian Quechua data from Muysken 2012:33f., based on Urioste 1964) in (5).

5	a	Bolivian Quechua	algu	algu-s
	b	Spanish	perro	perro-s
	c	Quechua	allqu	allqu-kuna
			dog	dogs-PL
			'dog'	'dogs'

Pattern borrowing is the borrowing of abstract structures or of rules. It can be exemplified with the periphrastic realization of the comparative in Molise Croatian (6a) according to an Italian model (6b), as opposed to synthetic comparative formation in Standard Croatian (6c) (Breu 1996:26).

6	a	Molise Croatian	veče	lip
	b	Italian	più	bello
			more	pretty
	c	Croatian	ljepši	
			pretty.CMPR	

‘prettier’

As we will see in §30.4, pattern borrowing represents the principal factor in the diffusion of structural traits and the development of linguistic areas.

30.3.1 Phonological borrowing

As observed in §30.2, very often speakers of RLs accommodate system-incongruent loanwords to fit into the phonological systems of their languages. As Liberman, Harris, Hoffman, and Griffith (1957:358) put it, ‘a person who is newly exposed to the sounds of a strange language finds it necessary to categorize familiar acoustic continua in unfamiliar ways.’ The same mechanism applies to everyday communication when we listen to speech: we cast many sounds to which we are exposed into ‘one or another of the phoneme categories that [our] language allows’ (ibid.). In fact, ‘the main task of phoneme perception systems in the brain is to enable [a] perceptual equivalence’ between related speech sounds (Binder 2016:447). Psychological research (Kuhl 1991; Kuhl, Williams, Lacerda, Stevens, and Lindblom 1992; Feldman, Griffiths, and Morgan 2009) has demonstrated that listeners tend to cluster perceptual stimuli, i.e., speech sounds, into prototypes which act as ‘perceptual magnets’, a phenomenon that has been dubbed the ‘perceptual magnet effect’ (Kuhl 1991).

In situations of bilingualism and intensive language contact as well, speakers are continuously exposed to input from a second language. The conflict between incongruent phonological properties of languages in contact can be solved in terms of phonological adaptation, as in the Mayan/Spanish case in §30.2, but it can also lead to the introduction of new phonological distinctions in an RL (for a recent collection of case studies on Romance-Germanic bilingual phonology, see Yavaş, Kehoe, and Cardoso 2017). Based on the assumption that language experience alters perception (Kuhl, Lacerda, Stevens, and Lindblom 1992), Blevins (2017) has hypothesized that external (i.e., foreign) phonetic prototypes may be internalized by RL speakers and act as new catalyzers in an RL. A paper by Egurtzegi (2017) provides an elegant analysis of phonological borrowing in terms of the role of the perceptual magnet effect. Modern Basque dialects normally only have five contrastive vowels (Michelena 1977:47), /i, e, a, o, u/, but Zuberoan (Souletin) and the neighbouring Mixean variety of low Navarrese also have the front rounded high vowel phoneme /y/. See the following minimal pair (Lafon 1962).

7 hun vs hün
 ‘good’ ‘marrow’

Speakers of Zuberoan and low Navarrese have been in close and sustained contact with speakers of the Romance variety of Bearnese Gascon. Egurtzegi (2017) claims that /u/-fronting, which eventually led to /y/, is due to the influence of the neighbouring Gallo-Romance languages Gascon and French, which possess a /u/ vs /y/ contrast. Since /y/ is a perceptually salient vowel (Blevins 2017:107), it might have acted as a prototype attracting tokens of the phonetically close /u/.

While this Basque case illustrates an additive effect of borrowing, the next case illustrates contact-induced phonological loss, more precisely a case of loss occurring in the context of language attrition. Standard Italian, just like most central and southern Italo-Romance

varieties, presents a singleton vs geminate contrast, yielding minimal pairs such as *caro* ‘dear’ vs *carro* ‘wagon’. Lucchese, the northern Tuscan variety spoken in Lucca, also displays distinctive consonantal length, but also shows an ongoing degemination process, which is variable in nature and mostly affects the alveolar trill (e.g., /'tɛr:a/ > ['tɛra] ‘land’) and sporadically, other consonants as well (e.g., /ma't:one/ > [ma'tone] ‘brick’). In a perception study conducted on 15 Lucchese-speaking immigrants in San Francisco (California), Celata and Cancila (2010) found that the weakening of the geminate opposition has gone far beyond the situation just described for the variety spoken in Lucca, apparently resulting in the loss — in perception — of the distinctive opposition, under the influence of English, which lacks distinctive consonant length. As a result, the test subjects were not able to discern between the pairs in (8a-c) (Celata and Cancila 2010:192).

8	a	[r:]-[r]	caro lontano ['karo lon'tano] ‘distant relative’	carro lontano ['kar:o lon'tano] ‘distant wagon’
	b	[s:]-[s]	casa aperta ['kasa a'perta] ‘open house’	cassa aperta ['kas:a a'perta] ‘open box’
	c	[t:]-[t]	in dote al matrimonio [in 'dote al matri'monjo] ‘as dowry for the marriage’	indotte al matrimonio [in 'dot:e al matri'monjo] ‘induced to marriage’

Thus far, we have seen the addition of a phonemic opposition (7) and the loss of a distinctive feature such as length (8), but as Campbell (1996:99) has claimed, ‘virtually all aspects of phonology can be borrowed’. As a matter of fact, phonological rules can be borrowed as well. A case in point is the French spoken at Quimper (Brittany), which is claimed to have borrowed a rule of stem-final devoicing from Breton (Vendryes 1921:339; see also Campbell 2013:79). In (9), a voiced fricative surfaces as voiceless in word-final position in Quimper French (9a); this devoicing does not occur, however, in standard French (9b). It does, however, occur in Breton (9c), the contact language of French in Quimper. In Breton, voiced obstruents surface as voiced before the plural suffix but are devoiced in word-final position (Ternes 1970:127).

9	a	Quimper French	/yn ʃə'mi:z nœv/ > [ʃə'mi:s nœf]
	b	French	/yn ʃə'mi:z nœv/ > [ʃə'mi:z nœv] ‘a new shirt’
	c	Breton	/korv/ > SG [korf] vs PL [korvew] ‘body’

30.3.2 Prosodic borrowing

Prosodic borrowing is the borrowing of categories, such as stress, rhythm, duration, prominence, and intonation (Lleó 2016). As such, it clearly can be classified as pattern borrowing. Judging from the scarcity of overview works on prosodic borrowing (a remarkable exception being the volume edited by Delais-Roussarie, Avanzi, and Herment 2015), it would seem that prosodic borrowing is an extremely rare phenomenon or, alternatively, that this

field is grossly understudied. Appearances are deceiving though. Publications dedicated to single case studies are abundant (Petit 1997; Vella 2003; Colantoni and Gurlekian 2004; O'Rourke 2005; studies in Matras and Sakel 2007a; Gabriel and Lleó 2011;) and the interest in this area of research is rapidly increasing: see, for instance, works by Elordieta and Irurtzun (2016) on pitch accent tonal alignment in declarative sentences in Lekeitio Spanish spoken in the Basque Country; Enzina (2016) on Spanish-influenced rhythm in Miami English; Colantoni (2011) on early peak alignment and downstep in Buenos Aires Spanish, attributable to contact with Italian.

I present here a case studied by Sichel-Bazin, Buthke, and Meisenburg (2015). It concerns two Gallo-Romance languages, Occitan and French, which have been in a centuries-long diglossic situation in southern France. The authors studied accentuation, phrasing, and intonation patterns. To investigate accentuation and prosodic phrasing, they performed a qualitative analysis on recordings of summaries of fairy tales and a pilot quantitative analysis based on acoustic characteristics of summaries of fairy tales produced by two bilingual speakers speaking Occitan and southern French or Occitan and Italian, while two monolingual northern French speakers served as a control group. To investigate intonation, they used questionnaires and analysed three sentence types: biased statements of the obvious (such as Occ. *E ben es encenta de son òme!* 'She's pregnant by her husband, of course!'), yes-no questions, and wh-questions. The authors found evidence for bidirectional contact influence. As for accentuation and phrasing, Occitan has contrastive lexical stress and therefore one would expect accentuation to be related to the phonological word. However, Occitan has borrowed from French the accentual phrase, a prosodic unit on which the French accentuation system is based: the accentual phrase may contain lexical words and clitics, obligatorily has final pitch accent hitting its last full syllable, and has an optional tonal rise at its left edge (for details, see Jun and Fougeron 2002). As for southern French, it has a certain degree of lexical stress and is reminiscent of Occitan in its rhythmic patterns (Sichel-Bazin, Buthke, and Meisenburg 2015:71). As for intonation, Sichel-Bazin, Buthke, and Meisenburg (2015:95) observe that 'the degree of contact with Occitan, which correlates directly with the age of the speakers and the area they live in, has a clear influence on intonation in southern French'. Occitan and northern French share most contours in statements and questions. However, in statements of the obvious, they display different nuclear configurations, while southern French also uses the Occitan contour. In wh-questions, Occitan has falling contours, northern French has both rising contours (for wh-in-situ constructions) and falling ones (for wh-movement), while southern French 'tends to one or the other pole as a function of the intensity of contact with Occitan' (Sichel-Bazin, Buthke, and Meisenburg 2015:71).

30.3.3 Morphological borrowing

Morphological borrowing is generally thought to be a rare phenomenon (for a recent debate, see Matras 2015 vs Thomason 2015), an assumption reflected in virtually all borrowability hierarchies, as we shall see in §30.6. Most such scales assume that derivational affixes are more easily transferable than highly bound inflexional affixes, an asymmetry attributed by Weinreich to their different levels of entrenchment in the grammar: 'the fuller the integration of the morpheme, the less likelihood of transfer' (Weinreich 1953:35). While, however, Meillet (1921:86) claimed that 'there are no records that inflexions such as those in *j'aimais* [I=love.PST.IPFV.1SG], *nous aimions* [we love.PST.IPFV.1PL] have passed from one language to

another', counterevidence has come up precisely from Romance languages. Megleno-Romanian, for example, is an eastern Romance language spoken by few thousand people in south-eastern Macedonia and northern Greece. In Megleno-Romanian dialects in close contact with Lower Vardar (south-eastern) Macedonian dialects (in particular the Gevgelija dialect), some first-conjugation verbs ending in the consonant cluster *muta cum liquida* display an exponent *-m* for the first-person singular of the present indicative (10a), whereas other Megleno-Romanian varieties do not display it (10c). Probably, the exponent *-m* was borrowed from neighbouring south-eastern Macedonian (10b) (Capidan 1925:159), although an alternative internal explanation of the phenomenon — in terms of a Megleno-Romanian conjugational restructuring — is also conceivable (see Friedman 2012:327).

10 a	Megleno-Romanian dialects	antru-m enter.PRS.1SG-1SG
b	Macedonian	nos-am carry-PRS.1SG 'I carry'
c	Megleno-Romanian	antr-u enter-PRS.1SG 'I enter'

As for derivational morphology, a well-known example is the borrowing of *-able* from French into English, cf. Fr. *lav-able* and Eng. *wash-able* (cf. Grant 2009; 2012). Cases of derivational borrowing are frequent, both in the Romance domain and crosslinguistically (Seifart 2013; 2017). As Gardani (2018; 2019) has recently shown, it appears that agent, patient, and instrument noun formatives are borrowed more frequently than other categories. To take one example, the Austronesian language Iloko, spoken in the northwest Luzon Island (Philippines), has borrowed from Spanish the agentive suffix *-ero* (feminine *-era*), which is used with both Spanish roots, e.g., *partera* 'midwife', and native roots, e.g., *karaykayéra* 'female raker' (from *karaykáy* 'foot of a bird; rake') (Rubino 2005:346).

As we have seen in §30.3, borrowing can also entail the transfer of abstract structures, which are then instantiated with RL-native material. The Sicilian dialect of Pantiscu, spoken on the island of Pantelleria, 95km off the Sicilian coast and 67km from Tunisia, provides an elegant example of pattern borrowing. From the mid eighth century onwards, Pantelleria was prevalently Semitic-speaking (Tropea 1988:xli). Sicilian was introduced there no earlier than the seventeenth century and it was initially only spoken along the coast. Almost certainly, the Arabic-speaking population shifted towards Sicilian, imposing some Arabic linguistic traits onto Sicilian. One such trait was the realization of the pluperfect. A unique case in the Romance-speaking landscape is that in Pantiscu the pluperfect comes as a verbal periphrasis consisting of two finite forms (11a), unlike elsewhere in Italo-Romance where it is expressed by a periphrasis consisting of (finite) auxiliary + (non-finite) past participle (11c). The Pantiscu pluperfect pattern involves the third-person singular imperfect of the auxiliary *èssiri* 'be', which is constant for all person-number cells, and the simple perfect inflected for person-number. Strikingly, this pattern largely matches the Semitic pattern, as the Maltese data in (11b) demonstrates. In Arabic, the first verb form is the imperfective past of the auxiliary *kāna* 'be', the second form is the perfective past of the lexical verb, and both forms

inflect for person, number, and gender. In Pantiscu, the aspectual difference is rendered by the use of the imperfect of the auxiliary and the perfect of the lexical verb, while the former, *era*, unlike Maltese, is an invariable third person singular form extended to all person and number combinations (cf. also Brincat 2003:104).

- 11 a Pantiscu
 èra scrissi
 be.PST.IPFV.3SG write.PFV.1SG
- c Maltese
 kont ktibt
 be.PST.IPFV.1SG write.PST.PFV.1SG
- b Italian
 avevo scritto
 have.PST.IPFV.1SG write.PST.PTCP
 ‘I had written’

The Romance-Semitic contact leading to the borrowing of the pluperfect pattern in (11) dates back centuries. As Loporcaro, Kägi, and Gardani (2018:278) have observed, however, the effects of a new type of contact, that between Pantiscu and Italian, have started to manifest themselves. According to the data they collected in fieldwork in 2017, the Semitic-origin pattern is very well conserved in Pantiscu. However, while informants from the urban area tend to produce utterances such as (12a), which is clearly a calque on Italian (12b), informants from the rural areas reject the pan-Romance pluperfect in (12a) as ungrammatical.

- 12 a Pantiscu Avía putútu kkattári tuttikósa!
 b Italian Avevo potuto comprare tutto!
 have.IPFV.1SG can.PST.PTCP buy.INF everything
 ‘I had been able to buy everything!’

30.3.4 Syntactic borrowing

Syntactic borrowing is the borrowing of structural patterns and rules and qualifies as prototypical pattern borrowing. Harris and Campbell (1995:120) wrote that ‘[s]yntactic borrowing is perhaps the most neglected and abused area of syntactic change’. As far as overview works are concerned, little has changed since then (for exceptions, see Bowerman 2008; Lucas 2012; Andersen 2016). However, a sustained number of dedicated works on syntactic borrowing in single contact settings have been published, and the Romance languages have played an important role in providing analyses of relevance for the general theory, as we will see in this section (as well as in §30.4). Syntactic borrowing mainly encompasses clausal syntax, sentential syntax, and word order (cf. Muysken 1996:121; Curnow 2001:432-3; Aikhenvald 2006:16), and the cases presented hereafter cover these three areas of syntax.

As for borrowing at the level of clausal syntax, a case in point is the innovative use of object clitic doubling in Nahuatl-influenced varieties of Spanish (Flores Farfán 2013:219; Dakin and Operstein 2017:9). Nahuatl is a non-configurational, agglutinative, head-marking language which makes extensive use of noun incorporation. A VP’s object is obligatorily

head-marked by means of an affix, as is visible in (13b), while this is not the case in Spanish (13c). However, it has been observed that in the variety of Spanish used by Nahuatl-Spanish bilinguals in Balsas, Guerrero, some Nahuas, when speaking Spanish, tend to insert an object clitic yielding constructions such as in (13a). Clearly, they impose a pattern of Nahuatl syntax onto their own variety of Spanish.

13 a	Nahuatl-influenced Spanish	Usted	los	vende	pescados?
		you	3MPL.ACC=	sell.PRS.3SG	fish.PL
b	Nahuatl	ti-k-tlanamaka			peskaados?
		you-OBJ-sell			fish.PL
c	Standard Mexican Spanish	Usted		vende	pescados?
		you		sell.PRS.3SG	fish.PL
		'Do you sell fish?'			

At the level of sentential syntax, we find several cases of borrowed comparative constructions (cf. Stolz and Stolz 2001; Stolz 2013). A particularly intriguing case is discussed by Chamoreau (2012a); it concerns the domain of comparative constructions of superiority in Purepecha, an endangered language isolate spoken in Mexico, which has stood in contact with Spanish for nearly five centuries. By comparing adverbial clauses of comparison in Purepecha with comparative constructions both in the pre-contact recipient language, Lengua de Michoacan, and in Spanish, Chamoreau (2012a:68) convincingly demonstrates that a type of construction, consisting of a particle and a locative phrase (14), constitutes an innovation. It involves the Spanish-origin degree marker *mas* (Sp. *más* 'more') and the relator *ke* (Sp. *que* 'that, than'), followed by *entre* 'between'.

14	Pedro	mas	sesi-e-s-ti	ke	entre	Xwanu.
	Pedro	more	good-PRED-AOR-ASRT.3	than	between	Xwanu
	'Pedro is better than Xwanu.'					

In fact, this construction deviates both from comparative patterns in Spanish and the use of the locative preposition *entre* 'between' in Spanish. Chamoreau links this instance of creative borrowing to the cross-linguistic tendency 'to connect comparison with location and to express comparison through the locative type' (p. 70), a hypothesis which seems pertinent. The emergence of innovative hybrid structures such as the one just seen in Purepecha, is not rare in contact-induced change, as we will see in the discussion of Italo-Romance data in §30.4.

While the Purepecha case just discussed is limited to a specific type of comparative construction, a change with potentially far-reaching consequences for the syntax of the RL is found in Tetun Dili, an Austroneasian language of East Timor with a history of long and intensive contact with Portuguese since the late 1700s, which led to a process of Lusification (Williams-van Klinken, Hajek, and Nordlinger 2002:1). As observed by Hajek (2006), Tetun Dili has been shifting from parataxis towards an increasing use of hypotaxis realized by means of conjunctions and coordinators. While native mechanisms to express inter-clausal relations do exist in Tetun Dili, they are not obligatory and are generally omitted, and the comparative evidence shows that other East Timor languages (including conservative Tetun)

prefer unmarked clause chaining. In Tetun Dili, the native inter-clausal chaining mechanisms have been reinforced, apparently by the use of Portuguese conjunctions and patterns, and the contact-induced hypothesis is supported by the fact that hypotaxis is especially frequent in higher registers. As the data in (15) show, native and borrowed forms and patterns can either be absent (*o' hakarak, bele ba' uma*), or appear as alternatives (*se o' hakarak, ... or o' hakarak karik, ...*), or coexist (*se o' hakarak karik, ...*) (Hajek 2006:172).

- 15 (se) o' hakarak (karik), bele ba' uma
 (if) you.SG want (perhaps), can go house
 'If you want, you can go home.'

Another clear example of syntactic borrowing at the level of sentential syntax is the innovative postposed relative clause in Basque (Jendraschek 2006:152; Trask 1998:320). Basque has a basic SOV word order and exhibits all the typological properties commonly associated with this word order pattern, such as having preposed modifiers and being exclusively postpositional (Trask 1998:320). The only deviation from this virtually perfect SOV order concerns relative clauses. Generally, in Basque a finite relative clause precedes its head and does not involve any relative pronoun, while subordination is marked by a suffix *-n* on the finite verb, as in (16).

- 16 lore-a-k eman dizki-o-da-n neska hor dago
 flower-DET-PL give PRS.3PL.ABS-3SG.IO-1SG.ERG-REL girl there be.PRS.3SG
 'The girl I gave the flowers to is right here.'

However, a typologically divergent relativization pattern of the SVO type has emerged in certain parts of the country and gained ground, especially among uneducated speakers (Trask 1998:320). It involves the use of a native Basque interrogative word *zein* functioning as a relative pronoun, while the pattern itself was borrowed from the Romance neighbours of Basque. This pattern is exemplified in (17): here, the head *neska* 'the girl' precedes the VP and the relative clause is introduced by the pronoun *zeini*. Interestingly, the subordinating suffix *-n* that we saw in (16), still occurs on the finite verb, suggesting that the innovative relative clause construction in (17) represents a transition stage between the genuine Basque construction and the Romance pronominal relativization strategy.

- 17 neska zein-i lore-a-k eman dizki-o-da-n
 girl which-DAT flower-DET-PL give PRS.3PL.ABS-3SG.IO-1SG.ERG-REL
 'The girl to whom I gave the flowers'

Often, word order has been viewed as the 'easiest sort of syntactic feature to borrow or acquire via language shift' (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:55). Crucially, some authors have maintained 'that certain of the word order types [...] come to exist only through foreign influence. Thus, contact and borrowing have important consequences for proposed universals of word order and even for the very definition of universals in general' (Harris and Campbell 1995:137). Not surprisingly, the literature is full of examples. For Romance, most of them concern cases of contact with Spanish (e.g., Camacho 1999; Ocampo and Klee 1995; Odlin

1990) but not exclusively (e.g., Cognola 2011). A simple case of word order pattern borrowing is found in Alsace French, where it was induced by contact with German. Example (18) shows convergence between Alsace French (18a) and German (18b), in contrast with standard French (18c), as regards the placement of the non-finite verb at the end of the clause in declarative main clauses (Petit 1997:1236f.).

18	a	Alsace French	Il	faut	ça	aussi	écrire.
			EXPL	need.PRS.3SG	this	also	write.INF
	b	German	Man	muss	das	auch	schreiben.
			IMPR	need.PRS.3SG	this	also	write.INF
	c	French	Il	faut	écrire	ça	aussi.
			EXPL	need.PRS.3SG	write.INF	this	also
							‘This has to be written too.’

Most of the time, changes in word order are introduced by means of single borrowed constructions and, if they are reinforced by borrowed constructions with similar typological types, they can lead to major typological change. To take one example, Hill and Hill (2004) have shown that the borrowing of the Spanish particle *de* ‘of, from’ has been instrumental in producing a word order shift in Malinche Mexicano, a modern variety of Nahuatl spoken in Tlaxcala and Puebla on the slopes of the Malinche Volcano. Sixteenth-century Nahuatl was a language with a word order type corresponding to Hawkins’ (1983) type 6 (V-I/Po/NG/AN), that is, it was strongly verb-initial, with left-dislocation of arguments to a position before the verb clearly associated with topicalization, displayed a strong preference for Noun-Genitive order, a productive use of locative postpositions, and rigid adjective-noun order. Under the influence of Spanish, a prepositional non-rigid V-medial language, Malinche Mexicano has moved in the direction of Hawkins’ (1983) word order type 2 (V-I/Pr/NG/AN), displaying an increasing use of prepositional structures, while reducing the use of postpositional locative suffixes. Seemingly, the starting point of this development was indigenous locative expressions with relational nouns in Locative-Noun order (i.e., prepositional order), with an adjunct *in*. At some point, Spanish *de* started replacing *in* (or being cliticized to it) leading speakers to equate relational nouns with Spanish prepositions and to reanalyse *de* as a genitive marker (note that *den* in (19a, c) is *de* ‘of’ + *in* ‘DET’). Subsequently, speakers started omitting possessive formatives on some elements, such as locative and possessive expressions, yielding (19a).

19	a	Malinche Mexicano	miec	omi-tl	den	micquē-tl
			many	bone-ABS	of.DET	dead.body-ABS
	b	Spanish	muchos	huesos	de	un muerto
			many	bones	of	DET dead
	c	Nahuatl	miec	in ī-omi-yō	den	micquē-tl
			many	DET POSS.3SG-bone-COLL	of.DET	dead.body-ABS
						‘many bones of a dead person’

30.4 The upper limits of borrowing

In §30.2, I said that the basic types of effects induced by language contact on an RL are innovative and conservative effects. Sometimes, these occur to such an amplified extent that they induce far more extreme changes. To these belong mainly the emergence of linguistic areas, typological change (see, for instance, Flores Farfán 2018 and Olko, Borges, and Sullivan 2018), creolization (see, for example, Sessarego 2017), and the emergence of mixed languages. In this section, I will briefly discuss cases pertaining to areal formation and bilingual mixed languages.

Current discussions of areality point to pattern borrowing as a main factor for the diffusion of structural traits and the development of linguistic areas (known by the German term *Sprachbünde*, singular *Sprachbund*, lit. ‘language league’): see, for instance, Ross (2001), Donohue (2012), and papers in Hickey (2017). *Sprachbünde* are characterized by a structural convergence of three or more languages which come to share a number of grammatical features, within a certain geographic area. Romance linguistics has contributed decisively to the concept of linguistic areas: one of the best known cases of a *Sprachbund* and, in fact, the first to attract the interest of researchers (Kopitar 1829), is the Balkan *Sprachbund* (Sandfeld 1930; Joseph 1983). In the Balkan *Sprachbund*, the shared elements include patterns of argument marking (such as clitic doubling, a tendency away from inflexional case marking, a recipient/possessor inflexional syncretism, and many more (cf. Lindstedt 2014).

As often it is not clear which is the source and which is the recipient of change, we do not yet know exactly how linguistic areas emerge. It appears, however, almost uncontroversial that *Sprachbünde* are the result of ‘mutual reinforcement’ of trends (Lindstedt 2000). One mechanism leading to such reinforcement is contact-induced grammaticalization (Heine 1994; Heine and Kuteva 2003; 2005), that is, a grammaticalization process is transferred from an SL to an RL. As a matter of fact, Romance languages are involved not only in the Balkan *Sprachbund* but also in the emergence of other possible linguistic areas — not *Sprachbünde stricto sensu* though —, such as the Alps (cf. Seiler 2004) and the south of Italy (e.g., Höhn, Silvestri, and Squillaci, 2017). It is in the context of studies on the influence of Greek on southern Italo-Romance varieties that the role of replica grammaticalization has received the attention it deserves (see Ledgeway 2013; Ledgeway, Schifano, and Silvestri 2018). As is well known (Rohlf's 1937; 1977), the centuries-long coexistence and linguistic contact between speakers of Italo-Romance varieties and speakers of Italo-Greek, viz. Greko in Calabria and Griko in Salento, have yielded a considerable amount of structural convergence. As Ledgeway (2013) neatly shows, in this area contact has often not resulted in the mere copying of forms or structures; rather, speakers have reanalysed existing Romance features and patterns, such as, for instance, dative and genitive, finite and infinitival complementation, determiner usage and verb movement to adjust to the Greek model. To take a concrete example, the syntax of Palizzese, a southern Calabrian variety, shows a convergence towards Greko (20b) in that it allows, besides infinitival complementation — as expected in an Italo-Romance language (20c) — also finite complement clauses such as in (20a), on the model of Italo-Greek (20b) (data from Squillaci 2017:6f.). To be sure, in both southern Calabrian and Greko infinitival complementation has been maintained alongside competing finite *mi/na* clauses, in conjunction with a class of restructuring predicates (cf. 21 and see Ledgeway 2013, for a detailed discussion).

b	Greko	θelo	na	pao.
		want.PRS.1SG	PTC.IRR	go.PRS.1SG
c	Italian	Voglio		andare.
		want.PRS.1SG		go.INF
		‘I want to go.’		

21	Egò	tus	àcua	platèttsi	/	na	platèttsusi.
	I	them=	hear.PST.1SG	talk.INF	/	that	talk.SBJV.3PL
		‘I heard them talking.’					

Another revealing example from the contact between Italo-Romance and Italo-Greek shows that language contact can result in innovative hybrid patterns (cf. also the Purepecha case in 14). The same southern Calabrian variety, Palizzese, displays a genitive structure that apparently calques the Greek dative-genitive syncretism; in reality, however, as Ledgeway (2013:193) has shown, this is not an autonomous genitive structure but rather ‘a hybrid structure in which the indirect object is referenced in part through dative marking on the verbal head [*nci*] and in part through genitive marking on the nominal dependent [*da*]’ (cf. example (22) from Squillaci 2017:6-7).

22	a	Palizzese	nci	desi	u	regalu	da	figghiola.
	b	Greko	tis	edoka	to	kaloma	ti	miccedda.
			to.her=	give.PST.1SG	DET	gift	DET.GEN	girl
	c	Italian	Ho	dato	il	regalo	alla	bambina.
			have.PRS.1SG	give.PTCP	DET	gift	to.DET	girl
		‘I’ve given the gift to the girl.’						

The second type of contact-induced phenomenon addressed in this section are mixed languages, which are a type of contact language that arises as the result of the fusion of two languages, normally in situations of bilingualism, and emerge in situations of severe social upheaval (Meakins 2013, 2016; Bakker 2017). Accordingly, mixed languages cannot be classified following the standard historical-comparative method. Mixed languages come in three main types: a) grammar-lexicon mixes, b) structural mixes, and c) converted languages. Two Romance languages, Spanish and French, are involved in the emergence of cases of (a) and (b) (for the third type such as Sri Lanka Malay, see the overview in Meakins 2013).

Media Lengua (Muysken 1997) is a mixed language spoken in Central Ecuador by a Quechuan group known as the Obreros. It qualifies as grammar-lexicon mix type, for its morphosyntactic frame is essentially Quechua, while around 90% of the vocabulary is Spanish as the result of a relexification process. The pattern of Spanish stems with Quechuan suffixes is clearly visible in (23).

23	Unu	fabur-ta	pidi-nga-bu	bini-xu-ni.	(Muysken 1997b: 365)
	one	favour-ACC	ask-NOM-BEN	come-PROG-1	
		‘I come to ask a favour.’			

Michif (Bakker 1997; 2017) is the mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Metis, originated probably in the early 1800s out of mixed marriages between Plains Cree-speaking women and French Canadian fur traders. Michif qualifies as a structural mix for its great degree of structural mixing: the verbal system is Cree, the nominal system is French, and accordingly, its vocabulary is composed of mostly Cree verbs and mostly French nouns (cf. Meakins 2013:173). The NP-VP split is clearly observable in (24) (Bakker 1997:6).

- 24 **êkwa** pâstin-am sa bouche **ôhi** le loup **ê-wî-otin-ât.**
and open-he.it POSS.F mouth this.OBV DET.M wolf COMP-want-take-he.him
‘And when the wolf came to him, he opened his mouth.’

30.5 Linguistic factors favouring grammatical borrowing

‘A language accepts foreign structural elements only when they correspond to its tendencies of development’ (Jakobson 1938:54, in the translation provided by Weinreich 1953:25). Many general claims, such as this, and universals concerning grammatical borrowing have been put forward in the contact literature, often in terms of the structural requirements necessary for borrowing even to occur. But this quotation from Jakobson is the quintessence of the most widespread belief in the language-contact literature: structural compatibility between SL and RL favours borrowing while typological disharmony inhibits it (see Field 2002:42; Sebba 1998; Weinreich 1953:44; Winford 2005:387). Intuitively, this proposal appears to go in the right direction: it should be easier to borrow patterns that are similar to, thus compatible with, those native of an RL than structurally incompatible patterns. The areas of grammar in which structural compatibility between SL and RL are often considered relevant in the literature include word order, morpheme order, the existence of one and the same feature, and matches in terms of how this feature is realized (cf. Meakins and O’Shannessy 2012:220). As far as the existence of a feature in both languages is concerned, a case in point is the borrowing in Mesoamerican languages of the Spanish diminutive suffixes *-ito* and *-ita*, discussed by Chamoreau (2012b). The author shows that Mesoamerican languages that lack grammatical gender distinctions realize diminutivization only by the suffix *-ito*. However, Yucatec Maya, which has a weak grammatical gender distinction (expressed by prefixes, for examples, in semi-pairs such as *j-meenwaaj* ‘baker.M’ vs *x-meenjanal* ‘cook.F’), accepts both the masculine marker *-ito* and the feminine marker *-ita* and applies them to native lexical roots. In (25), *-ita* occurs on an adjective that agrees in gender with a noun denoting an intrinsically female human (Chamoreau 2012b:84).

- 25 Yucatec Maya bek’ech-ita u y-iits’in.
thin-DIM.F ERG.3SG POSS-younger.sister
‘His younger sister is slender.’

Thus, in Yucatec Maya, the preexistence of a grammatical gender distinction, though weak, seems to support the borrowing of gender marking formatives from Spanish. New research has, indeed, confirmed that structural compatibility plays an important role in borrowing (Law in preparation; Mithun in preparation; Ralli in preparation; Souag in preparation). However, many authors have expressed doubts about considering structural similarity a factor favouring borrowing, for ‘borrowing and language contact can introduce

structures to a language which are not harmonious with existing structures’ (Harris and Campbell 1995:150). Again, it is the Romance ‘contactosphere’ that provides counterevidence. For example, Flores Farfán (2008:38f.) observes that Hispanicized varieties of Nahuatl are shifting towards more analytic structures under the influence of Spanish. The VP in (26a) marks the object by means of a dedicated formative, but the object NP is not incorporated, as one would expect from polysynthetic Nahuatl (26c). Example (26a) clearly represents a pattern converging towards Spanish (26b). As a matter of fact, this is becoming the default usage in highly Hispanicized speech, at least in bilinguals, whereas the polysynthetic structure in (26c) is characteristic of more conservative modern Nahuatl varieties.

26 a	Hispanized Nahuatl	_ -ki-chiiwa 3S-3O-make	tlaxkahli. tortilla
b	Spanish	Ella hace she make.PRS.3SG	tortillas. tortillas
c	Nahuatl	_ -tlaxkal-chiiwa. 3S-tortilla-make ‘She makes tortillas.’	

Even stronger claims about the unsuitability of structural similarity as a factor favouring borrowing were made by Babel and Pfänder (2014:254), and Seifart (2015:92) claims that structural similarity between a source language and a recipient language ‘plays at best a minor role in determining the extent of affix borrowing’.

Another factor which has repeatedly be claimed to favour borrowing is the presence of functional gaps in an RL (see Hale 1975; Heath 1978:115; among many others). As Harris and Campbell (1995:128) aptly note, the claim that the lack of shared structural similarity may trigger borrowing stands ‘[q]uite in opposition to the spirit of the structural-compatibility hypothesis’, while being still ‘akin to it in many ways’. The basic idea is that borrowing may exercise a therapeutic function in that it fills functional gaps. When a language A lacking some features or patterns comes in contact with a language B possessing them, the speakers of A may perceive these gaps and, once they become more familiar with B, adopt B as a model to fill those gaps. However, this claim has been met with scepticism, and some scholars have either dismissed it as untenable in theoretical terms (Brody 1987:508) or shown that the existence of functional gap plays no role in facilitating the borrowing process (see, for instance, Gardani 2008:88 and Thomason 2015:42).


In studies focusing on morphological borrowing (Gardani 2012:92), it was observed that such structural factors as morphotactic transparency, which obtains when the morphological segmentation of affixes is easily perceivable (cf. Dressler et al. 1987:102), and biuniqueness, that is, the relational invariance between *signans* and *signatum* (cf. Dressler 1999:404), do, in fact, have a boosting effect on inflexional borrowing.

At the current state of our knowledge, however, it appears reasonable to say that for all linguistic predictors claimed to boost or inhibit borrowing (for a quite exhaustive list, see Aikhenvald 2006:26-36), no definitive answers can be provided. Only statistical analyses based on large data sets will allow us to better understand the dynamics of grammatical borrowing.

30.6 Borrowability hierarchies

Reasonably, one can agree with van Coetsem (1988:3) that ‘language has a constitutional property of stability; certain components or domains of language are more stable and more resistant to change (e.g., phonology), while other such domains are less stable and less resistant to change (e.g., vocabulary)’. As a matter of fact, one of the research questions which have most intrigued scholars of language contact is how different elements of language react to language contact and how prone they are to borrowing. In this context, a number of claims have been made concerning the resistance of grammar to borrowing in terms of rankings, often referred to as borrowability scales (e.g., Whitney 1881; Haugen 1950; Moravcsik 1978:110-13; Thomason and Kaufman 1988:74-76; Field 2002; Matras 2007; for useful overviews, see Matras 2009:153-65 and Wohlgemuth 2009:11-17), most of which are constructed on parts-of-speech (nouns, verbs, etc.) and distinctive analytic units (phoneme, morpheme, etc.). A far more promising approach, in my view, consists in investigating which modules and submodules of grammar (phonology, syntax, etc.) are more, or less, susceptible to borrowing. Probably, the proposal which best serves this goal is the famous borrowing scale by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:74-76), summarized in Table 30.1, which predicts the degree of borrowing based on the degree of contact intensity.

Table 30.1: Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) borrowing scale

Casual contact  Intense contact	Level 1	- content words
	Level 2	- function words (conjunctions, adverbial particles) - minor phonological features - minor syntactic features - minor lexical semantic features
	Level 3	- adpositions - derivational suffixes - phonemicization of previous allophones - slight syntactic switches
	Level 4	- new phonemes - word order changes - inflectional borrowing
	Level 5	- new morphophonemic rules - changes in word structure rules - major changes in morphosyntax

In a nutshell, the rationale behind each borrowability hierarchy is that the degree of resistance of grammar to borrowing covaries with their degree of systematicity (Tesnière 1939:85). Driven by the basic conviction that ‘lexicon, morphology, and syntax form a continuum of symbolic units serving to structure conceptual content for expressive purposes’ (Langacker 1987:35), Gardani (2008; 2012) has studied inflexional borrowing in a crosslinguistic sample by distinguishing between submodules of inflexion. Adopting the distinction theorized by Booij (1996) between inherent inflexion (i.e., independent from the syntactic context) and contextual inflexion (required by the syntactic context), Gardani demonstrates that formatives pertaining to the one or the other submodule display different degrees of borrowing frequency. Specifically, Gardani finds that inherent-inflexional formatives such as nominal plural are more highly borrowable than contextual-inflexional ones. The following example of borrowing of a Greek formative *-ades* (27b), rendered as

Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

V[dz], in Aromanian (27a) (Gardani 2008:65), contrasted with Daco-Romanian (27c) is a case in point.

27	a	Aromanian	dumnidz-(á)dz god-PL
	b	Greek	psará-des fisherman-PL
	c	Romanian	dumneze-i god-PL

Similarly, Matras (2007:37-39, 60) has proposed tentative subhierarchies for phonology and syntax and has observed, for example, that prosody is more prone to borrowing than segmental phonology. Such detailed analyses, however, are exceptional in the literature and represent an urgent *desideratum*, to which the Romance data can contribute significantly.

30.7 Conclusion

This chapter has examined evidence drawn from the Romance-speaking world to show the enormous potential that the Romance languages have to contribute to contact linguistics. A number of diverse case studies were discussed, covering contact between a Romance and a non-Romance language, contact between two Romance languages, settings in which a Romance language is the RL and others in which a Romance language was the SL, cases of locally circumscribed contact and of areal diffusion. I have presented a selection of recent research in the field of grammatical borrowing and discussed claims and universals proposed in the literature regarding the principles of borrowing. The evidence at our disposal clearly confirms that ‘[n]o linguistic feature — be it a form, or a pattern — is entirely “borrowing-proof”’ (Aikhenvald 2006:2). However, I have argued that, given our current state of knowledge, it is not possible to provide a serious, non-intuitive assessment of predictions concerning the differential borrowability of different submodules of grammar, for a statistical evaluation of large data corpora, both crosslinguistically and across Romance, is indispensable in order to attain this goal. This is the most urgent and promising line of research for the future.

References

- Adamou, E., Breu, W., Scholze, L., and Shen, R. (2016). ‘Borrowing and contact intensity: a corpus-driven approach from four Slavic minority languages’. *Journal of Language Contact* 9:515-44.
- Aikhenvald, A. (2006). ‘Grammars in contact. A cross-linguistic perspective’. In Aikhenvald, A. and Dixon, R. (eds). *Grammars in Contact: a cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-66.
- Andersen, C. (2016). ‘Syntax in contact. Word order in a contact variety of German spoken in Eastern Siberia.’ *Journal of Language Contact* 9:264-92.
- Anttila, R. (1989). *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, 2nd edn. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Babel, A. and Pfänder, S. (2014). ‘Doing copying: why typology doesn’t matter to language speakers’. In Besters-Dilger, J., Dermarkar, C., Pfänder, S., and Rabus, A. (eds),

Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Congruence in Contact-induced Language Change: language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity. Berlin: De Gruyter, 239-57.

Bakker, P. (1997). *A Language of our Own: the genesis of Michif, the mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Metis*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, P. (2017). 'Typology of mixed Languages'. In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 217-53.

Binder, J. (2016). 'Phoneme perception'. In Hickok, G. and Small, S. (eds), *Neurobiology of Language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 447-61.

Blevins, J. (2017). 'Areal sound patterns: from perceptual magnets to stone soup'. In Hickey, R. (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 88-121.

Booij, G. (1996). 'Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis'. In Booij, G. and van Marle, J. (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1-16.

Bowern, C. (2008). 'Syntactic change and syntactic borrowing in generative grammar'. In Ferraresi, G. and Goldbach, M. (eds). *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 187-216.

Braunmüller, K. and House, J. (eds). (2009). *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Breu, W. (1996). 'Überlegungen zu einer Klassifikation des grammatischen Wandels im Sprachkontakt (am Beispiel slavischer Kontaktfälle)'. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49:21-38.

Breu, W. (2008). 'Der slavische Lokativ im Sprachkontakt. Ein Beitrag zur Binnendifferenzierung des Moliseslavischen'. In Kosta, P. and Freidhof, G. (eds), *Slavistische Linguistik 2006/2007*. Munich: Sagner, 59-102.

Breu, W. (ed.) (2011). *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie: resistenza e mutamento nella morfologia e nella sintassi; atti del 2. convegno internazionale Costanza 10 - 13 dicembre 2008*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Brincat, J. (2003). *Malta: una storia linguistica*. Genova: Le Mani.

Brody, J. (1987). 'Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan Languages'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 29:507-521.

Bybee, J. (2015). *Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Camacho, J. (1999). 'From SOV to SVO: the grammar of interlanguage word order'. *Second Language Research* 15:115-32.

Campbell, L. (1996). 'Phonetics and phonology'. In Goebel, H., Nelde, P., Z. Starý, Z., and W. Wölck, W. (eds), *Kontaktlinguistik: ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. Halbband 1*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 98-103.

Campbell, L. (2013). *Historical Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Campbell, L., Kaufman, T., and Smith-Stark, T. C. (1986). 'Meso-America as a linguistic area'. *Language* 62:530-570.

Capidan, T. (1925). *Meglenoromâni. I. Istoria și graiul lor*. Bucharest: Cultura Națională.

- Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celata, C. and Cancila, J. (2010). 'Phonological attrition and the perception of geminate consonants in the Lucchese community of San Francisco (CA)'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 14:185-209.
- Chamoreau, C. (2012a). 'Contact-induced change as an innovation'. In Chamoreau, C. and Léglise, I. (eds), *Language Contact and Bilingualism: II. Dynamics of Contact-induced Language Change*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 53-76.
- Chamoreau, C. (2012b). 'Spanish diminutive markers *-ito/-ita* in Mesoamerican languages: a challenge for acceptance of gender distinction'. In Vanhove, M., Stolz, T., Urdze, A., and Otsuka, H. (eds), *Morphologies in Contact*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 71-90.
- Cognola, F. (2011). 'Ordini OV/VO in mòcheno'. In Breu, 41-66.
- Colantoni, L. (2011). 'Broad-focus declaratives in Argentine Spanish contact and non-contact varieties'. In Gabriel, C. and Lleó, C. (eds), *Intonational phrasing in Romance and Germanic: cross-linguistic and bilingual studies*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 183-212.
- Colantoni, L. and Gurlekian, J. (2004). 'Convergence and intonation: historical evidence from Buenos Aires Spanish'. *Bilingualism: language and cognition*, 7:107-19.
- Costa, A., Branzi, F., and Ávila, C. (2016). 'Bilingualism: switching. In Hickok, G. and Small, S. (eds), *Neurobiology of language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 419-30.
- Curnow, T. J. (2001). 'What language features can be "borrowed"?'. In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds), *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 412-36.
- Dakin, K. and Operstein, N. (2017). 'Language contact in Mesoamerica and beyond'. In Dakin, K., Parodi, C., and Operstein, N. (eds), *Language Contact and Change in Mesoamerica and Beyond*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1-28.
- Dal Negro, S. (2013). 'Il prestito verbale nel contatto italiano-tedesco'. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 7:192-200.
- Dawkins, R. (1916). *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: a study of the dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with grammar, texts, translations and glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delais-Roussarie, E., Avanzi, M., and Herment, S. (eds). (2015). *Prosody and Language in Contact: L2 acquisition, attrition and languages in multilingual situations*. Berlin / Heidelberg: Springer.
- Donohue, M. (2012). 'Typology and areality'. *Language Dynamics and Change* 2: 98-116.
- Dressler, W. U. (1999). 'On a semiotic theory of preferences in language'. In Shapiro, M. and Haley, M. (eds), *The Peirce Seminar Papers. Essays in semiotic analysis*, vol. 4. New York: Berghahn Books, 389-415.
- Dressler, W. U., Mayerthaler, W., Panagl, O., and Wurzel, W. U. (1987). *Leitmotifs in Natural Morphology*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Drewes, A. (1994). 'Borrowing in Maltese'. In Bakker, P. and Mous, M. (eds), *Mixed languages: 15 case studies in language intertwining*. Amsterdam: IFOTT, 3-111.
- Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed Words: a history of loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Egurtzegi, A. (2017). 'Phonetically conditioned sound change: contact induced /u/-fronting in Zuberoan Basque'. *Diachronica* 34:331-67.

- Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elordieta, G. and Irurtzun, A. (2016). 'Pitch accent tonal alignment in declarative sentences in the Spanish of the Basque Country'. In Armstrong, M., Henriksen, N., and Vanrell, M. (eds), *Intonational Grammar in Ibero-Romance: approaches across linguistic subfields*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 25-44.
- Enrique-Arias, A. (2010). On language contact as an inhibitor of language change: The Spanish of Catalan bilinguals in Majorca. In Breitbarth, A., Lucas, C., Watts, S., and Willis, D. (eds), *Continuity and Change in Grammar*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 97-118.
- Enzina, N. (2016). 'Spanish-influenced rhythm in Miami English'. In Farrell, P. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2016 Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Washington D.C., January 7-10, 2016 I*. Washington, DC: Linguistic Society of America, 1-15.
- Feldman, N., Griffiths, T., and Morgan, J. (2009). 'The influence of categories on perception: explaining the perceptual magnet effect as optimal statistical inference'. *Psychological Review* 116:752-82.
- Field, F. (2002). *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Fishman, J. (1964). 'Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: a definition of the field and suggestions for its further development'. *Linguistics* 2:32-70.
- Flores Farfán, J. (2008). 'The Hispanisation of modern Nahuatl varieties'. In Stolz, T., Bakker, D., and Palomo, R. (eds), *Hispanisation: the impact of Spanish on the lexicon and grammar of the indigenous languages of Austronesia and the Americas*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 27-48.
- Flores Farfán, J. (2013). 'Spanish in contact with indigenous tongues: changing the tide in favor of the heritage languages'. In Bischoff, S. Cole, D., Fountain, A., and Miyashita, M. (eds), *The Persistence of Language: constructing and confronting the past and present in the voices of Jane H. Hill*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 203-27.
- Flores Farfán, J. A. (2018). 'Introduction: on typological change in Mesoamerica'. *Language Typology and Universals* 71:327-38.
- Friedman, V. A. (2012). 'Copying and cognates in the Balkan Sprachbund'. In Johanson, L. and Robbeets, M. I. (eds), *Copies Versus Cognates in Bound Morphology*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 323-36.
- Gabriel, C., and Lleó, C. (eds). (2011). *Intonational Phrasing in Romance and Germanic: cross-linguistic and bilingual studies*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Gardani, F. (2008). *Borrowing of Inflectional Morphemes in Language Contact*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Gardani, F. (2012). 'Plural across inflection and derivation, fusion and agglutination'. In Johanson, L. and Robbeets, M. (eds), *Copies Versus Cognates in Bound Morphology*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 71-97.
- Gardani, F. (2013). *Dynamics of Morphological Productivity: the evolution of noun classes from Latin to Italian*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Gardani, F. (2014). Review of Chamoreau, C. and Légise, I. (eds) (2012), *Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. *Journal of Language Contact* 7:431-7.
- Gardani, F. (2018). 'On morphological borrowing'. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 12:1-17.

- Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardani, F. (2019). 'Morphology and contact-induced language change'. In Grant, A. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 96-122.
- Gardani, F., Rainer F., and Luschützky, H. C. (2019). 'Competition in morphology: a historical outline'. In Rainer F., Gardani F., Dressler W. U., and Luschützky, H. C. (eds), *Competition in Inflection and Word-Formation*. Cham: Springer, 3-36.
- Granda, G. de. (1991). *El español en tres mundos: retenciones y contactos lingüísticos en América y África*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Grant, A. (2009). 'Loanwords in British English'. In Haspelmath, M. and Tadmor, U. (eds), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: a comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 360-83.
- Grant, A. (2012). 'Bound morphology in English (and beyond): copy or cognate?' In Johanson, L. and Robbeets, M. (eds), *Copies Versus Cognates in Bound Morphology*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 99-122.
- Hajek, J. (2006). 'Language contact and convergence in East Timor: The case of Tetun Dili'. In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds), *Grammars in Contact: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163-78.
- Hale, K. L. (1975). 'Gaps in grammar and culture'. In Kinkade, M. D., Hale, K. L., and Werner, O. (eds), *Linguistics and anthropology: In honor of C.F. Voegelin*. Lisse: de Ridder, 295-315.
- Harris, A. and Campbell, L. (1995). *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, M. (2009). 'Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues'. In Haspelmath, M. and Tadmor, U. (eds), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 35-54.
- Haspelmath, M., and Tadmor, U. (eds). (2009). *Loanwords in the world's languages: a comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Haugen, E. (1950). 'The analysis of linguistic borrowing'. *Language* 26:210-31.
- Hawkins, J. A. (1983). *Word Order Universals*. New York: Academic Press.
- Heath, J. (1978). *Linguistic Diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Heine, B. (1994). 'Areal influence on grammaticalization'. In Pütz, M. (ed.), *Language Contact and Language Conflict*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 55-68.
- Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2003). 'On contact-induced grammaticalization'. *Studies in Language* 27:529-72.
- Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hickey, R. (2016). 'Phonological change in English'. In Kytö, M. and Pahta, P. (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 203-19.
- Hickey, R. (ed.). (2017). *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, J. H. and Hill, K. C. (2004). 'Word order type change and the penetration of Spanish *de* in modern Nahuatl'. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 57: 23-48.
- Höhn, G. , Silvestri, G., and Squillaci, M. (2017). 'Greek and Romance unagreement in Calabria'. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17:263-92.

Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hope, T. (1971). *Lexical Borrowing in the Romance Languages: a critical study of Italianisms in French and Gallicisms in Italian from 1100 to 1900*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jagemann, H. von (1884). 'On the relation of the Anglo-Norman vowel system to the Norman words in English'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 15:66-87.
- Jakobson, R. (1938). 'Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques entre les langues'. In *Actes du Quatrième Congrès International de Linguistes, tenu à Copenhague du 27 août au 1er septembre 1936*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 48-59.
- Jendraschek, G. (2006). 'Basque in contact with Romance languages'. In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds), *Grammars in Contact: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 143-62.
- Joseph, B. (1983). *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: a study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jun, S. and Fougeron, C. (2002). 'Realizations of accentual phrase in French intonation'. *Probus* 14:147-72.
- Keenan, E. (2002). 'Explaining the creation of reflexive pronouns in English'. In Minkova, D. and Stockwell, R. (eds), *Studies in the History of the English Language: A millennial perspective*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 325-54.
- Kopitar, J. (1829). 'Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache'. *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46:59-106.
- Kuhl, P. (1991). 'Human adults and human infants show a "perceptual magnet effect" for the prototypes of speech categories, monkeys do not'. *Perception and Psychophysics* 50: 93-107.
- Kuhl, P., Williams, K., Lacerda, F., Stevens, K., and Lindblom, B. (1992). 'Linguistic experience alters phonetic perception in infants by 6 months of age'. *Science* 255: 606-08.
- Lafon, R. (1962). 'Sur la voyelle ü en basque'. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 57:83-102.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. I: theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Law, D. (in preparation). 'Pattern borrowing, linguistic similarity, and new categories: numeral classifiers in Mayan'. *Morphology*.
- Lefebvre, C. (2015). *Relabeling in Language Genesis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, A. (2013). 'Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy'. In Janse, M., Joseph, B. D., Ralli, A., and Bağrıaçık, M. (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, 184-228.
- Ledgeway, A., Schifano, N., & Silvestri, G. (2018). 'Il contatto tra il greco e le varietà romanze nella Calabria meridionale'. *Lingue Antiche e Moderne* 75:95-133.
- Lehiste, I. (1988). *Lectures on Language Contact*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Lieberman, A., Harris, K., Hoffman, H., and Griffith, B. (1957). 'The discrimination of speech sounds within and across phoneme boundaries'. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 54:358-68.
- Lindstedt, J. (2000). 'Linguistic Balkanization. Contact-induced change by mutual reinforcement'. In Gilbers, D., Nerbonne, J. A., and Schaeken, J. (eds), *Languages in Contact*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi, 231-46.

Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lindstedt, J. (2014). 'Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance: From congruence to convergence'. In Besters-Dilger, J., Dermarkar, C., Pfänder, S., and Rabus, A. (eds), *Congruence in Contact-Induced Language Change: Language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 168-83.
- Lleó, C. (2016). 'Bilingualism and child phonology'. In *Oxford Handbooks Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.013.53>
- Longobardi, G. (2001). 'Formal syntax, diachronic minimalism, and etymology: the history of French *chez*'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:275-302.
- Loporcaro, M., Kägi, N., and Gardani, F. (2018). 'Morfomi sommersi in Pantesco o dell'arte di arrangiarsi in morfologia'. In Chilà, A. and De Angelis, A. (eds), *Capitoli di morfosintassi delle varietà romanze d'Italia: teoria e dati empirici*. Palermo: Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani, 273-305.
- Lucas, C. (2012). 'Contact-induced grammatical change: towards an explicit account.' *Diachronica* 29:275-300.
- Malkiel, Y. (1975). [Review of *Lexical borrowing in the Romance languages* by Thomas Hope]. *Language* 51:962-76.
- Matras, Y. (2007). 'The borrowability of structural categories'. In Matras, Y. and Sakel, J. (eds), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 31-73.
- Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Y. (2012). 'An activity-oriented approach to contact-induced language change'. In Chamoreau, C. and Léglise, I. (eds), *Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 17-52.
- Matras, Y. (2015). 'Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred?'. In Gardani, F., Arkadiev, P., and Amiridze, N. (eds), *Borrowed Morphology*. Berlin / Boston / Munich: De Gruyter Mouton, 47-80.
- Matras, Y., and Sakel, J. (eds). (2007a). *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Y. and Sakel, J. (2007b). 'Introduction'. In Matras and Sakel, 1-13.
- Meakins, F. (2013). 'Mixed languages'. In Bakker, P. and Matras, Y. (eds), *Contact Languages: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin: Mouton, 159-228.
- Meakins, F. (2016). 'Mixed languages'. In Aronoff, M. (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meakins, F. and O'Shannessy, C. (2012). 'Typological constraints on verb integration in two Australian mixed languages'. *Journal of Language Contact* 5:216-246.
- Meillet, A. (1921). *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: Champion.
- Michelena, L. (1977). *Fonética histórica vasca*. San Sebastián: Imprenta de la Diputación Guipúzcoa.
- Miller, D. G. (2006). *Latin Suffixal Derivatives in English and their Indo-European Ancestry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, D. G. (2012). *External Influences on English: from its beginnings to the Renaissance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minkova, D. (2011). 'Phonemically contrastive fricatives in Old English?'. *English Language and Linguistics* 15:31-59.

- Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Minkova, D. (2014). *A Historical Phonology of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mithun, M. (in preparation). 'Replicated inflectional matter? Plots twists behind apparent borrowed plurals'. *Morphology*.
- Moravcsik, E. (1978). 'Language contact'. In Greenberg, J., Ferguson, H., and Moravcsik, E. (eds), *Universals of Human Language: method and theory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 93-122.
- Muysken, P. (1996). 'Syntax'. In Goebel, H., Nelde, P., Starý, Z., and Wölck, W. (eds), *Kontaktlinguistik: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. Halbband 1*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 117-24.
- Muysken, P. (1997). 'Media Lengua'. In Thomason, S. G. (ed.), *Contact Languages: A wider perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 365-426.
- Muysken, P. (2012). 'Root/affix asymmetries in contact and transfer: case studies from the Andes'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16:22-36.
- Ocampo, F. and Klee, C. (1995). 'Ov/vo word order variation in Spanish/Quechua bilingual speakers'. In Silva-Corvalán, C. (ed.), *Spanish in Four Continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 71-82.
- Odling, T. (1990). 'Word-order transfer, metalinguistic awareness and constraints on foreign language learning'. In VanPatten, B. and Lee, J. (eds), *Second Language Acquisition / Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 95-117.
- Olko, J., Borges, R., and Sullivan, J. (2018). 'Convergence as the driving force of typological change in Nahuatl.' *Language Typology and Universals* 71:467-507.
- O'Rourke, E. (2005). *Intonation in contact: a comparison of two Peruvian Spanish dialects*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: doctoral thesis.
- Petit, J. (1997). 'Français-allemand'. In Goebel, H., Nelde, P., Starý, Z., and Wölck, W. (eds), *Kontaktlinguistik: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. Halbband 2*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1222-40.
- Queiroz de Barros, R. (2018). 'Twentieth-century Romance loans: code-switching in the Oxford English Dictionary?'. In Pahta, P., Skaffari, J. and Wright, L. (eds), *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and beyond*. Boston / Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 61-76.
- Quinto-Pozos, D. and Adam, R. (2015). 'Sign languages in contact'. In Schembri, A. and Lucas, C. (eds), *Sociolinguistics and Deaf Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29-60.
- Ralli, A. (2012). 'Verbal loanblends in Griko and Heptanesian: a case study of contact morphology'. *L'Italia Dialettale* 73:111-32.
- Ralli, A. (2013). 'Romance verbal loans in Modern Greek dialects'. In Janse, M. Joseph, B., Ralli, A., and Bağrıaçık, B. (eds), *Online proceedings of MGDLT5: 5th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 430-44.
- Ralli, A. (in preparation). 'Matter vs. pattern borrowing in compounding: evidence from the Greek dialectal variety'. *Morphology*.
- Remberger, E. (2011). 'Morfosintassi verbale dei dialetti neogreci in Calabria'. In Breu, 123-48.
- Roberts, I. (2017). 'Inertia'. In Ledgeway, A. and Roberts, I. (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 425-45.

- Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rohlf, G. (1937). 'Mundarten und Griechentum des Cilento'. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 57:421-461.
- Rohlf, G. (1977). *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*, 2nd edn. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ross, M. (2001). 'Contact-induced language change in north-west Melanesia'. In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon R. M. W. (eds), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 134-166.
- Rubino, C. (2005). 'Iloko'. In Adelaar, K. and Himmelmann, N. (eds), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge, 326-49.
- Saade, B. (2016). 'Adverbial derivation in Maltese and Italian: a starting point for studies in cross-linguistic productivity'. *Language Typology and Universals* 69:547-63.
- Saade, B. (in preparation). 'Productivity as a borrowable pattern in derivational morphology'. *Morphology*.
- Sakel, J. (2007). 'Types of loan: matter and pattern'. In Matras and Sakel, 15-29.
- Sala, M. (1998). *Lenguas en contacto*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Sala, M. 2013. 'Contact and borrowing'. In Maiden, M., Smith, J.C., and Ledgeway, A. (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. II: contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 187- 236.
- Sandfeld, K. (1930). *Linguistique balkanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Champion.
- Sasse, H.-J. (1992). 'Language decay and contact-induced change: similarities and differences'. In Brenzinger, M. (ed.), *Language Death: factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 59-80.
- Schmid, M. and Köpcke, B. (eds). (2019). *The Oxford Handbook of Language Attrition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sebba, M. (1998). 'A congruence approach to the syntax of codeswitching'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2:1-19.
- Seifart, F. (2013). *AfBo: A world-wide survey of affix borrowing*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at <http://afbo.info>.
- Seifart, F. (2015). 'Does structural-typological similarity affect borrowability?'. *Language Dynamics and Change* 5:92-113.
- Seifart, F. (2017). 'Patterns of affix borrowing in a sample of 100 languages'. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 7:389-431.
- Seiler, G. (2004). 'Gibt es einen Alpensprachbund?'. In Glaser, E. Ott, P., and Schwarzenbach, R. (eds), *Alemannisch im Sprachvergleich: Beiträge zur 14. Arbeitstagung für alemannische Dialektologie in Männedorf (Zürich) vom 16.-18.9.2002*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 485-93.
- Sessarego, S. (2017). 'Chocó Spanish double negation and the genesis of the Afro-Hispanic dialects of the Americas'. *Diachronica* 34:219-52.
- Sichel-Bazin, R., Buthke, C., and Meisenburg, T. (2015). 'Prosody in language contact: Occitan and French'. In Delais-Roussarie, E. Avanzi, and M. Herment, S. (eds), *Prosody and language in contact: L2 acquisition, attrition and languages in multilingual situations*. Berlin / Heidelberg: Springer, 71-99.
- Souag, L. (in preparation). 'When is templatic morphology borrowed? On the spread of the Arabic relative'. *Morphology*.

Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Squillaci, M. (2017). *When Greek meets Romance: a morphosyntactic investigation of language contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge: doctoral thesis.
- Stolz, T. (2013). *Competing Comparative Constructions in Europe*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Stolz, C. and Stolz, T. (2001). 'Hispanicised comparative constructions'. In Zimmermann, K. and Stolz, T. (eds), *Lo propio y lo ajeno en las lenguas austronésicas y amerindias: procesos interculturales en el contacto de lenguas indígenas con el español en el Pacífico e Hispanoamérica*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 35-56.
- Ternes, E. (1970). *Grammaire structurale du Breton de l'Île de Groix*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Tesnière, L. (1939). 'Phonologie et mélange de langues'. In *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague: Vol. 8. Études phonologiques dédiées à la mémoire de M. le Prince N.S. Trubetzkoy*. Prague: Jednota Ceskych Matematiku a Fysiku, 83-93.
- Thomason, S. (2015). 'When is the diffusion of inflectional morphology not dispreferred?'. In Gardani, F., Arkadiev, P., and Amiridze, N. (eds), *Borrowed Morphology*. Berlin / Boston / Munich: De Gruyter Mouton, 27-46.
- Thomason, S. and Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Trask, R. L. (1998). 'The typological position of Basque: then and now'. *Language Sciences* 20:313-24.
- Tropea, G. (1988). *Lessico del dialetto di Pantelleria*. Palermo: Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani.
- Urioste, J. L. (1964). *Transcripciones quechuas I-VII*. La Paz: Instituto de Cultura Indígena.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1988). *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*. Dordrecht, Holland, Providence RI: Foris.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1990). [Review of Thomason and Kaufman (1988); Lehiste (1988); Wardhaugh (1987)]. *Language in Society* 19:260-68.
- Van Coetsem, F. (2000). *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vella, A. (2003). 'Language contact and Maltese intonation: some parallels with other language varieties'. In Braunmüller, K. and Ferraresi, G. (eds), *Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language History*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 261-83.
- Vendryes, J. (1921). *Le Langage: introduction linguistique à l'histoire*. Paris: Renaissance du livre.
- Walkden, G. (2012). 'Against inertia'. *Lingua* 122:891-901.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Weinreich, U. (2011). *Languages in Contact: French, German and Romansch in twentieth-century Switzerland*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Whitney, W. (1881). 'On mixture in language'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12:5-26.
- Williams-van Klinken, C., Hajek, J. and Nordlinger, R. (2002). *Tetun Dili: a grammar of an East Timorese language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Winford, D. (2005). 'Contact-induced changes: classification and processes'. *Diachronica* 22:373-427.
- Wohlgemuth, J. (2009). *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gardani, Francesco. (accepted). Contact and borrowing. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics (CHRLing)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yavaş, M., Kehoe M., and Cardoso, W. (eds). (2017). *Romance-Germanic Bilingual Phonology*. Sheffield: Equinox.

Zeshan, U. and Webster, J. (eds). (forthcoming). *Sign Language Typology*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.