

12. Pragmatics

- 1. Pragmatics of language contact
- 2. Conceptualizing language contact
- 3. New directions
- 4. Challenges for future research
- 5. References

1. Pragmatics of language contact

This chapter aims to depict the pragmatics of language contact as a field that is characterized both by intradisciplinary diversity and interdisciplinary convergence. Pragmatics is most often defined as studying language in use (e.g. communicative functions) and the contexts in which it is used; that is, the study of the adaptability of language to social and cultural ecologies (Verschueren 1987). Originally emerging as a branch of semiotics (Morris 1938), and forming a disciplinary triad with syntax and semantics, pragmatics might rather be considered as offering a particular perspective on many of the same objects that syntacticians, semanticists, psycholinguists, phonologists, and/or morphologists approach in their research (Verschueren 1987). As the literature referred to in this chapter will suggest, by foregrounding language use in context with reference to language contact, pragmatics has a close, dialectical relationship with sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology/ethnography on the one hand, and with psycholinguistics on the other. Current pragmatics research further confirms that the epistemological distinction between linguistic-philosophical pragmatics (e.g. interlanguage pragmatics, cross-linguistic pragmatics), sociocultural-interactional pragmatics (e.g. sociopragmatics), as well as the more recently emerging intercultural pragmatics (e.g. intercultural politeness) set out by Horn and Kecske (2013), also holds true for the pragmatics of language contact. Horn and Kecske (2013: 353) define these traditions as follows:

Linguistic-philosophical pragmatics seeks to investigate speaker meaning within an utterance-based framework focusing mainly on linguistic constraints on language use. Socio-cultural interactional pragmatics maintains that pragmatics should include research into social and cultural constraints on language use as well. The link between classical philosophically-oriented pragmatics and research in intercultural and inter-language communication has led to the development of intercultural pragmatics, focusing on the roles and functions of language and communication within a world-wide communication network. Intercultural pragmatics attempts to combine the two traditions into one explanatory system that focuses special attention on characteristics of intercultural interaction.

Thus, a major difference between linguistic-philosophical pragmatics and other approaches is the examination of not just the individual utterance, but discourse and interaction.

This chapter is structured into four sections. After this section, section 2 will take issue with the ontological question of how language contact in diverse strands of pragmatics research has been conceptualized, and trace the foundational influences of these strands. Section 3 will discuss emerging directions in pragmatics scholarship. The chapter concludes with some of the current challenges in the pragmatics of language contact. While aiming to be inclusive throughout, sociocultural-interactional and intercultural

epistemologies are foregrounded in the latter two sections, as necessitated by the selective nature of the discussion.

2. Conceptualizing language contact

Schiffrin's (1996) discussion on the pragmatics of language contact focused on three discursive features – codeswitching, contextualization cues, and speech acts – used by socially and culturally heterogeneous groups. Although these aspects remain relevant more than three decades on, and would in themselves be deserving of a thorough review, researchers nowadays contribute to the pragmatics of language contact, responding to multifarious issues and from diverse paradigms. Thus, some of the conceptualizations of 'language' and of 'contact' emerging from recent research are discussed briefly in this section. We take a bottom-up approach to the question of how language contact is treated empirically in pragmatics, and in how it falls within certain 'classic' traditions. While the research has been grouped into four broad perspectives, these are not meant to be bounded categories, and some of the studies approach language contact in intersecting ways.

In a significant number of studies, *named languages are brought into contact by researchers*, in the sense that features of communication in language X are contrasted with features of communication in language Y. This is especially the case in subfields such as intercultural pragmatics or cross-linguistic pragmatics. For example, Lorenzo-Dus and Bou-Franch (2013) studied a corpus of impromptu, monolingual e-mails by speakers of either Peninsular Spanish or British English. Their results show complex, fluctuating patterns in levels of (in)formality and (in)directness, which they related to cross-cultural variation in the way that different sociopragmatic principles found expression in computer-mediated communication. Zufferey, Mak, and Sanders (2015) investigated the acquisition of objective and subjective causal relations in monolingual French- and monolingual Dutch-speaking children from age five to eight on the same comprehension task. Their findings show that French- and Dutch-speaking children have a similar ability to handle the linguistic features studied, thereby refuting arguments of linguistic determinism on acquisition. In both of these studies, the languages/varieties in question (Peninsular Spanish and British English; French and Dutch) were brought into contact by researchers through the design of the studies, rather than being a feature of a particular individual's or social collective's repertoires. Many of the studies that conceptualize language contact in this way have their foundations in contrastive linguistics, represented in the early work of scholars such as Lado (1957), and also find illustrious precedents in some of Clyne's (1987) early work on written texts.

In a similarly large number of studies, *language contact is studied as a phenomenon at the level of individual speakers' repertoires*. This is the case in much research on intercultural and interlanguage pragmatics, including intercultural politeness. For example, Safont-Jordà (2013) conducted a longitudinal study of the early stages of trilingual pragmatic development, focusing on requests in Catalan, Spanish, and English. The research highlighted how the introduction of a third language (i.e. English) in a young boy's already bilingual (i.e. Catalan and Spanish) repertoire prompted the use of conventionally indirect request forms in the three languages. Gassner (2012) compared how L1

Australian English speakers, and L2 English speakers who had migrated to Australia from different South-American, European, and/or Asian countries, used the word *thing* in an oral corpus of job interviews, concluding that the L2 speakers were more vague in their speech. Parvaresh (2015) responded to this study by using a corpus of speech by L1 Persian and L2 English speakers to show how vagueness is equally a feature of L1 and L2 repertoires. Mugford (2013) used questionnaires and interviews with female French and German learners of Spanish in Mexico to examine their use of *güey*, a seemingly impolite word used in an inoffensive way, finding that they failed to use it for the whole spectrum of its functions. Dewaele (2016) demonstrated that speakers who acquire English later in life generally overestimate the offensiveness of certain emotion-laden words, are less sure about their meaning, and tend to use them less frequently as compared to L1 English speakers. However, the more contact they have with monolinguals, the more the L2 speakers' use converges with that of L1 speakers. Most of these studies focus on how users of multiple languages use the pragmatic features of them, hinting at how transfer takes place across the languages in their repertoire. A significant body of this research understanding language contact in this way has a basis in classic work on interlanguage (Selinker 1972; Weinreich 1953).

In a third set of studies, especially those within sociopragmatics, *language contact is explored in terms of communicative encounters in everyday contexts of linguistic and cultural diversity*. This research often has foundations in early work on code choice and codeswitching (Gumperz 1982; Myers-Scotton 1993; Poplack 1980), in microsociological work on aspects such as politeness (Goffman 1959), and in discourse analytic approaches to intercultural pragmatics (Tannen 2005), among other influences. For example, Ifukor (2011) studied language use in Nigerian online forums, claiming that linguistic diversity is particularly of interest in computer-mediated communication due to the dominance of English in this medium. The researcher showed how the informality of internet discussions allows significant insights into 'linguistic eclecticism', language contact, and codeswitching to be gathered, as characteristics of vernacular talk and internet multilingualism in unregulated spaces. Albirini (2014) looked at code-switching in spontaneous speech, at weddings, and in interviews, by speakers of three varieties of Arabic in Syria: a standard variety, an urban variety, and a Bedouin variety, drawing on Bourdieu's theory of social capital. The author concludes that use of one variety or another is sociopragmatic, in that switching can serve functions such as indexing identities, helping to develop intra-tribal connections, and facilitating access to workplace relationships. Androutsopoulos (2014) studied entextualization and linguistic repertoires in social networking, and specifically showed how young Greek-German Facebook users mobilized languages (e.g. German, Greek, and English) to entextualize different events. He argues that language choice in this online space was connected to sociodemographic characteristics of the users, as well as transnational trajectories (e.g. travelling to Greece). The public space of social networking thus provided participants with novel opportunities to display language use in relation to mobility, be it a new language encountered or one hidden in a user's repertoire. These studies, therefore, all involve naturally-occurring interactions in different social settings in which the use of more than one language or variety emerges amongst speakers with heterogeneous repertoires.

Lastly, in a smaller set of studies, *language contact is conceptualized in terms of encounters between modes, media, genres, registers, etc.*, thereby offering an expanded

perspective on what language is by incorporating recent advances in the study of multimodality (Kress 2009; Kress and van Leeuwen 2001). For example, Tseng (2016) took a sociopragmatic and discourse analytic approach to examine advertisements in Taiwan, which are predominantly in Chinese, although some English words might be used in the product title, text, and/or picture(s). The analysis showed how multiple meanings are created in a multilingual context: using more than one language enriches meaning-making and contributes to consolidating the creative force of the product discourse. Sambre and Feyaerts (2017), in their study on a trumpet master class, highlight the interplay between gesture, speech, playing instruments, and the presence of material objects for the achievement of musical interpretation. Their research points clearly at the combination of modes by taking into account the embodied experience of subjects in relation to their surroundings. Chiluwa and Ajiboye (2016) adopted a discourse-pragmatic approach to examine the various ways youths construct themselves, their group identities, and their environment and socio-economic aspirations by using T-shirt messages and slogans at two educational institutions in Nigeria. The messages on the T-shirts, which are mainly in Nigerian English, combine features of spoken and written communication, including text message language, and some Nigerian Pidgin. Similar to the previous set of studies, this research deals with language use in contexts of diversity, concentrating on how meaning is created in relation to localities shaped by the social presence of varied linguistic repertoires.

3. New directions

The origins of language contact as a field of inquiry are often traced to scholars such as Haugen (1953), Weinreich (1953), Ferguson (1959), or Fishman (1967). While pioneering an emerging discipline, these early scholars also implicitly supported a view of languages as used in separate domains. The different languages known by multilingual individuals were often described as employed for doing different things, with different interlocutors, keeping less dominant linguistic resources for the more private domains of life, and prestigious, standard languages for more public ones (i.e. diglossia). Such conceptualizations have been challenged in recent research, so much so that scholars such as Jaspers and Madsen (2016: 236) have even proposed that “what we know today as a standard language is an idea that has depended on assiduously separating language from nature and society before associating it with civilisation, progress, and later with national, supposedly organic communities”. However, these ideas fit well with the understanding at the time in structural linguistics (e.g. Lado 1957), which continues to persist in much scholarship today: that languages could be compared in order to predict sources of cross-linguistic transfer by learners in order to avoid them, and to keep languages bounded.

A number of studies have started to engage with pragmatics in a way that sees language contact differently. In particular, some research has taken up the call voiced by an increasing number of scholars for studying language use from a perspective that considers that “named languages are social constructs and not lexical or structural ones” (Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015: 287). Indeed languages are increasingly conceptualized in terms of “entities without names, as sets of lexical and structural features that

make up an individual's repertoire and are deployed to enable communication" (Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015: 286). These are ideas that are not new, having previously been raised by scholars such as Alvarez-Caccamo (1998), Gafaranga (2000), or Heller (2002), and are traceable in the work of Hymes (1972); however, they have found new impetus in recent years. This shift is in keeping with much psycholinguistics research that has stressed the relevance of re-thinking the conventional separation between different linguistic subsystems in the brain in favor of an integrated system of multi-competence (Cook and Wei 2016).

Numerous terms have been proposed recently in disciplines concerned with the social use of language to describe communicative practices that draw on whole repertoires in an expansive way. These include 'languaging' (Becker 1995), 'plurilingual practices' (Lüdi and Py 2009), 'translanguaging' (García 2009), 'codemeshing' (Canagarajah 2011), 'metrolingualism' (Otsuji and Pennycook 2010), and 'polylingualism' (Jørgensen 2008), as well as the multi-competence approach already mentioned, first put forward by Cook (1991). Many of these terms at present are beginning to find representation in pragmatics research. Of them, translanguaging, or "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages" (Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015: 283) is gaining significant acceptance by researchers from an array of disciplines concerned with the social use of language. The notion includes codeswitching, the focus of much pragmatics research until now, but it also goes beyond it. It refers not only to fluid practices that go between and beyond national and state languages, but also to those that go between and beyond visual, aural, embodied, and spatial modalities. Interestingly, although translanguaging is just starting to find its place in pragmatics, Wei's (2011) seminal article on translanguaging was published in the *Journal of Pragmatics*, thereby speaking directly to research on the pragmatics of language contact, and suggesting the breadth of theories that feed into pragmatics.

Recent research in a Polish shop in East London (Hua, Wei, and Lyons 2017) has shown the applicability of translanguaging to the analysis of interactions in space, as well as the complex practices that are integral parts of the communication in the shop itself. These include gestures, gazes, and movement, but also the display and arrangements of signs and objects. Similarly, Lou (2017) was able to integrate the analysis of verbal interaction with a range of other modes through what she called a 'geosemiotic' analysis, showing how different Hong Kong markets display, and allow individuals to use, various forms of semiotic resources. Similar interests have also driven Pennycook and Otsuji (2017) to conceptualize semiotic assemblages, and other scholars (Izadi 2017; Karrebæk 2017; Kusters 2017; Williams 2017) to approach markets so that semiotic resources, rather than linguistic units, are brought to the fore as agentive in communication. This is in line with the view put forward by Wei (2018: 26) as follows:

We know for a fact that the labelling of languages is largely arbitrary and can be politically and ideologically charged, and there is often a close relationship between the identity of a language and the nation-state. But in everyday social interaction, language users move dynamically between the so-called languages, language varieties, styles, registers, and writing systems, to fulfil a variety of strategic and communicative functions. The alternation between languages, spoken, written, or signed; between language varieties; and between speech, writing, and signing, is a very common feature of human social interaction. It constructs an identity for the speaker that is different from a La identity or a Lb identity. More-

over, language users use semiotic resources, gesture, facial expression, etc., in conjunction with language to communicate with each other. From a Translanguaging perspective, asking simply which language is being used becomes an uninteresting and insignificant question.

Even if we consider recent studies that do not take these novel perspectives into account explicitly, we can see that the range of linguistic elements brought into the analysis of interactions is increasingly multi-layered. This is, for instance, the case in a study by Okada (2015), which used Conversation Analysis (CA) to analyze audio-recorded job interviews for a student assistant position in English classes at a Japanese university, part of which was conducted in the named languages, English and Japanese. The author analyzed the data in English, which included some Japanese features. Yet rather than focusing on the juxtaposition of English and Japanese in what might be defined as insertional codeswitching (Auer 1999), the author centered the analysis on how different communicative moves, including different lexical features of speakers' repertoires, contributed to building rapport through sequentially linked joke-serious responses. In Italy, Baraldi (2018) showed that a Nigerian interpreter in a migration support center not only translates and helps with mutual understanding, but also plays a major role in reducing cultural distance. Furthermore, it is the interaction between the migrant, the social worker, and the interpreter that contributes to the articulation of problems as they progressively emerge in multilingual encounters. In Australia, Hlavac (2014) studied the participation roles of a language broker and the discourse of brokering among Macedonians in Australia. He showed how language brokers assumed the roles of animators, authors, and principals, following Goffman (1981), in communicating between languages; they do not simply translate passively (animators) or put together the pieces (authors), but also state beliefs, positions, etc., using the first person (principal). Such fluid language use is arguably more complex than codeswitching or translation, and appears to require new descriptive terms. Studies such as these show how the tools of pragmatics can shed light on meaning-in-interaction when resources are managed simultaneously in context.

These resources may well go above and beyond the tools that speakers employ in face-to-face interaction. As Androutsopoulos (2013) points out, digitally-mediated interaction means that languages are coming into contact in written as well as spoken modalities like never before, although research in this area is still comparatively scarce. There are several exceptions to this in recent pragmatics research mentioned in the previous section, including Ifukor (2011) and Androutsopoulos (2014). The complexity of handling interactional data that is both multilingual and multimodal was also highlighted recently by Egbert, Yufu, and Hirata (2016). Recent contributions to pragmatics by authors including Broth and Mondada (2013), who study video recordings of guided tours in French, Swedish, and English, or Ticca and Traverso (2017), who examine video recorded encounters in which French mediators offer assistance to migrants for social, legal, and health matters, provide methodological ways forward for handling complex embodied interactional data. The special issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* edited by Mondada (2014) is also insightful in this regard. Social-semiotic approaches to multimodality, represented in recent pragmatics work by authors including Moya Guijarro (2011), also offer potential for understanding linguistic diversity as it emerges in visual modes.

4. Challenges for future research

The scenario that researchers have to handle is a complex one, where language use is not only hard to interpret because it encompasses a range of manifestations that have not been taken into account before, but also because these manifestations question the way in which we see language contact as a whole. If we follow a perspective whereby language contact is fully embedded in language use in all its forms, then the way in which we conceptualize contact when undertaking pragmatics research needs to be revisited. As we have seen in the previous sections, scholars from various traditions have approached contact differently, and have succeeded in showing that language use does vary across contexts and that communicative norms play a role in shaping the way in which communication is organized and achieves its goals. As Gafaranga (2017) argues, now that the linguistic behavior that bilinguals display is being liberated from its old, negative connotations, we need to move forward in the study of the interactional practices it involves.

Researchers from a range of disciplines within and beyond linguistics use the term ‘superdiversity’, coined by Vertovec (2007), to refer to the linguistic and cultural diversity of 21st century urban contexts. The term, which is not without controversy (e.g. Reyes 2014), has been useful for framing linguistic intricacies that include historical diversities, the results of demographic mobility (e.g. refugees and asylum seekers, labor migration, tourism, and/or international education), and transformations in the way we communicate brought about by digital technologies (Appadurai 1996; Blommaert 2010; Blommaert and Rampton 2011; Castells 1996). Being theorized as a form a renovation as opposed to a total reinvention (Arnaut et al. 2015), superdiversity, for linguistics, means focusing on the sheer complexity of communication as it unfolds at this historical juncture.

In pragmatics research, scale theory has been proposed as a possible model to look at the relationship between linguistic phenomena and social structures (Blommaert 2007), in a bid to investigate language while considering that different individuals have uneven access to linguistic resources, and that the way they mobilize them is influenced by higher power dynamics. These are now being reshaped, as mobility is being integrated in the very concept of context, and the distinction between context and text becomes increasingly problematic (Blommaert 2017b; Canagarajah 2017). If context is not simply something that contains and supports communication, but plays a much more active role, then indeed its reconceptualization is imperative in pragmatics research. Such a reconsideration calls for both spatial and chronological depth (e.g. Blommaert 2017a), as well as a rethinking of the ways in which language contact can be framed to account for its interdependencies with human mobility, or lack thereof.

Focusing on these complexities is indeed related to the understanding of the actual relationship between what happens at the micro-level of communication, and the larger phenomena at the societal level that have an impact on how language takes shape. In other words, continuing to recombine and problematize ‘micro-’ and ‘macro-’ aspects (Blommaert 2017a; Lo and Park 2017) is a key challenge that the study of language faces, and that scholars will have to address in years to come. This is in line with a view of multilingualism that sees conversational dynamics in co-production with larger systems and structures, where the resources speakers use are both connected to, and possibly transcend, situations of mobility (Rampton 2011). Further taking up this challenge could effectively mean that the mobility that linguistic resources are embedded into, and the

subsequent contact that occurs among them, will have to be considered as critical factors for an appreciation of their functions in society. In this sense, contact, rather than constituting a point of encounter among well-segmented resources, would be seen as part and parcel of how individuals use language as they do the work of meaning-making.

5. References

Albirini, Abdulkafi
 2014 The socio-pragmatics of dialectal codeswitching by the Al-‘Keidaat Bedouin speakers. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 11(1). 121–147.

Alvarez-Caccamo, Celso
 1998 From ‘switching code’ to ‘code-switching’: Towards a reconceptualization of communicative codes. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 29–48. London: Routledge.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis
 2013 Code-switching in computer-mediated communication. In Susan Herring, Dieter Stein & Tuja Virtanen (eds.), *Pragmatics of computer mediated communication*, 667–694. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis
 2014 Moments of sharing: Entextualization and linguistic repertoires in social networking. *Journal of Pragmatics* 73. 4–18.

Appadurai, Arjun
 1996 *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arnaut, Karel, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton & Massimiliano Spotti
 2015 Introduction: Superdiversity and sociolinguistics. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 130. 1–17.

Auer, Peter
 1999 From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4). 309–332.

Baraldi, Claudio
 2018 Interpreting as mediation of migrants’ agency and institutional support: A case analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 125. 13–27.

Becker, Alton L.
 1995 *Beyond translation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Blommaert, Jan
 2007 Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4(1). 1–19.

Blommaert, Jan
 2010 *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan
 2017a Chronotopes, scales and complexity in the study of language in society. In Karel Arnaut, Martha Sif Karrebæk, Massimiliano Spotti & Jan Blommaert (eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: Recombining spaces, times and language practices*, 47–64. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Blommaert, Jan
 2017b Commentary: Mobility, contexts, and the chronotope. *Language in Society* 46(1). 95–99.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton
 2011 Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2). 1–22.

Broth, Mathias & Lorenza Mondada
2013 Walking away: The embodied achievement of activity closings in mobile interaction.
Journal of Pragmatics 47(1). 41–58.

Canagarajah, Suresh
2011 Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging.
The Modern Language Journal 95(3). 401–417.

Canagarajah, Suresh
2017 Introduction. In Suresh Canagarajah (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of migration and language*, 1–28. New York: Routledge.

Castells, Manuel
1996 *The rise of the network society, the information age: Economy, society and culture*, vol. I. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Chiluwa, Innocent & Esther Ajiboye
2016 Discursive pragmatics of T-shirt inscriptions: Constructing the self, context and social aspirations. *Pragmatics and Society* 7(3). 436–462.

Clyne, Michael
1987 Cultural differences in the organisation of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11. 211–247.

Cook, Vivian
1991 The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research* 7(2). 103–117.

Cook, Vivian & Li Wei
2016 *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewaele, Jean-Marc
2016 Thirty shades of offensiveness: L1 and LX English users' understanding, perception, and self-reported use of negative emotion-laden words. *Journal of Pragmatics* 94. 112–127.

Egbert, Maria, Mamiko Yufu & Fumiya Hirataka
2016 An investigation of how 100 articles in the Journal of Pragmatics treat transcripts of English and non-English languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 94. 98–111.

Ferguson, Charles F.
1959 Diglossia. *Word* 15(2). 325–340.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1967 Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2). 29–38.

Gafaranga, Joseph
2000 Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(3). 327–350.

Gafaranga, Joseph
2017 *Bilingualism as interactional practices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

García, Ofelia
2009 *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gassner, Denise
2012 Vague language that is rarely vague: A case study of “thing” in L1 and L2 discourse. *International Review of Pragmatics* 4. 3–28.

Goffman, Erving
1959 *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving
1981 *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Gumperz, John Joseph
1982 *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, Einar Ingvald
 1953 *The Norwegian language in America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Heller, Monica
 2002 *Éléments d'une sociolinguistique critique*. Paris: Didier.

Hlavac, Jim
 2014 Participation roles of a language broker and the discourse of brokering: An analysis of English-Macedonian interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 70. 52–67.

Horn, Laurence & Istvan Kecske
 2013 Pragmatics, discourse and cognition. In Stephen Anderson, Jacques Moeschler & Fabienne Reboul (eds.), *The language-cognition interface. Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Linguists*, 353–373. Geneva: Droz.

Hua, Zhu, Li Wei, & Agnieszka Lyons
 2017 Polish shop(ping) as translanguaging space. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 411–433.

Hymes, Dell
 1972 Models of interaction of language and social life. In John J. Gumperz & Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, 35–71. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Ifukor, Presley
 2011 Linguistic marketing in “...a marketplace of ideas”. *Pragmatics and Society* 2(1). 109–147.

Izadi, Dariush
 2017 Semiotic resources and mediational tools in Merrylands, Sydney, Australia: The case of Persian and Afghan shops. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 595–512.

Jaspers, Jürgen & Lian Malai Madsen
 2016 Sociolinguistics in a languagised world: Introduction. *Applied Linguistics Review* 7(3). 235–258.

Jørgensen, J. Normann
 2008 Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3). 161–176.

Karrebæk, Martha Sif
 2017 Thai veggies and hair removal products: Space, objects and language in an urban green-grocery. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 451–473.

Kress, Gunter
 2009 *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther & Theo van Leeuwen
 2001 *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. London: Arnold.

Kusters, Annelies
 2017 “Our hands must be connected”: Visible gestures, tactile gestures, and objects in interactions featuring a deafblind customer in Mumbai. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 394–410.

Lado, Robert
 1957 *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

Lo, Adrianne & Joseph Park
 2017 Metapragmatics of mobility. *Language in Society* 46(1). 1–4.

Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria & Patricia Bou-Franch
 2013 A cross-cultural investigation of email communication in Peninsular Spanish and British English: The role of (in)formality and (in)directness. *Pragmatics and Society* 4(1). 1–25.

Lou, Jackie Jia
 2017 Spaces of consumption and senses of place: A geosemiotic analysis of three markets in Hong Kong. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 513–531.

Lüdi, Georges & Bernard Py
2009 To be or not to be ... a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6(2). 154–167.

Mondada, Lorenza (ed.)
2014 A body of resources: CA studies of social conduct. [Special issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics* 65.

Morris, Charles
1938 *Foundations of the theory of signs. International encyclopaedia of unified science*, vol. 1, no. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moya Guijarro, Arsenio Jesús
2011 Engaging readers through language and pictures: A case study. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(12). 2982–2991.

Mugford, Gerrard
2013 Foreign-language users confronting anti-normative politeness in a Mexican university. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 10(1). 101–130.

Myers-Scotton, Carol
1993 *Social motivations for code-switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Okada, Yusuke
2015 Building rapport through sequentially linked joke-serious responses in second language job interviews. *Pragmatics and Society* 6(4). 593–614.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid
2015 Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(3). 281–307.

Otsuji, Emi & Alistair Pennycook
2010 Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7(3). 240–254.

Parvaresh, Vahid
2015 Vague language that is vague in both L1 and L2: A comment on Gassner (2012). *International Review of Pragmatics* 7(1). 129–143

Pennycook, Alastair & Emi Otsuji
2017 Fish, phone cards and semiotic assemblages in two Bangladeshi shops in Sydney and Tokyo. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 434–450.

Poplack, Shana
1980 “Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español”: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7–8). 581–618.

Rampton, Ben
2011 Style contrasts, migration and social class. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 1236–1250.

Reyes, Angela
2014 Linguistic anthropology in 2013: Super-new-big. *American Anthropologist* 116(2). 366–378.

Safont-Jordà, Maria-Pilar
2013 Early stages of trilingual pragmatic development: A longitudinal study of requests in Catalan, Spanish, and English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 59. 68–80.

Sambre, Paul & Kurt Feyaerts
2017 Embodied musical meaning-making, and multimodal viewpoints in a trumpet master class. *Journal of Pragmatics* 122. 10–23.

Schiffrin, Deborah
1996 Discourse analysis and pragmatics. In Hans Goebel, Peter H. Nelde, Zdenek Stary & Wolfgang Wölck (eds.), *Kontaktinguistik / Contact Linguistics / Linguistique de contact: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung / An International*

Handbook of Contemporary Research / Manuel international des recherches contemporaines, 138–144. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Selinker, Larry
1972 Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10(3). 209–241.

Tannen, Deborah
2005 *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ticca, Anna Claudia & Véronique Traverso
2017 Participation in bilingual interactions: Translating, interpreting and mediating documents in a French social centre. *Journal of Pragmatics* 107. 129–146.

Tseng, Ming-Yu
2016 Towards a pragmatic analysis of product discourse: Creative force and metapragmatic performance. *Pragmatics and Society* 7(1). 105–140.

Verschueren, Jef
1987 Pragmatics as theory of linguistic adaptation (IPRA working document 1). Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.

Vertovec, Steven
2007 Superdiversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6). 1024–1054.

Wei, Li
2011 Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5). 1222–1235.

Wei, Li
2018 Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1). 9–30.

Weinreich, Uriel
1953 *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Williams, Quentin
2017 Bark, smoke, and pray: Multilingual Rastafarian-herb sellers in a busy subway. *Social Semiotics* 7(4). 474–494.

Zufferey, Sandrine, Willem M. Mak & Ted J. M. Sanders
2015 A cross-linguistic perspective on the acquisition of causal connectives and relations. *International Review of Pragmatics* 7. 22–39.

Emilee Moore, Barcelona (Spain)
Marco Santello, Leeds (UK)

13. Borrowing

1. Definitions
2. Types of borrowing
3. Motivations for borrowing
4. Structural integration
5. Constraints on borrowing
6. References

1. Definitions

The term ‘borrowing’ has been widely used in linguistic literature since the works of Haugen (1950) and Weinreich (1953) to refer to the adoption of a structure from one