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This paper is concerned firstly with introducing a preliminary sketch of a function-oriented theory of language contact. Second, it will address the position of connectivity devices as mental or cognitive operations, which constitute part of the bilingual's communicative activity. From the behaviour of connectivity devices in bilingual communication, I will be drawing some conclusions as to their position in the grammatical apparatus. The final issue to be addressed is a rather speculative addendum, a commentary on the possible position of connectivity operations in the ancient architecture of the language faculty itself.

1. Preliminaries: A function-oriented theory of language contact

Linguists normally view contact-related change, and often also synchronic bilingual behaviour, through the prism of self-contained linguistic 'systems': Contact is envisaged as a partial convergence of two systems. I propose an alternative approach to language contact, one that consistently takes the perspective of the bilingual speaker, and which places at the top of its agenda the task to investigate how speakers act in multilingual settings. To the bilingual speaker, languages are not analytical 'systems'. They are, rather, components of an overall repertoire of forms, constructions, experience, and skills on which the speaker draws in order to communicate. The bilingual speaker, very much like the monolingual speaker who is familiar with various registers of just one language, acquires rules on the selection of components within this repertoire through experience and socialisation. These rules tend to point toward the selective usage of distinct repertoire components in separate environments, or for separate sets of communicative activities. The key to communicating in a bi-lingual repertoire is therefore the acquisition and the application of skills that enable the bilingual speaker to draw demarcation boundaries within the repertoire, and to maintain those demarcation boundaries in line with the communicative conventions and social expectations of the surrounding speech community.1 Rather than talk about the bilingual's languages, I therefore choose to discuss the distinct components of a bilingual's overall repertoire of linguistic-communicative structures.
Investigating language contact is therefore not about describing how systems converge, but about investigating how successful bilingual speakers are in maintaining demarcation lines within their linguistic repertoires: Where will speakers fail to maintain the boundary between components of the repertoire? Around which grammatical categories or constructions? For which language-processing operations? When will they license themselves consciously to lift the boundary? And under which circumstances will either the lifting of a demarcation boundary, or the failure to maintain it, become habitual, and lead ultimately to a permanent shift in the position of the boundary—i.e. to language change?

My basic assumption is that both the maintenance of demarcation boundaries within the repertoire, and their partial lifting or even longer-term removal around specific structures, are functional to communication in multilingual settings. This is a view of language contact that does not discriminate between diachronic and synchronic aspects of contact, or between idiosyncratic occurrences and widespread variation, but takes an integrated approach to the theme of acquiring, maintaining, and re-setting demarcation boundaries within the repertoire. This is the view that is taken, because any changes in the conventions of linguistic behaviour that become accepted by the speech community will have had their roots in individual innovations that speakers introduce at the level of the single utterance, embedded into a specific communicative event. As in monolingual speech (cf. Croft 2000), changes in bilingual settings too are individual innovations which are imitated, replicated, and ultimately propagated successfully throughout the speech community or in certain contexts of it. Bilingual behaviour is a way to navigate through the challenge of communicating, using a relatively wide and diverse repertoire of linguistic structures, and under a complex set of contextual constraints on variant selection. Contact-induced language change is a set of solutions to this challenge, which have become favoured by a significant number of speakers in a significant set of communicative constellations.

The task of contact linguistics is to describe and explain speakers' communicative navigation strategies in multilingual settings, and the conditions under which they lead to longer-term solutions, and so to change. This begins with the gradual process of the acquisition of the skill that enables the speaker to actively set demarcation boundaries within the repertoire. In respect of the infant acquiring two languages from birth, the agenda for investigation has long been defined as a need to analyse the acquisition of boundaries as a social skill (Ochs 1988, Lanza 1997). In respect of more mature speakers, who are generally self-confident in the skill of maintaining boundaries among repertoire components, the agenda of the contact linguist is to define the conditions under which speakers license themselves to lift boundaries and make discourse-strategic use of the repertoire in its entirety, or indeed of the contrast between repertoire components (cf. e.g. Maschler 1994, Auer 1999). Discourse-strategic bilingual activities such as situational, conversational, and metaphorical codeswitching, insertions, loan translations or loan blends may be considered in this light.
But even in respect of the mature and self-confident speaker, the question arises whether difficulties in maintaining separation between repertoire components might still occur, either in certain situations, or indeed around particular processing functions of language, manifesting themselves around certain grammatical categories or constructions. This would point toward a cognitive trigger, rather than a discourse-strategic one, for certain kinds of language mixing. Are there instances of particular language-processing operations, where under certain conditions even mature and skilled bilingual speakers fail to keep apart their repertoire components? The hypothesis put forward here is that this is indeed the case with certain types of connectivity markers: When engaging in the linguistic-mental operation known as 'connectivity', under certain conditions, bilingual speakers may 'lose control' of the selection mechanism that maintains demarcation between the different components of the linguistic repertoire, and select a structure that is cognitively functional (in that it triggers the relevant processing function) but socially inappropriate (in that it is not an acceptable variant in the particular setting). Some types of connectivity devices stand out in their vulnerability in such situations.

From this it is firstly possible to derive an hypothesis of contact-induced language change: Should the difficulties in maintaining a boundary between the repertoire components persist around a particular function of language beyond just spontaneous and idiosyncratic use, and should the resulting pattern of 'language mixing' become accepted and even propagated within the speech community, then a cognitive trigger may be said to have sown the seeds for language change. Second, it can be argued that language contact can shed light on the internal structure of grammar; such 'pathological' errors in navigating through the bilingual repertoire indicate that the mechanism involved in selecting connectivity structures is more error-prone, and so that it is structured differently from that which governs the selection of other grammatical operations or lexical items. On this basis we might hypothesise that connectivity occupies a different kind of position in the speech production mechanism.

2. Connectivity devices in multilingual language acquisition

I base this section on informal observations of the language acquisition process of a trilingual child, whom we shall call 'Ben'. Born and raised in England, Ben is exposed to two languages at the home: German, which he hears from his mother, and Hebrew, which he hears from his father. Both parents speak their respective languages consistently to Ben, consciously trying to avoid mixing. Between the ages of 0:4 and 4:4, input was balanced: During the first two years of his life, Ben spent four days a week with an English-speaking child minder, and was cared for at home during roughly half of the working week primarily by his father, and during the other half primarily by his mother, while weekends were spent with both parents. At the age of 1:11, Ben's parents split up and moved into separate households, in separate towns. Ben stayed with his moth-
er, spending three to four working days at an English-speaking nursery, while six days out of a fourteen-day cycle were spent with his father. Holiday time was split equally among the two parents. Most of the holiday time with the mother was spent in Germany, and around half the holiday time with the father was spent in Israel – in both countries with family and relations. On the whole, then, between the age of 0:4 and 4:4, Ben spent roughly equal amounts of time with each of the two parents (each speaking his/her language consistently) and at the English-speaking nursery, with exposure during holidays to monolingual contexts of German and Hebrew.

Ben's active language acquisition history begins between the age of 1:3–1:6, with the acquisition of lexical items from all three input languages. In the early phase, the lexicon appears mixed, characterised, not surprisingly, by the absence of bilingual synonyms and the indiscriminate use of individual lexical items, irrespective of addressee or context (cf. already Volterra & Taeschner 1978). A consistent desire to separate the languages becomes clear however by the age of 1:9, by which time much of the vocabulary is used selectively according to setting (setting being defined primarily by the parent-addressee, and gradually also by a number of other adults who are associated with one language rather than the other). Bilingual synonyms begin to appear during this period, while there is also a set of preferred lexical items, containing elements from all three languages, which the child continues to use irrespective of context.

By the age of 2:4 – 2:6, Ben has acquired a fairly fluent command of both his domestic/parental languages, German and Hebrew, with English lagging somewhat behind in active use. In both German and Hebrew, Ben is able to conjugate verbs in various tenses, to make full use of person inflection and inflected pronouns or pronominal clitics, and to produce complex sentences with the full range of conjunctions. He is fully aware of the context-bound separation of languages, and pursues it consistently. However, lapses do occur: In situations immediately following the transition from one parental household to another, i.e. within a few hours or on the first day, or in other situations of partial ambiguity, such as when speaking on the phone to one parent while in the care of the other, Ben occasionally slips into the 'wrong' language, that is, into the language that is not the language of the addressee (i.e. the slips are either into the language of the parent with whom he had been spending the past few days prior to the transition, or, in the case of phone conversations, into the language of the parent at whose house he is currently staying). The slips are unintentional; sometimes they are noticed and self-repaired, but quite often they remain unnoticed by the child, and usually un-commented on by the hearer.

The most interesting aspect of these bilingual slips is the fact that they involve almost exclusively a particular class of discourse and connectivity markers. Most frequently affected are the particles 'yes' (Hebrew ken/ German ja) and 'no' (lo/nein), the conjunctions 'because' (ki/weil), 'and' (ve/und), 'or' (o/oder), and 'but' (avdī/aber), and occasionally focus particles such as 'too' (garn/auch), 'even' (afīlu/sogar) or 'at all' (bix-lāl/überhaupt):
(1) Hebrew; age 2:3, first few days in the father's care after returning from a 3-week holiday in Germany; inspecting the shell of a snail in the garden:
   báyít šel xilazón aber éyn xilazón bīnīm
   house of snail but [German] is-no snail inside
   'A snail-shell, but there is no snail inside'

(2) German; age 7, on the phone to the mother while at the father's house, describing a collection of insects:
   dann gibt's Butterfly, ve/ und zwei Craneflies
   then is and [Hebrew] and two
   'Then there's a butterfly, and/ and two craneflies'

(3) Hebrew; age 5:2, reaching to inspect his trousers while planning a game in which a toy is to be hidden in a pocket:
   yeš li überhaupt kis?
   there.is.to.1sg at all [German] pocket
   'Do I even have a pocket?'

(4) Hebrew; age 7:2, on the phone to his father while on holiday in Germany, about a sports event that was being shown on television there:
   Jan Ulrich hayá be'erex mispár ševa oder Šméne o Šméne
   was approximately number seven or [German] eight or eight
   'Jan Ulrich was about number seven or eight/ or eight'

Language choice errors, or rather, speech production errors of the type illustrated in (1)–(4) occur in both directions – German connectors in Hebrew utterances and vice versa – especially during the age period 2:3–4:6, but occasionally also later. Of particular interest is the history of the adversative conjunction, Hebrew avád, German aber, at an earlier phase during this period. Both language forms of the conjunction (as well as the English form) had been acquired and used regularly in the individual languages before the age of 2:6. At 2:6, Ben spent a three-week holiday with his mother in Germany. Upon his return, and for the next three months, German aber consistently replaced the Hebrew adversative conjunction in Hebrew discourse. It appears as though the two languages underwent a fusion of the structure expressing contrast between propositional units in discourse. The demarcation line between the repertoire components collapsed around the particular processing operation of contrast, allowing aber to function independently of context or setting and so independently of language selection. This situation prevailed until the age of 2:10, when Ben left for a three-week holiday with his father to Israel. Within a week of interacting in the monolingual Hebrew environment, Hebrew avád was reinstated in Hebrew discourse. Then, upon Ben's return home, and for the next 2–3 weeks, avád replaced aber in German discourse. Thus, a repetition of the process of fusion took place, with the languages in reverse roles.
How can we make sense of the turbulent fate of the contrastive conjunction during this period? We might first establish that, while an entire set of connectivity markers is prone to instability around the transitions between contexts (= between sets of extralinguistic factors that condition the selection of particular elements within the linguistic repertoire), contrast is affected in a special way, and there is greater difficulty in keeping apart the repertoire components, and less flexibility to select the appropriate form and so to accommodate to the new extralinguistic setting. The behaviour of contrast is similar to, but is more extreme than that of the other connectivity markers. Next, we can establish that the child’s difficulty in maintaining separation between repertoire components is not due to the overall dominance of any one set of linguistic structures (= one ‘language’). Rather, ‘dominance’ or loyalty to a particular set of structures is variable and fluid. It is, in a way, this changing loyalty which triggers the confusion in the first place. The child undertakes an effort to accommodate to the constraints of the new setting; consequently, a language becomes dominant – not within the repertoire as a whole, but pragmatically, as the preferred set within the repertoire for a series of ongoing activity domains. It is, in other words, **pragmatically dominant** (see Matras 1998).

In this section we saw that even a bilingual child with maximum domain separation between the languages and a high level of linguistic awareness and avoidance of mixing, encounters certain difficulties in keeping apart two of his languages around connectivity functions, especially contrast. There is a certain difficulty, in situations of relative ambiguity which surround the transition between settings, to disassociate connectivity devices from the pragmatically dominant language – the language in which communicative performance took place until the transition. The speaker/child is thus unable to maintain the demarcation boundary consistently. Instead, the boundary collapses occasionally around a specific function or set of related functions, leading to an instantaneous or temporary **fusion** – i.e. non-separation – of the structures of connectivity (or certain functions thereof) in the two languages.

3. *Fusion* in adult speech

In this section I will demonstrate that the difficulties encountered by the bilingual child and discussed in the previous section are not particular to children, but may just as well affect adult or mature bilingual speakers. Consider first the case of a young, but linguistically mature Hebrew-English bilingual, brought up partly in Israel and partly in the United States. At the age of around eight, he is addressed, in Israel, by a monolingual Hebrew speaker of a similar age group, who asks him a yes/no question:

(5) Hebrew; asked a yes-no question by Hebrew monolingual of same age group:

S: uh-huh. [ʔɛˈhʌ]  
‘Yes’.
H: ((looks puzzled)) ma?

'What?'

The speaker's reply is an affirmative signal which he attributes to a non-language-specific sector of his linguistic repertoire – a kind of language-independent linguistic gesture. In fact, this sequence of segments is not understood in the Hebrew context/setting, i.e. it is not familiar to the hearer with a monolingual Hebrew repertoire. Virtually the same kind of communicative breakdown occurs at a somewhat later age, here in the United States, when the speaker is confronted with a question by an English monolingual adult:

(6) English; having been asked a yes-no question by English monolingual adult:
S: ts-. [ə]

'No.'

H: ((awaits response))

The click-related implosive sound indicating a negative reply, which is common in the Mediterranean region, is meaningless to the English monolingual hearer, who continues to await a response. In both situations, the speaker mistook operators that help regulate the interaction, for gestures that are language-independent. This kind of collapse of the demarcation boundaries differs from the type discussed in the previous section; here, there is no realisation that demarcation exists around a particular function. The result in both cases, however, is a fusion of both components for a particular language processing function (or group of functions).

Consider now the following excerpts (7) – (8) from a television interview, broadcast in the United Kingdom in the documentary series 'Dispatches' on Channel 4 television, on 8 June 1997. The speaker is German, and is being interviewed in Berlin about his part in an arms smuggling scheme:

(7) S: Well jus/ just the way a ø the m/ the weapons ø brought ø I have brought to London, øø øø I have told them the truth, øø, that they were brought by car, øø øø and øø and ø...

H: Were they very interested?

S: Yes, they were very interested, øø, to know how, øø.

(8) At the border in England were by the custom/ they have investigated this car, very very ø ø thoroughly, and they have removed the panels from the doors, the panels from the luggage room and they in/ investigated in the engine compartments aber they didn't find anything but they/ they have forgotten to get unten ø ø ø ø ((clears throat)) they/ they forgot to look under the ø car.

The first excerpt, (7), is characterised by the frequent insertion of the (northern) German tag øø. Its consistent appearance suggests that it is not attributed by the speaker to any single component of his repertoire, but has again the status of a sector-independent structure within the repertoire, a kind of universal communicative gesture, appli-
cable with no setting-related constraints. In reality, of course, no is completely foreign to English speakers and fails to achieve its communicative function when directed at a monolingual English addressee. In addition to this absence of realisation of a demarcation boundary, in both (7) and (8) the speaker fails to maintain the boundary around altogether three forms/structures: Two of them are connectors – *und* ‘and’ in (7), and *aber* ‘but’ in (8).³ It is not clear that in either of the cases the speaker actually noticed his error, as no obvious self-repair is inserted. Still, one can safely assume that the speaker is aware of the German origin of the two words, and aware of their English counterparts. The German insertions convey the impression as though chaining devices in the narrative are being carried out in German, while the actual propositional part of the discourse – though possibly planned in German⁴ is on the whole communicated successfully in English.

The conclusion is that there is a set of connectivity devices which at times escapes the speaker’s control with respect to conscious language choice, and that another subset of connectivity items – those that are less ‘lexical’, and appear more ‘gesture-like’ – are in fact processed by the speaker as ‘untagged’ for any particular language, i.e. as part of the overall linguistic repertoire, rather than of a particular component of that repertoire, constrained to a specific set of communicative domains.

More evidence for lapses in adult bilingual’s control of the language selection mechanism around connectors follows. In (9), a Czech academic whose foreign working language is generally English gives a brief survey of her research activities at a German-speaking academic forum:

(9) ...in Norwegen/ über diese zwei Sprachen, Bokmål and Nynorsk, und so weiter. ‘...in Norway/ about these two languages, Bokmål and Nynorsk, and so on.’

In (10), a native speaker of Polish who has been living in Germany for the past decade or so meets friends from Germany in London, where she has been attending an advanced English language course and living with an English family during the past two weeks. She crosses the street from the Café where the party is sitting to inspect a restaurant, which is said to be decorated in Polish style. Having returned and confirmed that the style is on the whole indeed Polish, she says:

(10) ...bis auf/ bis auf die Tischdecken, *because* eh weil sie... ‘...except/ except for the tablecloth, *because* uh because it...’

The error was noticed by the speaker, and a self-repair is inserted. Note that in both (9) and (10), the target of the error – the prevailing form – does not come from a language that is generally dominant in the respective speaker’s life, but rather from one that has pragmatic dominance in the particular communicative domain: Thus for the Czech academic in (9), English is the usual language of international academic events. For the Polish-German student in (10), English has been the focus of her communicative efforts in London over the past couple of weeks.
Consider finally two more examples. In (11), a group of four Israelis — the speaker, her husband, and two friends — are having lunch at a Chinese restaurant in Manchester, England. As they are engaged in conversation in Hebrew, a waiter appears to take their order. The speaker’s husband takes the active role in ordering most of the items, and in (11) the speaker intervenes and adds:

(11) …and one Won Ton soup *aváld eh* the vegetarian one.

The Hebrew contrastive conjunction *aváld* appears here, rather than English *but*; it is possible, though not obvious, that the error was noticed by the speaker, for there is a pause and hesitation, but no explicit repair. Finally, in (12), the Saudi Ambassador to the United Kingdom gives an interview on BBC television (Newsnight, 7 June 2004), commenting on plans for municipal elections in Saudi Arabia. In response to a question challenging him about the authorities’ ability to ensure fair elections, he says:

(12) I would beg to say that *yaññí* the Kingdom is a very big territory.

The Arabic discourse marker *yaññí* in fact derives from an Arabic inflected verb meaning ‘it means’. Nonetheless, as a discourse marker it appears to be assigned to those gesture-like items of speech that are not consciously assigned to a particular component of the linguistic repertoire; *yaññí* appears frequently in foreign-language discourse of Arabs. For a trained diplomat speaking on national television about matters of state, it is certain that the insertion of *yaññí* constitutes a non-volitional, potentially embarrassing clash with his own and his audience’s expectations in respect of the well-formedness of his discourse. We can safely assume that the insertion is not intentional nor strategic in any way, but that it represents a lapse in the speaker’s control over the mechanism that governs selection over repertoire components.

This brings us to the principal point of this section, and that is, that in all instances documented here, the failure to maintain demarcation boundaries between repertoire components surrounding connectivity devices is not in any way discourse-strategic: It is not pre-planned, it is not conscious, in fact it is often self-repaired, and it does not yield any overt communicative advantages for the speaker, either in terms of prestige or recognition on the part of the hearer, or in terms of efficiency of communication and the ability to express a function or relation that would otherwise have to remain unexpressed (this is already excluded through the potential breakdown in communication or at least the lack of any guarantee that the hearer will be able to decode the foreign structure successfully). We can therefore rule out two factors that are often regarded as principal triggers for language mixing, namely prestige-related or emblematic mixing, and functional gap-filling. There remains therefore what must be regarded as a language-processing related or cognitive trigger, a non-volitional and sub-conscious mechanism which, in its quasi-pathological character remotely resembles some symptoms of bilingual aphasia: the inability, around specific language-processing functions (mental operations), to maintain a demarcation boundary between components (sets) within the linguistic repertoire, and to select structures in
in accordance with the context- or domain-particular constraints that govern their normal use in the speech community.

4. Variation in connectivity marking in bilingual communities

It has been argued that in bilingual communities speakers will use discourse markers to flag their linguistic abilities (Poplack 1980), or that they will make use of bilingualism to mark out boundaries between utterances (Maschler 1994), or that frequent use of discourse markers will flag cultural integration (Clyne 2003). In the previous section we saw examples of bilingual speech production in which cognitive difficulties of language processing and language production override social-setting related and conversational constraints. I suggest on this basis that bilingual speakers, while generally able to maintain demarcation boundaries within their complex linguistic repertoires, encounter inconvenience when it comes to connectivity devices. The removal of demarcation boundaries is a solution of convenience, and hence at least covertly advantageous to the speaker. This 'covert' advantage of course competes with the overt communicative disadvantages of losing face when failing to select correctly (i.e. according to the social norms of the community) among the repertoire components, or of risking a breakdown in the efficiency of communication.

But let us assume a situation where a) there is no loss of face, since most speakers are bilingual, hence slips of the kind documented in section 3. are commonplace; and b) there is no breakdown of communication, since all members of the speech community understand the pragmatically dominant language into which the slips are likely to occur. In such cases, the inconvenience of maintaining demarcation boundaries around utterance-organising operations might not be counteracted by factors such as prestige or efficiency of communication. Where can we expect to encounter such situations? They are, in fact, common in minority language settings where several conditions are met: 1) The minority language is an ethnic language, whose primary function is to flag loyalty to a clan or ethnic group; it is mainly used for group-internal communication; 2) It is primarily an oral language, and enjoys minimal institutional support (i.e. little or no support in schools, media, written tradition or other institutions, and no norm dictating language purism); 3) Bilingualism is widespread among all adult speakers of the minority language, and interaction with persons outside the community, and so use of the majority, dominant language, is frequent.

Although members of the community might well value the maintenance of their own language, the regular appearance of connectors that are identical to those of the second, external or dominant language might not be regarded as endangering the coherence of the ethnic (minority) language. Indeed, we saw above that in the case of some connectivity structures, especially those that are interaction-related and hearer-directed and have a remote relation to the content of adjacent propositions, the structures involved are sometimes regarded as non-component-specific, i.e. as part of the
overall repertoire of linguistic structures, but untagged for a specific component that is limited to particular communicative domains or settings. The motivation to remove the inconvenience of having to maintain strict demarcation boundaries around utterance-organising operations, might then override the wish to preserve the internal, aesthetic coherence of a separate ethnic language, or might indeed not be seen at all as contradicting the latter.

Consider the example of Romani, a typical oral minority language lacking the protection of any institutions of literacy or other kind of language regulation, in a permanent situation of bilingualism, its key functions being to serve as family- or clan-language, flagging ethnic separateness. Examples (13) – (14) stem from a corpus of recordings of the Lovari dialect, spoken here by a second-generation immigrant from Poland to Germany:

(13) Laki familija sas also kesave sar te phenav, artisturi, na
her family were part [German] such how comp I-say artists part
[German]
Her family were like such how shall I say, showpeople, right?

(14) Taj žasas ande veša taj rodasas, taj dikhasas, khelasas
and we-went in woods and we-searched and we-saw played
ame
halt, na.
we part [German] part [German]
‘And we used to go into the woods and search, and look around, we like used to play, right!’

The speaker belongs to the first generation in her family to grow up with both languages, Romani and German (previous generations spoke Romani and Polish, Slovak, and Romanian). Note that the German discourse particles also, halt, na are treated as an integral part of the Romani discourse. They are not regarded as foreign, and they do not disturb the subjective (from the speaker’s point of view) well-formedness of the Romani discourse. Needless to say, they do not cause either loss of face or barriers to comprehensibility within the extended family, which is where Romani is mainly used. On the other hand, there is nothing to suggest that acceptance of German culture, or flagging of German-language competence, are motivating triggers behind the insertion of German particles. Bilingualism is an accepted reality in Romani communities, and at least among members of the second generation of immigrants it is a self-evident norm which does not entail any privileged position. Cultural adaptation is often functional, but a culture of contrast is cherished as a key to the preservation of a diasporic identity. There is therefore, in the Romani-speaking context, no obvious advantage of flagging any form of cultural or emotional accommodation to the outside, non-Romani environment; if anything, community members who do appear strongly integrated into the dominant, surrounding culture are looked down upon as semi-assimilated by other members of the community. What we witness in (13) – (14), therefore, is the
emerging acceptance of regular insertions of utterance-organising devices from the contact-language into the home-language discourse.

In (13 – (14) we witness the acceptability of those connectors that operate exclusively at the interactional level, like fillers and tags. They convey processing instructions in respect of the roles of the participants and the sequencing arrangement of speech activities, and have a special function as an invitation to the hearer to accept the speaker's role and point of view. These connectors tend to be less overtly lexical or even grammatical, and we might conclude that it is for this reason that they are more volatile to the mixing of boundaries between repertoire components during conversation, and so also more prone to propagation and ultimately acceptance within the speech community. There is indeed evidence in support of such an hypothesis. Thus, the speaker cited in (13) – (14) uses German sentence particles, but the Polish contrastive conjunction ale 'but' (recall that the speaker's family immigrated to Germany from Poland).

However, those connectors that make reference to logical relations among propositions that are part of a propositional chain, are also susceptible when it comes to crossing demarcation boundaries and gaining acceptability. Consider examples (15) – (16) from conversations with two native speakers of Low German originating from the province of Schleswig-Holstein in northern Germany, who immigrated to the United States as teenagers in the mid-1950s.

(15) IF: (a) und dor arbeidet ik den för hunnertsofi Däler and there worked I then for hundredfifty dollar de Monat the month

DH: (b) jáå, dat weer al wat anners.
yes that was already something else

IF: (c) dat weer wat anners, und hewer uk en Düütsche that was something else and he was also a German een, ni, and åh ik weer de drüddee, drüddee or one no and uh I was the third third or feerte Düütsche, wat för em arbeiden dee.
fourth German who for him work did

IF: (a) 'And there I then worked for one hundred and fifty dollars a month

DH: (b) Yes that was already different.

IF: (c) That was different, and he was also a German, right, and uh I was the third, third or fourth German who worked for him.

(16) dat weer'n Ünnerich för süstein Stunnen, but ik hef bloos that was a lesson for sixteen hours but I have only acht Stunnen måkt, åber dor haf ik uk nix leert. eight hours made but there have I also nothing learned 'That was a sixteen-hour class, but I only did eight, but I also didn't learn anything there.'
In (15) we find both Low German *und* and English *and* (as well as *or*), and in (16) both Low German *aber* and English *but*. Although some effort is made to select connectors in line with the overall choice of linguistic set (lexical, grammatical), i.e. in line with the selected ‘language’ of the discourse, this effort is not consistent, and the infiltration of English connectors does not seem to be regarded by the speaker as a clash with the norms and expectations on well-formedness of communication structures. Thus, in both the Romani examples and the Low German ones, speakers are licensing themselves to lift the demarcation boundaries within their repertoire around a specific class of grammatical operations.

That the adoption of such a licence is gradual, makes common sense, and is also supported by evidence from speech communities where original (native, or inherited) devices continue to be used alongside those markers that are borrowed from the surrounding dominant language. Mosetén is spoken by approximately 800 people in the foothill-region of the Bolivian Andes. It has been in contact with Spanish since the 17th century, but Spanish influence has been particularly strong since the 19th century. The following examples (from Sakel, in press) illustrate the acceptability of Spanish connectors in Mosetén discourse:

(17) Wènjö’ kho’i mōmō’ jishyiti’y
move f only.f comb and [Spanish]
mē’mē’ shiphki’ raej dyaba.
so leave all peanut
‘She must have come, [and] she just combed herself and so the peanuts came out [of her hair].’

(18) Chhibin o tiis ji’jaem’te penne chopati kdyetyi’.
three or [Spanish] four good raft big.raft
‘Three or four rafts to make a big raft.’

(19) Me’ jímē mō’ pero mō’ majjo’ mē’.
so close 3ESG but [Spanish] 3ESG much so
‘This (water-source) is closer, but that one has more (water).’

(20) Tyiñetyi’ pero-ki pen’-ki jai’bai.
semi.red but [Spanish]-co side-co white
‘It (the peanut) is semi-red, but one side is white.’

While examples (17) – (19) show plain integration of the Spanish connectors *y* ‘and’, *o* ‘or’ and *pero* ‘but’ into Mosetén discourse, in (20) the Spanish contrastive connector *pero* is combined with a Mosetén marker of contrast. The two devices are, typologically and apparently also functionally, not incompatible with one another, so that the lifting of boundaries here may be conceived of as making full use of the entire repertoire, with no constraint on domain-specific selection.

Anders (1993) documents the speech of ethnic Germans in Russia. Despite the preservation of some literary tradition in German, and a closed and rather isolated
community structure, Russian discourse particles are infiltrating German-language discourse and gaining acceptability; this can be seen by examining their frequency, as well as by paying attention to the fact that such elements are rarely accompanied by any self-repairs:

(21) T: Der Mann war krank und wir konnten doch nicht.
    the man was ill and we could not

P: Ja.
    yes

T: Nu und •• wie er gestorben ist, und dann •• hat es nicht
    PART [Russian] and as he died is and then has it not
    so lang gedauert.
    so long lasted

T: 'The man was ill and so we couldn't.'

P: Yes.

T: Well and •• when he died, and then •• it took so long.'

Other Russian connectors, such as no 'but', appear in the corpus alongside their German equivalents (in this case aber):

(22) Ma: Sie wollen jetzt noch Brot holen?
    you want now still bread fetch

    No ich hab etwas zu Hause!
    but [Russian] I have some at home

    oh [Russian] I have bread but for tomorrow

Ma: Do you still want to get bread now? But I've got some at home!
Ba: Oh, I've got bread. But for tomorrow.

We have established that a) connectivity devices are prone to lapses in control over the choice of repertoire component in early bilingualism, and to speech production errors involving control over the choice of repertoire component in adult bilingualism, and that b) connectivity devices are subject to variation in communities with stable bilingualism, with markers from the surrounding majority or dominant language gradually gaining acceptance as part of the inventory of linguistic structures of the in-group, ethnic, immigrant or minority language.

5. Connectivity structures and grammatical borrowing

My claim in this paper (see also Matras 1998) is that variation of the kind seen in the previous set of examples is an outcome of the gradual acceptance and conventionalisation of spontaneous and unintentional lapses in bilingual speakers' overall effort...
to maintain demarcation among their repertoire components. We shall return to a discussion of the reasons behind the pressure triggering such lapses specifically around connectivity devices in the discussion below. Once variation sets in, it motivates change: Where too different forms compete for the same function, speakers are likely to regard one of them as more fashionable than the other. Change is thus likely to affect the inventory of connectivity devices; one might say, therefore, that the connectivity apparatus is particularly prone to grammatical borrowing in language contact situations where the recipient language is the weaker or rather the group-internal language.

Turoyo (Christian Neo-Aramaic of Tur Abdin, southeastern Turkey; Jastrow 1992) for example, a minority language in a multilingual region, shares its connective and discourse particles amma ‘but’, ya ‘or’, faqat ‘however’, and ya ... ya ‘whether/either ... or’, hetta ‘even’ and baliki ‘maybe’ with the surrounding languages Kurmanji (Kurdish), Turkish, and Arabic, the particles û ‘and’ with Kurmanji and Arabic, the connectors onkân ‘if’ and lašân ‘in order to’ with Arabic, and the particle disa ‘again’, hêš ‘still’, edi ‘then, so’, šëwa ‘anyway’, ta ‘at all’, véga ‘now’, and žnu ‘only then’ with Kurmanji. Such wholesale adoption of the inventory of connective devices (including coordinating and some subordinating conjunctions, interjections, discourse particles, focus particles, and phasal particles) is common in other languages under similar sociolinguistic conditions (stable and widespread multilingualism, primarily oral tradition, restriction of the language to in-group or family communication). Domari, for instance, the Indic language of the Dom peripatetics of the Middle East, employs the full inventory of Arabic conjunctions and discourse particles, including all coordinating and subordinating conjunctions and co-particle (co-relatives), relative particles, phasal and focus particles, interjections, fillers, and tags (items in italics are grammatical loans from Arabic):

(23) lahé-r-om xužōtī kān laher-d-om-s-a

if [Arabic] comé-PAST.1SG yesterday COND [Arabic] see-PAST.1SG-ANT

‘If I had come yesterday I would have seen him.’

(24) warik-ar-a mlây-ék minsâin mâ džân-ad-is

wear-PAST.3SG-ANT veil-PRED.M so.that [Arabic] NEG [Arabic] know-3PL.SUBJ-3SG

‘She used to wear a veil so that one would not recognise her’

(25) qâbel-mâ dža-m xâlašk-ed-om kam-as

before-COMP [Arabic] go-1SG.SUBJ finish-PAST.1SG work-OBL

‘Before I left I finished my work’

(26) iza wars-arî, n-aw-am-e?

if [Arabic] rain-3SG NEG-come-1SG-NEG

‘If it rains, I shall not come’

(27) na kil-d-om bara liʔam-hâ wars-arî

NEG go.out-PAST.1SG out because-3SG.F [Arabic] rain-3SG

‘I did not go out because it is raining’
As a result of this wholesale incorporation of Arabic connectors, along with the syntactic convergence of Domari with Arabic and its replication of Arabic word order and clause structure features, sentence organisation and clause combining is identical in the two languages. For Domari speakers, the in-group component of their linguistic repertoire, or what makes up the 'Domari language', therefore does not include a specific inventory of connectors or connectivity structures, but is limited to the internal organisation of clauses or even just constituents. As far as speakers are concerned, speaking 'internally' (speaking Domari) and speaking 'externally' (Arabic) are identical when it comes to connectors and connectivity devices. From a diachronic viewpoint, Domari has undergone complete fusion with Arabic in the domain of connectivity.

Romani, too, tends to borrow connectivity markers from the various surrounding languages with which Romani dialects have come into contact. Most prone to early borrowing are, as we saw above, discourse particles, fillers, and tags. Coordinating conjunctions form an interesting hierarchy of borrowing in Romani. All dialects of Romani borrow the conjunction 'but' from a current or recent contact language (e.g. Slavic no, po and ali/ale, Hungarian de, Turkish ama, German aber). A pre-European expression for 'or', vai, is retained in some dialects. Elsewhere, 'or' is often found to be a more stable borrowing than 'but'. For instance, the Aija Varvara Romani dialect of Athens has ja 'or' from its Recent L2 Turkish, but ala 'but' from its Current L2 Greek; Helsinki Romani has elle 'or' from its Recent L2 Swedish, but num 'but' from its Current L2 Finnish. Pre-European ta(j) 'and' is retained in many dialects, though often alongside a borrowed conjunction for 'and'. The additive conjunction too may be a more conservative, earlier loan than the contrastive or alternative conjunction; thus Bugurðži Romani hem/em from the Recent L2 Turkish, alongside pre-European thaj, but ili 'or' and po/ali 'but' from the Current L2, Serbian. There is a clear implicational hierarchy for the borrowing of coordinating conjunctions, based on contrast (cf. Matras 1998): If 'and' is borrowed, then 'or' is also borrowed, and if 'or' is borrowed, then 'but' is also borrowed.7

Romani is not unique in this regard. A sample of languages under the cultural influence sphere (directly, or via another language) of Arabic (Matras 1998) show a similar hierarchy, with Arabic-derived contrastive expressions such as lakin or amma most widespread (cf. Urdu, Punjabi, Persian, Turkish, Lezgian, Albanian, Somali, Hausa, Ful), followed by Arabic-derived disjunctive expressions (ya), followed by additive conjunctions from Arabic (such as ve/w). In a sample of 29 Mesoamerican languages
discussed by Stolz & Stolz (1996), 21 languages borrow Spanish pero 'but', 16 borrow o 'or', and 12 borrow y 'and'. The results are by and large implicational: If a language in the sample borrows y, it also borrows pero. There are no exceptions to this rule. If a language borrows y, with only two exceptions it also borrows o. If a language borrows o, it is also very likely to borrow pero, there being only three exceptions. We return to the significance of this hierarchy in the Discussion below.

The Macedonian dialect of Turkish has borrowed not only individual connectors from its contact language, Macedonian, but also the design of clause combining, which relies on free-standing, clause initial conjunctions introducing finite clauses (whereas in Turkish clause combining is often achieved through converbal structures, with converbs marked as suffixes to verbs):

(30) i şimdi onların atları kaldi “Yürük”
and [Macedonian] now 3PL.GEN.name.PL.POSS stay.PAST Yürük
And so they kept the name “Yürük”

(31) a gemide para yok whereas [Macedonian] boat.LOC money none whereas on the boats there’s no money

In (30) – (31), we find the Slavic (Macedonian) clause-initial conjunctions i ‘and’ and a ‘and, however; whereas’, and so also a contrast between two distinct connectivity types – addition, and contrastive-addition – which do not exist in (Standard) Turkish. The organisation of clause combining structures in Macedonian Turkish replicates the Macedonian blueprint even in those cases where no actual formal material is borrowed. Thus in (30), the first embedded clause (‘what I want to say’) is finite, and is introduced by a conjunction ne, deriving from the interrogative ‘what’; this conjunction also serves as a relativiser. The second, modal clause (‘I want to say’) is also finite, showing the typical Balkan infinitive-loss and its replacement through a finite (in this case, subjunctive) verb describing the target action (cf. Matras 2003/2004):

(32) bilirsin ne istiyom deyim
know.AOR.2SG what.want.PROG.1SG say.SUBJ.1SG
‘You know what I want to say.’

Note that Macedonian Turkish remains, in contrast to the other languages of the Balkans, an agglutinating, postpositional, and predominantly SOV language, and so typologically quite distinct. In terms of syntactic typology, the structure of clause combining might be regarded as the first (and so far principal) domain in which convergence with the neighbouring languages takes place. Connectivity structures, then, appear particularly vulnerable not just to the actual borrowing for formal material such as conjunctions and other particles, but also to the replication of patterns of constituent ordering, agreement and overall form-function mapping that form the mental blueprint for the respective construction. We find evidence for this tendency toward con-
vergence of clause combining structures in other linguistic areas, too. Consider the structure of complementation in a number of languages in the northern Levant / eastern Anatolian region – Kurmanji (Iranian), Neo-Aramaic (Semitic), Arabic (Semitic), and Domari (Indo-Aryan).

(33) Kurmanji:
   ez-dí-xwaz-im her-im mal-é
   I PROG-want-1SG go.SUBJ-1SG home-OBL

(34) Neo-Aramaic (Zakho, Iraq):
   ana g-il-an áz-in l-bésa
   I PROG-want-1SG go.SUBJ-1SG to-home

(35) Arabic:
   ana biddí a-rūḥ ša-l-bêt
   I want.1SG 1SG-go.SUBJ to-DEF-home

(36) Domari:
   ama biddí džä-m kury-ata
   I want.1SG go.SUBJ-1SG home-DAT
   'I want to go home'

Note that the languages differ in basic word order rules, Kurmanji showing predominantly SOV, the others showing mainly SVO. As is the case in Macedonian Turkish, the structure of connectivity appears more prone to convergence than other aspects of syntactic typology.

Based on a selection of case studies, we can arrive at the following tentative conclusion about the position of connectivity devices in language contact situations:

a. Connective particles are prone to direct borrowing (i.e. replication of form), particularly from a dominant language (whereby the prestige of the dominant language is the key to long-term acceptability of the forms, but not necessarily the trigger for their initial insertion at the utterance level). 'Smaller' or 'weaker' languages will tend toward fusion of the inventory of connective particles with that of the dominant language. The susceptibility of connective particles to borrowing tends to be hierarchical, with those expressing contrast as well as those with minimal lexical content (i.e. gesture-like) among the most likely to be affected.

b. Connectivity structures that operate at the level of the entire organisation of the complex clause are prone to replication of that organisation pattern. Such convergence or pattern replication occurs under the influence of a dominant language, but also in linguistic areas (where relations of prestige and dominance may not be obvious). What is replicated here is primarily the rules of form-function mapping, the ordering of elements and their grammatical meaning. In other words, we are dealing here with the replication or fusion of constructions (in the sense of Construction Grammar; cf. Goldberg 1995, Croft 2001).
6. Discussion: The triggers of fusion around connectivity devices

Why is connectivity prone to fusion (of the inventory of operators and their functions) and convergence (of the inventory of constructions) in language contact situations? If our hypothesis is correct, and fusion begins as speech production errors where speakers select the correct function, but fail to observe the constraints on the selection of the appropriate form ('language'), then we must assume that there is a property of the mental processing operation that is associated with connectivity, and which interferes with the mechanism that controls the selection of items within the overall repertoire of forms and constructions in accordance with context- and situation-bound constraints (i.e. the demarcation mechanism). We must therefore search for the answer to the question of the susceptibility of connectivity devices to borrowing in the function of connectivity in processing language in discourse.

Approaches to discourse agree that connectivity does not just concern the relation between the content of one clause or phrase and that of another that is adjacent to it. Rather, it concerns the complex communicative interrelations between the speaker and the hearer during the sequencing of units of discourse (cf. already Schiffrin 1987; see also Rehbein 1979, Redder 1989, Ehlich 1986). The speaker has to guide the hearer into processing relations between utterances, or between the propositional components of utterances. With some combinations of propositions, the processing track is more problematic than with others, i.e. some connections are harder to accept against the set of existing presuppositions. This is where the speaker has to 'work harder' in order to sustain the supportive participation of the hearer, and the hearer's acceptance of the speaker's authority as speaker and point of view. Similarly, the speaker has to 'work harder' when his/her own authority is at stake for other reasons, for instance for failing to maintain the flow of the turn, or for failing to provide convincing clarification, on in instances where the speaker may simply wish to ascertain the support of the hearer (circumstances that are often highlighted by means of fillers, hesitation markers, or tags).

The inventory of structures and forms involved in such communicative procedures constitute an apparatus through which the speaker can monitor hearer-sided participation in the discourse, guide the hearer and intervene with hearer-sided processing of the discourse – a kind of 'monitoring-and-directing' apparatus. It contains the more obvious functions of connectors –inviting the hearer to accept a proposition as a supplementary continuation of a previous proposition (addition), urging the hearer to revise a possible course of processing and accept a broken causal chain (cf. Rudolph 1995) proposed by the speaker (contrast), or inviting the hearer to accept the speaker's explanation of a state-of-affairs and its relevance (causation/ result). They may also include the more strictly interaction-oriented functions of connectors – inviting the hearer to continue to anticipate the conclusion of the speaker's turn despite an interruption in the speaker's flow of speech or clarity of expression (fillers), or inviting the hearer to signal reassurance of having accepted the speaker's subjective
chaining of propositions or portrayal of an overall point of view (tags). The monitoring-and-directing apparatus involves complex processing in that it depends on the speaker's anticipation of the hearer's mental processing of and reactions toward the discourse and communicative behaviour; thus, it calls on the speaker to make predictions about the interlocutor's activities, and to organise actions of speech accordingly.

In this light, the borrowing hierarchy of connectors discussed in the previous section has more than just coincidental value. At the top of the cline contrast\textgreater disjunction\textgreater addition we find, in discourse-pragmatic terms, maximal intervention on the part of the speaker in the hearer-sided processing of propositions, in effect blocking a pathway for processing the proposition that is available (based on presupposition), and limiting interpretation to a particular direction. With disjunction, the option of diverting a course of interpretation is introduced by the speaker, who offers the hearer an alternative pathway. Addition may be considered the most supportive of all three positions on the cline, in terms of the firm and clear direction of processing which the speaker offers to the hearer, and its harmonious relationship to contextual presuppositions. Borrowing thus appears to mirror the intensity of tension between anticipated, presupposition-based hearer-sided processing of propositional content, and the direction that the speaker's following speech activity takes.

If we trace borrowing of connectors back to a lapse in exercising control over the selection mechanism through which bilingual speakers maintain context-bound demarcation among repertoire components, then we come across a link between interactional tension of this kind, and failure at a given instant to maintain control over the demarcation boundary. Compromising demarcation boundaries is thus, we hypothesise, triggered by the mental processing effect of intense monitoring-and-directing by the speaker of hearer-sided participation in the discourse. This explains why alongside connectors and connectivity structures, other operators whose function it is to process, explicitly, hearer-sided expectations, and so to highlight explicitly the relevance of propositional contents (in the sense proposed by Blakemore 2002; cf. also Sperber & Wilson 1986), such as focus particles (even, too) or phasal particles (still, no longer), are similarly prone to bilingual speech production errors (i.e. 'wrong' choices) as well as to long-term borrowing in contact situations.

It appears, then, that the monitoring-and-directing apparatus is tightly associated with the forms that trigger the individual operations (but for contrast, you know for tags/fillers, and so on), which reduces the 'reflection time' that the speaker has at his/her disposal to contemplate the selection of an appropriate element, and which makes this selection more automaticised or gesture-like, compared with other linguistic selections. At the same time, the procedures involved in monitoring-and-directing appear more abstract and so more loosely associated with any particular subset within the repertoire of linguistic forms and constructions, and so more prone to evading control over the context-bound demarcation among repertoire components.

In practice, what this means is that the bilingual speaker, when initiating a monitoring-and-directing procedure, is prone to select the structure that encodes this procedure
from the pragmatically dominant language (i.e. the language to which strongest mental attention has recently been directed), rather than from the selected language of the ongoing interaction. If the structure is a word-form, that word-form is likely to be inserted. If the structure is a construction, that is a pattern of form-function mapping, then this pattern will be replicated drawing on elements of the selected language of the interaction.

7. Epilogue: Connectivity and language evolution

If our interpretation of the data discussed in the sections above is correct, then we can conclude that the position of connectivity devices at the top of the cline of structural borrowing reflects the particular position of connectivity in the grammatical apparatus. What, then, is that particular position, and what can we learn from it about the ancient architecture of the language faculty? The evolution of language is probably the most speculative domain in current linguistic discussions (cf. Wray 2002, Tallerman 2005, for an overview). This final section does not pretend to offer any methodological breakthrough in the study of language evolution. Rather, it relies on an interpretation of the empirical evidence discussed in the previous sections, and joins the pool of speculations on the significance of empirical evidence to theories of the emergence of language.

The monitoring-and-directing apparatus, we argued, is more difficult to control as part of the demarcation of repertoire components (= 'separation of languages' in the bilingual repertoire). This positions the monitoring-and-directing apparatus in a different category from other types of linguistic structures and constructions, not just functionally, but from the point of view of the nature of its retrievability or mental activation. Indeed, its potential detachability from a closed subset of the repertoire places it in the vicinity of other means of communication, such as gestures, that are tightly associated with a particular interactional function, but only more loosely associated with just a particular set of contexts or settings (a particular 'system' or 'language'). Which other elements of language might be regarded as belonging to this class of gesture-like functions, and is there any evidence linking them with connectivity devices?

There is, in fact, some experimental evidence based on neuroimaging of the brain, indicating that the processing of clause conjoining is linked to greater right-hemispheric activity (Friederici 2001). There appears to be rather clear evidence linking the processing of prosody to greater right-hemispheric activity, compared to the processing of melodic features of language (Schirmer et al. 2001; Friederici 2001; cf. also McMahon 2005). There is also cross-linguistic evidence that discourse particles, including clause-initial coordinating conjunctions, tend to be produced correctly by patients suffering from agrammatism (Menn & Obler 1990: 1370), which again supports the impression of some kind of neurofunctional separation of discourse-organisational operators from other function words. Brain lateralisation could therefore be a factor promoting susceptibility to bilingual production errors in some linguistic procedures—those procedures that are more difficult to control in an analytical fashion. Not sur-
prisingly, this involves functions that show greater dependency on non-analytical, right-hemispheric processing.

We might assume that the source of the neurofunctional distinctness of connectors and discourse markers is related to their function as a kind of verbal gesture expressed by the speaker to accompany the organisation of speech at the discourse level, and especially to direct the attention and participation of the hearer. These are elements with which the speaker may be said to reach out to the hearer. McMahon (2005) argues for a primary function of prosody in an evolutionary sense, one that emerged prior to the emergence of language as an analytical faculty. It is noteworthy that prosody, like connectivity, is particularly susceptible to contact-induced change, and to convergence in linguistic areas. Arguably, contact-susceptibility in these domains is linked to instinctive (rather than analytical), gesture-like communicative activities. If there is indeed a right-hemispheric orientation for connectors and discourse markers, as there is for prosody, one would be tempted to assume that monitoring-and-directing functions evolved prior to the emergence of language as a more analytic (and left-hemisphere-oriented) faculty.

The assumption that monitoring-and-directing operations emerged early in the sequence of evolution of communicative functions is not incompatible with Tomasello’s (1999) suggestion that language evolved in response to the emergence in humans of the capacity to ‘identify’ with fellow humans as intentional agents. It is possible that, much like prosody, the gesture-like nature of grammatical elements such as connectors and discourse markers is a residue of the earliest mental ‘tools’ used by human to capture an interlocutor’s attention and to try and influence the course of an interlocutor’s intentions and actions. The interactional aspects of connectivity might therefore belong to the more primitive, more ‘instinct’-driven and less analytical components of human communication; as such, they are more prone to escaping the analytical control of the bilingual who struggles to maintain what is, effectively, a socially constructed demarcation boundary within a repertoire of communicative tools.

Notes

1. Grosjean’s (2001) speaks of ‘language modes’, which involve a cline of different degrees of activation of each language within the bilingual’s repertoire.

2. See Matras (1998) for a discussion of fusion in this sense. Cf. Meisel (1990), who characterises the lack of grammatical separation between languages in Bilingual First Language Acquisition as fusion.

3. The third – unten ‘below’ – reveals that at least part of the utterance was planned in German, and the local expression which serves as a crucial reference point escapes the simultaneous transposition of the original mental plan of the proposition into English. This slip does not escape the speaker’s attention, however, and he pauses to save face, then repairs.
4. See previous footnote, and note German word order patterns in ... were by the custom, the use of the perfect tense, and the lexical composition luggage room < German Kofferraum.

5. But see also Salmons (1990) for a different approach to bilingual discourse markers, one that emphasises the convergence of communicative strategies.


7. Aikhenvald (2002: 182) mistakenly cites this hierarchy in reverse order: "In the hierarchy of borrowing suggested by Matras (1998: 303), the coordinating conjunction 'and' is considered more likely to be borrowed than 'or', and goes on to say that Tariana is a counterexample, since the coordinating conjunction is not borrowed, neither is the Portuguese contrastive conjunction mas borrowed, although Portuguese o 'or' does appear.

8. In Standard Turkish a paratactic construction resembling this structure is possible, but the default embedded clause would be nominal: bil-ir-sin de-mek iste-dig-im-i know-AOR-2SG say-INF want-PAST-PART-1SG-ACC.
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