LOAN TRANSLATIONS AS A LANGUAGE CONTACT PHENOMENON: CROSSING THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN CONTACT LINGUISTICS, SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo,
Päivi Kuusi and Hanna Lantto
University of Eastern Finland

Abstract. This article provides a review of loan translations as a language contact phenomenon from the perspectives of contact linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA) research and translation studies (TS). We discuss both similarities and differences in the ways in which loan translations are conceptualized across these three disciplines. The discussion highlights a common cognitive basis underlying bilingual language use, SLA and translation, while at the same time the prevailing attitudes to loan translations in these disciplines reveal differing underlying ideologies. This study is a contribution towards broadening the scope of language contact studies to cover related disciplines that examine similar phenomena.[1]

---

1. Introduction

Loan translations (or calques) are a well-recognized phenomenon in contact linguistic literature. They are generally defined as „words or phrases that are reproduced as literal translations from one language into another" (Backus, Dorleijn 2009: 75). Examples of loan translations abound in earlier research on language contact effects in bilingual communities, but the process of loan translation may also occur in any context where an individual needs to learn or use another language, such as in classroom-based acquisition of a foreign language and translation. The starting point for the present article is the authors' observation that while loan translations have been studied within the fields of contact linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA) research and translation studies (TS), their findings and theoretical approaches have not yet been systematically brought together. Earlier contact linguistic studies have primarily treated contact-induced features, including loan translations, as a community-level phenomenon, although they essentially originate from the cognitive processes of a bilingual individual (see Weinreich 1974 [1953]: 1, Matras 2009: 3, 5). It is therefore well justified to expand the scope of language contact studies to cover related disciplines that examine language contact effects at the level of an individual, in this case, SLA and TS.

This article provides a review of loan translations as occurring in bilingual language use, SLA and translation. We discuss both similarities and differences emerging from earlier literature on loan translations in these three contexts of language contact. The aim of this article is to enhance the emerging line of dialogue between contact linguistics, SLA and TS, which have long remained separate paradigms (in line with Paulasto *et al.* eds. 2014 and Riionheimo *et al.* eds. 2014). Due to space limitations, this article does not attempt to provide a conclusive summary of the phenomenon; rather it focuses on those aspects of loan translations that connect these three disciplines.

The outline of the article is as follows: Sections 2–4 discuss the notion of loan translations in the fields of contact linguistics, SLA and TS[2], covering historical perspectives and developments, cognitive dimensions and the emerging ideological differences. Each of these sections provides a somewhat different viewpoint of the phenomenon, which reflects differing terminological conventions and underlying ideologies across these three disciplines. Section 5 draws these perspectives together and discusses the benefits of bringing together different disciplines in the study of language contact effects.

2. Loan translations in contact linguistics

Loan translation is an old term originating from the historical linguistics of the early 1900s (see e.g. Weinreich 1974 [1953]: 48–49 and the references therein). The phenomenon is defined as „adhoc word-for-word or morpheme-per-morpheme translations from one language into another" (Aikhenvald 2006: 24) or „a type of interference in which word or sentence structure is transferred without actual morphemes" (Thomason 2001: 260). Two aspects are central here: 1) what is transferred from the model language to the recipient language is the semantic content, not the actual phonological form and 2) the process involves translating, i.e., replacing the words or morphemes of the model language with their equivalents in the recipient language. Loan translation is thus viewed as a covert form of cross-linguistic influence in contrast to overt borrowing of phonological substance. Traditionally, loan translations were described

---

[2]   A note should be made on the differing use of terminology across these disciplines to refer to the languages in contact. Contact linguistics employs a variety of terms, such as *donor* or *model language* (the language giving the influence) and *borrowing* or *recipient* or *replica language* (the language receiving the influence); here we adopt the terms *model* and *recipient* language. SLA generally uses the terms *first language (L1)* to refer to the learner's mother tongue and *second/foreign language (L2)* (also *target language*) for the language the learner is attempting to learn. In TS, the terms *source language* and *target language* are generally used to refer to the language that is being translated from and the language being translated to respectively.

as a type of lexical borrowing (e.g., in the seminal works of Haugen 1972 [1950] and Weinreich 1974 [1953]). The most prototypical examples of loan translations found in earlier literature are compound nouns, but it has been recognized that loan translations may also involve idioms, other phrasal expressions or longer fixed units such as proverbs (e.g. Weinreich 1974 [1953]: 50).

Towards the end of the 20th century, the focus of contact linguistics shifted from narrowly defined (primarily lexical) phenomena onto code-switching and other broader manifestations of cross-linguistic influence. As a consequence, loan translations became largely neglected in contact linguistic discussion (for an overview, see Backus, Dorleijn 2009). Along with the increased interest of language contact research in the structural or grammatical outcomes of contact, however, loan translations have re-emerged under a new disguise, and the notion has been expanded to cover instances of structural influence. The phenomenon of loan translation is embedded in some recent, comprehensive models capturing language contact effects. For example, in the code-copying framework (Johansson 1998, 2002, Verschik 2008), loan translations are placed among code-switching and morphosyntactic influence. The model distinguishes between two basic types of cross-linguistic influence: *global copying*, where material (loanwords and insertional code-switches) is transferred from the model language to the recipient language, and *selective copying*, where the model language expression is copied only partially. There are two subtypes of selective copying that involve phenomena traditionally labelled as loan translations: *semantic copying* (i.e., copying the semantic features of a model code; Verschik 2008: 63) and *combinational copying* (i.e., replication of a word combination, such as a phrasal structure, word-internal morphemic pattern or a morpho-syntactic combination; Johanson 2002: 15). Of special interest to this article is the connection between the code-copying framework and translating; Verschik (2008: 113–114) describes translation as „selective copying par excellence", which

may function as a pathway for semantic copying between the contacting languages.

In another model, Matras and Sakel (2007; see also Matras 2009: 240–243) capture a language processing mechanism which they term *pattern replication*, i.e., a form of cross-linguistic influence in which elements of the recipient language are rearranged in line with the semantic and grammatical patterns of the model language. Pattern replication covers all forms of semantic and structural influence, including loan translation. Matras and Sakel propose the mechanism of *pivot-matching*:

> We suggest that it involves identifying a structure that plays a pivotal role in the model construction, and matching it with a structure in the replica language, to which a similar, pivotal role is assigned in a new, replica construction. […] The replica construction evolves around the new pivot in a way that generally respects various constraints of the replica language. (Matras, Sakel 2007: 830.)

The pivot-matching model allows for subjective and creative decisions by bilingual speakers in the process of selecting and combining the elements of the replica structure, which accounts for the fact that there is not always a neat one-to-one-correspondence between the model construction and the replica construction. This model thus stretches the notion of loan translation to cover instances which are not literal translations of the model structure.

The most detailed approach yet taken to loan translations is provided by Backus and Dorleijn (2009, see also Backus 2010), who discuss the difficulty of defining loan translations and teasing them apart from other contact-induced phenomena such as code-switching, lexical borrowing, semantic extensions and structural or grammatical borrowing. They view loan translation as a synchronic process closely related to both structural interference and (insertional) code-switching. They argue that the process underlying loan translation and structural or grammatical interference is the same

although the items involved may be different; in the case of content words, it is common to use the term *loan translation* whereas non-content words are typically classified under *interference* (Backus 2010: 235–236). Backus and Dorleijn (2009) propose a typology of loan translations based on the specificity of the meaning of the linguistic elements involved: 1) content morphemes (one-word semantic extensions, prototypical two-word expressions and multi-word translations such as phrases), 2) function morphemes, 3) grammatical morphemes and 4) discourse patterns. Thus, Backus and Dorleijn (2009) quite radically expand the boundaries of loan translation as a contact mechanism. Loan translation and code-switching are viewed as related phenomena because they are both motivated by the wish of a bilingual speaker „to say something in a base language in the way it is said in the other language" (Backus, Dorleijn 2009: 90), the difference being that in code-switching the speaker uses overt ingredients from the other language and in loan translation the expression is translated.

The above discussed studies address the process by which loan translations emerge in bilingual speech, and highlight multilingual speakers' creative and innovative potential. The role of the individual is significant in two respects. First, many researchers emphasise that the trigger for loan translation is „bilingual speakers' need to express the same thoughts in two languages" (Sasse 1990: 32, according to Ross 2007: 132; see also Backus, Dorleijn 2009: 90; Backus 2010: 239; Matras, Sakel 2007: 832; Matras 2009: 240–241). Multilingual speakers are seen as creative actors who use their full linguistic repertoire, and loan translations are one manifestation of their innovative agency. Secondly, the process of loan translation is in practice possible only if there are semantically corresponding words or forms in the model language and the replica language (see e.g., Matras, Sakel 2007: 234; Backus, Dorleijn 2009: 90). This correspondence is referred to as an *equivalence*, *translation equivalence* or *interlingual identification* (the latter term originating from Weinreich 1974 [1953]), and the mental or cognitive connections of

bilingual speakers are viewed as subjective and based on perceived equivalents (Johanson 2002: 57, Backus & Dorleijn 2009: 90). This interest in the mental connections and subjective perceptions of the bilingual individual is also shared by SLA research.

3. Loan translations in second language acquisition research

In the field of SLA research, loan translations are treated as a form of lexicosemantic transfer[3] from the learners' L1 into the L2 (e.g., Ringbom 1987, 2007; James 1998; Jarvis 2009). The notion of loan translation has been taken over from contact linguistic literature (e.g., Weinreich 1974 [1953]), and it refers to instances where „semantic properties of one item [are] transferred in a combination of lexical items" (Ringbom 1987: 117). Unlike in language contact literature, where such forms are considered lexical innovations or loan words, in the context of (often classroom based) foreign language acquisition such forms are viewed as errors that break the conventions of the target language. Several works have indeed examined loan translations as a category of lexical errors, along with, e.g., semantic extensions (i.e., extension of meaning based on the semantic range of an L1 word), substitutions (or borrowings; i.e., an L1 word is used in L2 in an unmodified form) and relexifications (or coinages; i.e., L1 word is tailored to the structure of the L2) (e.g., Ringbom 1987, 2007, James 1998, Meriläinen 2010). The following discussion focuses on two recent works, Ringbom (2007) and Jarvis (2009), which are relevant to this article in the sense that they address the nature of transfer underlying loan translations. As SLA research views transfer as an individual-level cognitive phenomenon, these works shed light on the cognitive processes and psycholinguistic variables that explain loan translations as well as other types of lexical non-target forms.

Ringbom (2007) examines the effect of cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning through evidence from

---

[3]   The term *transfer* is used interchangeably with *cross-linguistic influence*.

Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners of English in Finland. His work incorporates loan translations as one category of lexical errors. Ringbom (2007) brings up two important points about loan translations: 1) the type of transfer that underlies them and 2) how they are affected by cross-linguistic similarity. According to Ringbom (2007: 54–58), loan translations are a manifestation of *system transfer*, i.e., the transfer of abstract principles of organizing information, as opposed to *item transfer*, in which learners establish simplified one-to-one relationships between L1 and L2 items (e.g., words, sounds, letters, morphemes). While item transfer requires some degree of formal similarity between the languages, system transfer does not; learners tend to assume that abstract systems (e.g., semantics, pragmatics) are similar in different languages (*perceived* vs. *assumed similarity*, Ringbom 2007: 24–26). What is transferred in the case of loan translations are abstract lexical procedures. Based on extensive evidence from L1 Finnish and L1 Swedish learner populations, Ringbom (1987, 2007) has shown that lexical transfer generally manifests itself in the form of loan translations and semantic extensions when learners' L1 and L2 are typologically distant (Finnish and English), while in the case of related languages (Swedish and English) learners' errors most often involve words that are formally similar but have different meanings or functions in L1 and L2 (system transfer vs. item transfer; for examples, the reader is referred to Ringbom 2007). The source for loan translations is usually the learners' L1 because system transfer requires native-like or very advanced proficiency in the source language (Ringbom 2007: 86–87). Item transfer, on the other hand, may take place from any language that the learner has perceived to be (formally) similar to the target language (e.g., from L2 to L3).

Jarvis (2009) provides a comprehensive account of different types of lexical transfer in the light of current thinking concerning the structure of the bilingual mental lexicon. He differentiates between *lexemic* and *lemmatic* transfer; the former refers to phonological and graphemic L1 influence while the latter encompasses

semantic and syntactic properties of words. This division is based on two distinct levels of lexical entry in the mental lexicon; lexemes (i.e., form-related properties) and lemmas (i.e., semantic and syntactic information) (see Jarvis 2009: 100–102). Lexemic transfer may manifest itself in the form of borrowings, coinages and deceptive cognates, while lemmatic transfer results in semantic extensions, loan translations, collocational transfer and subcategorization transfer (i.e., the choice of a complement to accompany a particular headword). Lemmatic transfer thus covers semantic, collocational, morphological and syntactic constraints on words, which cannot always be strictly separated from one another. As discussed in Jarvis (2009: 114–115), loan translations may involve simple compound words as well as more complex constructions and collocational constraints. This is evident in the phrase *spend cat's days* (lead an easy life), where a Finnish learner has transferred a Finnish idiom (*cat's days*) as well as a collocating word (*spend*) into English (Meriläinen 2010: 125). Loan translations are in essence similar to transferred idioms and other types of transferred fixed expressions in that „what is transferred is a blueprint for organizing multiple forms (words and morphemes) together in specific orders and within specific syntactic constructions in order to allow them to convey a specific intended message“ (Jarvis 2009: 115). This resembles the central idea presented in Backus and Dorleijn (2009) and Backus (2010) according to which loan translations involve not just separate lexical items, but any units that convey a particular meaning. These units may cover lexical items as well as grammatical elements, which are not strictly separated in the L2 speaker's mind (cf. Jarvis 2009).

From the review of earlier literature, it becomes evident that loan translations do not receive as much attention amongst the SLA community as they used to, largely because they tend to be equated with learner errors. Due to a shift of emphasis from error analysis to a more holistic analysis of learner language (see, e.g., Ellis, Barkhuizen 2005), and from grammar-translation oriented teaching methods to communicativeness (see, e.g., Richards, Rogers 2001), errors do

not occupy a very central position in current thinking on language learning and teaching. However, as a natural product of bilingual language use, loan translations deserve more attention in the SLA context. The recent cognitive orientation of SLA research has a great deal to contribute to the study of loan translations in different types of language contact settings. Furthermore, contact linguistic works emphasising the creative mixing of bilingual resources, including loan translating (cf. Matras, Sakel 2007, Matras 2009) resonate with the plurilingual ideology that has recently emerged in the discussion on language education policies and the goals of language teaching. This is evident, for example, in the language education policy guidelines by the Council of Europe (2007), which encourage the acquisition of different languages/varieties to differing degrees, and the flexible use of different communicative resources in different situations, including simultaneous use of different languages/varieties (i.e., code-switching). Instead of errors, loan translations could be approached as an effective foreign language production strategy, which can be employed in certain communicative contexts along with code-switching. The practical application and wider acceptance of these ideas at the classroom level is yet to be seen, but it appears evident that we are moving away from a monolingual norm and from viewing native speaker competence as the implicit target of foreign language learning. This might, sooner or later, change the way loan translations are perceived in the context of SLA.

4. Loan translation in Translation Studies

Perhaps surprisingly, loan translation as an object of research occupies a marginal position in Translation Studies[4]. In most studies on the subject, loan translation is not approached on its own but as one of the local (small-scale) translation strategies, typically used by

---

[4]   In the present article, the discipline of Translation Studies is taken to include Interpreting Studies as well.

professional translators for solving a particular type of translation problem such as realia (culture-bound words), allusions, or terminology (see, for example, Vlahov and Florin 2009 [1980], Leppihalme 1997, Šarčević 1985). These phenomena pose problems for translators because they often lack natural equivalents – equivalents that exist in the target language prior to translating (on natural equivalence, see Pym 2010: 12ff.). Consequently, loan translation is perceived as a lexical phenomenon that produces neologisms in the target language such as *kick sled* in English for the Finnish realia *potkukelkka* (Leppihalme 2011: 129). The need for a neologism serves as a justification for resorting to loan translation: it is considered an accepted translation strategy when there is a lexical gap in the target language (Pym 2010: 14). This means, basically, that what is expected from a professional translator is information retrieval – finding a pre-existing equivalent term – rather than lexical innovation in the form of loan translation. Cabré (2010: 364), for example, suggests limiting the use of neologisms to cases where „all the possibilities of finding a *real* term have been exhausted" (emphasis original).

In a classic treatment by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995 [1958]), translation strategies (or procedures, as Vinay and Darbelnet call them) form a continuum from the most literal to the most free or creative, and loan translation is located at the literal end of this continuum, together with loan words and literal translation (Vinay, Darbelnet 1995 [1958]: 85–86; Pym 2010: 13). The difference between calques and literal translation is not explicitly discussed, but it seems to be one of degree and not of kind: calques are translations of separate elements, whether lexical or structural, whereas literal translation concerns whole sentences (Vinay, Darbelnet 1995 [1958]: 85-88). A similar distinction is displayed in discussions on loan translation and interference. Loan translation is defined, for example, by Leppihalme (2011: 129) as „a word-for-word translation resulting in a target-language neologism", while interference is described in Lamberger-Felber and Schneider (2008: 217) as „a projection of characteristics of the source text into the target text". The reference to

neologisms suggests a lexical approach, while „characteristics of the source text" point to a somewhat broader phenomenon. The distinction, however, is not clear-cut. In studies on interference, the sub-category of lexical interference is often discussed (see, for example, Toury 1985, Franco Aixelá 2009), but mostly with no reference to its relationship with loan translation.

The overlap between the notions of loan translation and interference probably results from the fact that in actual translations, lexical and syntactic source-language influence frequently co-occur. For example, Musacchio (2005) reports on economic articles translated from English into Italian, where the influence of English is present not only in lexical borrowings, but involves loan translation, compound term formation, phraseology, syntactic constructs and the use of cohesive links. Similarly, in Interpreting Studies, Lamberger-Felber and Schneider (2008) find evidence of both lexical and morphosyntactic interference in simultaneous interpreting. The terminological overlap is enhanced by the fact that the terms *calquing* and *interference* have both been used to designate similar phenomena on the level of discourse. Toury (1985: 8) discusses the possibility of interference on the discourse level, pointing out that a translation with no interference on lexical and syntactic levels can still mirror the textual model of the source text. For instance, a translation of a cooking recipe may, on the whole, mirror the source-language rather than the target-language organisation for cooking recipes. Bennett (2011) refers to a similar phenomenon as *calquing* on the level of discourse, claiming that in many non-English-speaking countries scientific discourse does not result from evolution of the domestic discourse system, but has been calqued from the English model (Bennet 2011: 190).

Another distinction between loan translation and interference concerns their intentionality. Loan translations are generally considered deliberate choices on the part of the translator, whereas interference is often perceived as an unintended source-language influence on translation (Chesterman 1997: 94). Typically, this

influence is deemed undesirable, because it is likely to make the translation sound unnatural and compromise fluency (for a short overview of this negative view, see, for example, Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008: 217). However, interference can also result from a translator's conscious choice to opt for a literal translation strategy[5]. Here, the notion of strategy refers to the translator's overall (macro-level) approach to translation, which may be either form-based (literal translation) or meaning-based (free translation)[6]. Form-based translation involves keeping close to both the lexical and the syntactic features of the source text; Maier (2011: 76) describes it as a tendency to „follow the words and the surface syntax of the source text more closely than when working under a meaning-based approach".

Form-based approach to translation is often thought typical of untrained translators or interpreters ('regular' multilinguals) rather than professionals (see Maier 2011: 76–78). However, there is evidence that both novice and expert translators actually resort to form-based, word-for-word translation (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005; Englund-Dimitrova 2005). The difference lies in the fact that professional translators monitor their own performance in order to detect renderings that are not acceptable or appropriate and find other solutions (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005: 407–408), and this kind of monitoring and control is considered an essential part of their competence (PACTE 2003: 58). For a professional translator, literal translation is an intermediary step that helps to distribute cognitive effort during the translation process (Englund-Dimitrova 2005: 234) and a carefully considered strategic choice when employed in the final output

---

[5]   As a manifestation of a deliberate strategy of literal, foreignising translation, interference has its ardent advocates as well, the most prominent in recent years being Lawrence Venuti (1998).

[6]   The dichotomy has been alternately referred to as domesticating vs. foreignising translation, source-language orientated vs. target-language orientated translation, overt vs. covert translation or formal vs. dynamic equivalence, to name just a few. For a more thorough discussion, see Chesterman (1997: 9ff.).

(Maier 2011: 78). For non-professional translators, it seems to be the default tendency (ibid.). In simultaneous interpreting, interference is a frequent phenomenon even in the output of trained professionals (Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008: 232), but this only corroborates the role of monitoring and control in avoiding interference: due to extreme time pressure, there are less possibilities for corrections in interpreting, which makes it especially liable to interference (Lauterbach, Pöchhacker 2015: 194).

This control and monitoring of one's own work is in line with Toury's (2012 [1995]: 313) laws of translational behaviour which suggest that accomplished translators are less prone to interference. However, apart from these cognitive factors, Toury's laws also take into account the whole socio-cultural situation surrounding them. Specifically, interference is predicted to be more common (and better tolerated) in translations made from a dominant, prestigious language into a language that is, in some sense, weaker than the source language (Toury 2012 [1995]: 314). This helps to explain why professional translators are not free from a tendency to calque, despite having been trained to use loan translations sparingly. The socio-cultural tolerance of visible influence from a prestigious language makes loan translation a more accepted strategy in both professional and non-professional translation.

All in all, the attitude towards both loan translation and interference in TS has been largely negative. However, while interference is mostly seen as the translator's failure to keep the source-language and the target-language codes apart, loan translation is generally accepted as a strategic choice in the case of a lexical gap in the target language. For example, in legal translation, translators are often required to maintain formal equivalence, which makes loan translation an appealing option (Harvey 2002: 180). However, even in legal translation, the attitudes have been changing in recent years, with fidelity being re-defined as „achieving an equivalent impact on the target reader" (ibid.). It is precisely this need to get the message

through to ordinary (lay) readers in legal translation that renders loan translation problematic (Šarčević 1985: 130).

In sum, the arguments presented against loan translation in TS are plenty. In both general and special field translation, the risk of producing *faux amis* (false cognates) is often mentioned in relation to loan translation (Vinay, Darbelnet 1995 [1958]: 85, Šarčević 1985: 129). In translating allusions in literary texts, Leppihalme (1997) found loan translation (referred to as *minimum change*) to be a common translation strategy, even though in the case of allusions a word-for-word translation can hardly be expected to get the full meaning across. Loan translation results in „a literal translation, without regard to connotative or contextual meaning“ (Leppihalme 1997: 84), thus leaving something essential untranslated. Perhaps the most striking example of the negative attitude towards loan translation is found in Bennett (2011: 195), who refers to the calquing of English-language model of scientific discourse as „cultural colonization“ and explains it with reference to unequal power relations between cultures (ibid. 199). Bennet's argument brings us back to Toury's law of interference. A form-based approach to translation, including loan translation, is not only a matter of cognitive act: in translations, tolerance of interference is also socio-culturally conditioned (Toury 2012 [1995]: 311).

5. Discussion

This article has attempted to demonstrate that loan translations provide a fertile meeting ground for cross-disciplinary dialogue between contact linguistics, SLA research and TS, and that they are worthy of further empirical research. Based on the preceding review of the literature, it appears evident that loan translations, whether produced by bilingual/multilingual speakers, foreign language learners or translators, are in essence a similar phenomenon with a similar cognitive basis, notwithstanding the considerable dissimilarities between these different groups of language users. Regardless

of the context in which they occur, loan translations are a manifesta-
tion of individual-level cross-linguistic influence and have a similar
underlying motivation; as suggested by Backus and Dorleijn (2009:
90), „the basis of any loan translation is an urge that a bilingual feels,
consciously or not, to say something in a base language in a way
that it is said in the other language". The idea that loan translations
extend beyond lexical units into morphological, syntactic or dis-
course domains receives support across all these three disciplines,
which further highlights their common origin in the bilingual cog-
nitive network, where different levels of language are intertwined
(cf. the notion of lemmatic transfer by Jarvis 2009).

A major difference between these disciplines lies, however, in
the ways in which the innovations resulting from the process of
loan translation are perceived amongst scholars. Contact linguistic
literature treats loan translations in a relatively neutral manner as
one type of linguistic innovation in bilingual communities. In the
context of second language learning and teaching, where native-like
foreign language competence has long been viewed as an implicit
goal, loan translations are considered errors that break target lan-
guage conventions. As the goals set for professional translator train-
ing are even higher, the ability to suppress and control for effects of
cross-linguistic influence, including loan translation, is considered
an integral part of a professional translator's competence. Formal
education, metalinguistic awareness and differing underlying ide-
ologies regarding adequate linguistic competence thus emerge as
differentiating factors between these fields.

Another perspective that we find relevant in the study of loan
translations is that of TS. The term loan translation in itself implies
that their use involves translation from one language into another.
This is also highlighted in Backus (2010: 239), who states that „the
mechanism suggested to underlie all contact-induced change in
which the source of the change is cross-linguistic influence […] is
translation". However, it remains unclear what exactly 'translation'
means in this context. Translation as a mechanism for language

contact has not been given much prominence to date in contact linguistics literature (see, e.g., Kranich *et al.* 2011, Kolehmainen 2013), although it may be a more pervasive phenomenon than previously assumed (Kolehmainen *et al.* 2015). This is where TS has a contribution to make, especially research into non-professional translation (for an overview, see Antonini 2011); translational actions performed by untrained bilingual individuals may be influential in that they provide a channel through which innovations spread from one language or language variety into another. Loan translations are an example of this; although their exact source is often difficult to identify, it is likely that they are often introduced into the language not only by professional translators (whether as strategic choices or as occasional failures to keep the codes apart), but also by ordinary language users who are familiar with another language.

All in all, through this discussion we hope to have demonstrated that loan translations are anything but a marginal phenomenon. We therefore agree with Backus and Dorleijn (2009: 76) who state that the real frequency of loan translations depends on how you define them. The combined perspectives from contact linguistics, SLA and TS support the idea that loan translations form an interlocking system with other language contact effects, which deserve to be examined as a whole and with evidence from neighbouring disciplines.

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic perspective. – Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology. Eds Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–66.

Antonini, Rachele 2011. Natural translator and interpreter. – Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 2. Eds Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins, 102–104.

Backus, Ad; Margreet Dorleijn 2009. Loan translations versus code-switching. – The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching. Eds

Barbara E. Bullock, Almeida Jacqueline Toribio. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 75–93.

Backus, Ad 2010. The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish. – Working Papers in Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education 5, 225–241.

Bennett, Karen 2011. The scientific revolution and its repercussions on the translation of technical discourse. – The Translator 17:2, 189–210.

Cabré, Maria Teresa 2010. Terminology and translation. – Handbook of Translation Studies, Vol. 1. Eds Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 356–365.

Chesterman, Andrew 1997. Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Council of Europe 2007. Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education. Available at: www.coe.int/lang (accessed May 2016)

Ellis, Rod; Gary Barkhuizen 2005. Analysing Learner Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Englund-Dimitrova, Birgitta 2005. Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Franco Aixelá, Javier 2009. An overview of interference in scientific and technical translation. – The Journal of Specialised Translation 11, 75–88.

Harvey, Malcolm 2002. What's so special about legal translation? – Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal 47:2, 177–185.

Haugen, Einar 1972 [1950]. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. – Studies by Einar Haugen. Presented on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, April 19, 1971. Ed. Evelyn S. Firchow. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 161–185.

James, Carl 1998. Errors in Language Learning and Use. New York: Longman.

Jarvis, Scott 2009. Lexical transfer. – The Bilingual Mental Lexicon. Interdisciplinary Approaches. Ed. by Anita Pavlenko. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Johanson, Lars 1998. Frame-changing code-copying in immigrant varieties. – Bilingualism and Migration. Eds Guus Extra, Ludo Verhoeven. London and New York, Routledge, 247–260.

Johanson, Lars 2002. Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts. Richmond: Curzon.

Kolehmainen, Leena 2013. Käännöstiede ja kontaktilingvistiikka kohtaavat [Translation studies and contact linguistics meet]. – Kielten vertailun metodiikka [The methodology of language comparison]. Eds Leena Kolehmainen, Matti Miestamo, Taru Nordlund. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 420–460.

Kolehmainen, Leena; Kaisa Koskinen; Helka Riionheimo 2015. Arjen näkymätön kääntäminen. Translatorisen toiminnan jatkumot. [Invisible everyday translation: the continuums of translatorial action]. – Virittäjä 3/2015, 372–400.

Kranich, Svenja; Viktor Becher; Steffen Höder 2011. A tentative typology of translation-induced language change. – Multilingual Discourse Production. Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives. Eds Svenja Kranich, Viktor Becher, Steffen Höder, Juliane House. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 11–43.

Lamberger-Felber, Heike; Julia Schneider 2008. Linguistic interference in simultaneous interpreting with text: A case study. – Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research. A Tribute to Daniel Gile. Eds Gyde Hansen, Andrew Chesterman, Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 215–236.

Lauterbach, Eike; Franz Pöchhacker 2015. Interference. – Routledge Encyclopaedia of Interpreting Studies. Ed. Franz Pöchhacker. New York: Routledge, 194–195.

Leppihalme, Ritva 1997. Culture Bumps. An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions. Topics in Translation 10. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Leppihalme, Ritva 2011. Realia. – Handbook of Translation Studies. Eds Luc van Doorslaer, Yves Gambier. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 126–130.

Maier, Robert M. 2011. Towards a psycholinguistic model of translation processes: Directionality in natural translation. – Interpreting Naturally: A Tribute to Brian Harris. Eds María Jesús Blasco Mayor, María Amparo Jimenez Ivars. Bern: Peter Lang, 67–102.

Matras, Yaron 2009. Language Contact. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron; Jeanette Sakel 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. – Studies in Language 31:4, 829–865.

Meriläinen, Lea 2010. Language transfer in the written English of Finnish students. Publications of the University of Eastern Finland. Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology, no 9. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland. Available at: http://epublications.uef.fi/pub/urn_isbn_978-952-61-0230-6/

Musacchio, Maria Teresa 2005. The influence of English on Italian: The case of translations of economic articles. – In and Out of English: For Better, for Worse. Eds Gunilla M. Anderman, Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 71–96.

PACTE 2003. Building a translation competence model. – Triangulating Translation. Perspectives in Process-Oriented Research. Ed. Fabio Alves. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 43–66.

Paulasto, Heli; Lea Meriläinen; Helka Riionheimo; Maria Kok (eds) 2014. Language Contacts at the Crossroads of Disciplines. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Pym, Anthony 2010. Exploring Translation Theories. London: Routledge.

Richards, Jack C.; Theodore S. Rodgers 2001. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riionheimo, Helka; Minna Kumpulainen; Lea Meriläinen; Pirkko Muikku-Werner (eds) 2014. Virittäjä 3/2014. Special issue: Kielikontaktit tutkimussuuntausten risteyksessä [Language contacts at the crossroads of disciplines].

Ringbom, Håkan 1987. The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ringbom, Håkan 2007. Cross-linguisitic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ross, Malcolm 2007. Calquing and metatypy. – Journal of language contact – THELMA 1, 116–143.

Šarčević, Susan 1985. Translation of culture-bound terms in laws. – Multilingua 4–3, 127–133.

Sasse, Hans-Jurgen 1990. Language decay and contact-induced change: similarities and differences. – Arbeitspapier (Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität zu Köln) 12 (Neue Folge), 30–56.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. Language Contact: An Introduction. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja 2005. The monitor model revisited: Evidence from process research. – Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal 50:2, 405–414.

Toury, Gideon 1985. Aspects of translating into minority languages from the point of view of translation studies. – Multilingua 4, 3–10.

Toury, Gideon 2012 [1995]. Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond. Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence 1998. The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference. London and New York: Routledge.

Verschik, Anna 2008. Emerging Bilingual Speech – from Monolingualism to Code-copying. London: Continuum.

Vinay, Jean-Paul; Darbelnet, Jean 1995 [1958]. Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. Translated into English by Juan C. Sager & M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vlahov, Sergei; Florin, Sider 2006 [1969]. Neperevodimoe v perevode [Untranslatable in Translation]. Moscow: Valent.

Weinreich, Uriel 1974 [1953]. Languages in contact: Findings and problems. The Hague: Mouton.