CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL REVIEW ON
SOCIOLINGUISTIC PROCESS OF
LANGUAGE CONTACT

2.0 LANGUAGE IN CONTACT

When speakers of different languages interact closely, it is natural for their languages to influence each other. Language contact can occur at boarders of different linguistic or dialect area or as the result of migration and cultural contacts. Benjamin (2005) reports that “the cultural contact can be occurred either directly through the personal contact of the speakers of these languages or indirectly through the media or literature. The common outcome of direct and indirect cultural contact is the diffusion of cultural items across linguistic boundaries. One clear manifestation of this cultural diffusion is the emergence of new lexical items in a recipient language”. These new lexical items are imitations of forms or pattern in the donor language and they can be manifested as phonetic or semantic adaptations.

As Bakker (2010) views “change as a result of contact may be often unidirectional. In the favourable socio-cultural situations, language contact may lead to multidirectional outcomes including mutual exchange of linguistic items, although these exchanges are likely to be limited to a particular geographic region or at certain linguistic level. The language
mixing patterns offers evidences for the process of integration between two social groups that might have come about historically”. To explore the historical, sociological and linguistic pattern of borrowing and hybridization of the languages, the sociolinguistic data are to be brought in alongside of linguistic data.

The studies on the linguistic processes in the phenomenon of language contact had been limited in the evaluation of loan words or word borrowing at the initial stages of the development of contact linguistics. These traditional studies have been focused just on explaining the linguistic items that have been loaned, and rarely on in which way have the loans items come about. The traditional investigations often failed to explain why the mixing and borrowing have been occurred, which is an equally important enquiry to be explained in socio historical context.

Benjamin (2005) opined that “many scholars in the field of contact linguistics emphasized that the study of loan-words is concerned only with phonetically adapted lexical items, to the exclusion of semantically adapted items, which, according to them, should simply be seen as new lexical items in the language resulting from ‘influence’ by items from another language”. He termed this approach as the Narrow Approach to lexical importation.

Some other scholars have argued with a broad perspective engaging non-linguistic such as sociological and cultural considerations that lexical
items reflecting foreign origin should be effectively studied within the same setting. “It tries to find out a broad relationship between language and culture. This approach is designated Broad Approach (ibid)”. It is the main thrust of the Sociolinguists who probe into different linguistic outcomes of language contact situations. For Sociolinguists, the analysis of even a simple loan word should not be separated from non-lexical factors such as societal and cultural influence and intervention.

According to Gillian (2009) “when probe into the diverse social circumstances of language contact separately according to the various domains of linguistic structure, it is clear that these circumstances have a differential effect. Though most language contact situations lead to unidirectional, rather than bidirectional linguistic results, conditioned by the social circumstances, it is also the case that linguistic structure significantly conditions the linguistic outcomes. Morphology and syntax are clearly the domains of linguistic structure least prone to the influence of contact”. On the other hand, lexicon is clearly the most readily borrowable element, and in due course, borrowing lexicon can lead to structural changes at all linguistic level.

Winford (2010) reviewed that “the study of the consequences of language contact has been a central point of research interest of such great linguists as Muller (1875), Paul (1886), Johannes Schmidt (1872), and Schuchardt (1884). It continued to be a central topic into the twentieth
century, and was addressed by Sapir (1921), Bloomfield (1933), and other early pioneers of structuralism. In his (1884) paper, Schuchardt, the first great Creolist and pioneer in the study of contact language illustrates structural mixture and contact-induced change from a variety of situations, including Slavic/German, Slavic/Italian, and Balkan contact, as well as pidgin and Creole situations”. “Even the traditional linguists like Muller (1872) admitted the process of language mixture by using the term “abnormal transmission” (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 11). The researches of all these scholars were more linguistically oriented than Sociological.

Later in the beginning of 20th century, pure linguistic research on language contact was complemented by other approaches with proper emphasis on the social context of language contact. Some scholars probe in to the problems and threat of endangerment of ethnic minorities having deep linguistic and cultural root as a result of the strong influence of a majority national language especially in colonial context. Winford (2010) further attests that “systematic study of language maintenance began with Kloss (1927, 1929). Other scholars became interested in the fate of immigrant languages in North America (Herzog 1941; Reed 1948; Pap 1949; etc.). Studies like these established the foundation for the discipline known as the sociology of language, focusing on language maintenance and shift (Fishman 1964)”.
“From the beginning of modern sociolinguistics, due attention has been paid to the study of speech communities characterized by language contact (Weinreich 1951, Ferguson & Gumperz 1960, Gumperz 1964). Far from conceiving of language contact as an individual enterprise, these authors recognized that language contact is always the historical product of social forces” (Gillian 2001:2).

The socially and historically oriented body of works done by Sociolinguists gave a strong theoretical base to contact linguistics. In short, the sociolinguistic perspectives on language contact situation give emphasis on the investigation of the types of socio-historical situations that have given rise to different linguistic outcomes.

In the discussion on the origin of Contact Linguistics, Winford (2007) confirms that “the theoretical perspectives on the earlier Contact Linguistics studies envisioned it as a multi disciplinary area of study, encompassing a broad range of language contact phenomena and issues, linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociological and psycholinguistic. The field of study developed out of several lines of research dating back to the 19th century. Among its foundations was work on dialect contact and the formation of pidgins and creoles, as conducted by researchers such as Schuchardt (1884), Hesseling (1899, 1905) and others. Other lines of research concerned with contact phenomena included work on the linguistic and social aspects of
code-switching, contact-induced language change, the dynamics of language maintenance and shift in immigrant and other multilingual communities, and the nature of bilinguals’ linguistic competence and cognition. All of these diverse lines of enquiry have become part of the general study of languages in contact”.

The theoretical framework of contact linguistics became more vibrant with the works of Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1950a, 1950b, 1953). “Working within the structural paradigm, they both emphasized the importance of studying language contact from both a linguistic and a sociocultural perspective (Michael Clyne 1987: 453)”.

However, Weinreich focus specifically on the phenomenon of ‘bilingualism’ and ‘interference’. For example Weinreich (1953: 86): wrote “To predict typical forms of interference from the sociolinguistic description of a bilingual community and a structural description of its languages is the ultimate goal of interference studies”.

Language contact became an esteemed field of study, with the publication of Weinreich’s Languages in Contact (1953) and it was an attempt to make an empirical base for the contact linguistic studies. However, language or dialect contact has rarely been explicitly built into either the theory or the methodology of variationism – the branch of sociolinguistics,
typified by much of Labov's work, which deals with broad patterns of social differentiation and seeks to describe linguistic change in a community.

Paul (1994) review that “although within the variationist paradigm there had been some attempt to deal with contact, notably by Payne (1976; 1980), the first to bring together a wide range of evidence from contact situations relevant to the variationist approach was Trudgill in his Dialects in Contact (1986). A number of studies in this direction show that a good deal of language change and borrowing is the result of contact between speakers of closely related language varieties – mainly as a result of mass migration. Of particular interest are the cases Trudgill describes of the results of koinéization – the formation of new varieties as a result of the contact between speakers of different dialects of a single language”.

While discussing the contribution of Siegel in the development of Contact Linguistics, Paul (1994) further attests that “Siegel (1987: 186-8) provides a brief discussion of the different processes that have been included under this term. Some definitions describe koines as spoken dialects that become standard languages. Most of the scholars in this line emphasize the phenomena of contact between 'subsystems' rather than 'systems', that is, contact between varieties that share a large portion of their structure. This may lead to regional lingua franca, which does not necessarily displace the contributing dialects. All these dialectologists agree that the outcome of
language and dialect contact will depend on both the linguistic relationship between the varieties and the social conditions underlying the contact”.

Gillian (2001:638-639) confirms that “since the publication of Weinreich’s (1953) classic and pioneering work in the field, frameworks for investigating contact-induced change have become increasingly sophisticated”. Weinreich introduced the term ‘Interference’ to “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact” (1968:1). The concept of ‘transfer’ began to replace ‘interference’ in this work, and the term ‘interlanguage’ was also introduced in an effort to conceptualize the linguistic system of the second language learner as rule-governed and orderly, rather than an error-ridden version of the target language.

Winford (2007) analyzed that “Weinreich’s distinction between borrowing and interference as the two basic types of cross-linguistic influence was further expanded and refined by Thomason & Kaufman (1988), with reference to a wide variety of contact situations”. According to them linguistic outcomes of language contact are influenced mainly by the history of social relations among populations, including economic, political and demographic factors. Language contact within a socio historical perspective that considers the historical forces led to language contact is central theme of the work of
Thomason & Kaufman on language contact. Thomason & Kaufman (1988:14-15) argue that: "linguistic constraints on linguistic interference . . . are based ultimately on the premise that the structure of a language determines what can happen to it as a result of outside influence”

Thomason and Kaufman envision “two alternative directions in which language contact can go, resulting in two distinct linguistic processes: borrowing and substratum interference”. They reserve the term borrowing to refer only to "the adoption of foreign elements into the speakers' native language" (ibid). When the influence goes the other way, and native language structures influence the second language, they speak of substratum interference.

A remarkable observation made by them is that “Language contact does not require fluent bilingualism or multilingualism” (Thomason: 1988:2). They empirically shows that the speakers of two or more languages need not be in the same place for language contact to occur as in the case of the languages of sacred texts and other writings connected with major world religions. “Christianity was responsible for the spread of Latin (and, to a lesser extent, New Testament Greek) to many countries; Pali, the sacred language of Buddhism, spread with the religion to Thailand, Burma, and other Southeast Asian countries. The Koran (or, more precisely, Qur’an), the sacred text of Islam, is written in Classical Arabic, but many of the world's Muslims
do not speak any form of Arabic. Nevertheless, classical Arabic is in contact with other languages in many parts of the world through the religion, as is attested by the sizable number of Arabic loanwords in various languages—among them Persian, Turkish, and Malay—that are spoken primarily by Muslims” (Thomason: 1988:3).

They also view that contact without full bilingualism is confined not only to religious languages. “Millions of non-English speakers have come into contact with English through radio, television, Hollywood-films, popular music (on CDs and cassettes as well as on the radio and television), and writings of all kinds” (ibid: 16). Thomason & Kaufman viewed creative writings as a considerable source of language contact and mixing of linguistic elements. “When human creativity comes into play, there are no discernible linguistic limits to the possibilities for transferring any linguistic feature from one language to another” (ibid).

The linguists in the last decades further refined the theoretical frameworks of Contact Linguistics formulated by the pioneers in this field. The terminologies in these classic studies were used in various senses and the later theoreticians found conceptual ambiguity in those terms.

Winford (2010) opined, “The notable attempt to address these problems is the framework formulated by Van Coetsem (1988, 2000)”. Winford (2010) pointed out that “Van Coetsem’s major contribution was to
further refine the traditional distinction between ‘borrowings’ and ‘interference’ by defining these types of cross-linguistic influence more precisely, and above all, by distinguishing the kinds of agentivity they involve. Van Coetsem’s framework distinguishes between two types of cross-linguistic influence or what he calls ‘transfer types’ namely, borrowing and imposition. The latter is largely equivalent to terms like ‘interference via shift’, ‘transfer’ ‘indirect diffusion’, and ‘substratum influence’ that appear in the literature”.

Van Coetsem (1988) argued that language contact studies should give importance to the psycho linguistic processes along with social process. “Van Coetsem’s concepts allow for new links to be made between purely structural and sociolinguistic approaches to contact, and psycholinguistic models of bilingual speech production” (Winford: 2007).

The approaches on contact linguistics discussed above are interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary in nature, as it absorbs various lines of approach from discipline such as sociology, anthropology etc.

2.1 DEFINITION OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

Contact is “a term used in sociolinguistics to refer to a situation of geographical continuity or close social proximity (and thus of mutual influence) between languages or dialects. The result of contact situations can be seen linguistically, in the growth of loan words, patterns of phonological
and grammatical change, mixed forms of language (such as creoles and pidgins), and a general increase in bilingualism of various kinds. In a restricted sense, languages are said to be ‘in contact’ if they are used alternately by the same persons, i.e. bilinguals” (David Crystal, A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, 2006: 102).

Thomason (2007: 42) defines contact-induced change as "a particular linguistic change is caused at least in part by language (or dialect) contact if it would have been less likely to occur outside a particular contact situation".

The definitions of language contact projects three basic elements: two or more languages, the users of these languages and a socio-cultural setting in which contact takes place. Basic linguistic nature of the language families in contact are also equally important factor which describing the contact induced linguistic outcomes.

The term speech community “describes a group of human beings identified in terms of geographical and social spaces and the set of sociolinguistic practices which make them different from other groups” (Crystal 2006: 427). The ‘space’ in this definition need not always be physical or geographical. It can be social in the case of indirect contact through media or sacred texts (see Thomason: 1988).
2.2 TYPES OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

The discussion of language contact and the resultant borrowing ought to consider the different kinds of contact and the results for the languages involved. The two basic types of contact phenomena are Direct and Indirect transfer. The first is direct transfer in which the outcome of the contact is immediately manifested, often with modifications in the construction of the target language. Morphology and syntax is considered as the closed class in the contact induced changes and it underwent considerable transformation only under extreme contact. Such extreme influence gives birth to Pidgin and Creoles. The Indirect contact can be viewed as delayed effect contact, where remarkable structural disturbance can rarely be found in the recipient language and the influence is limited to lexical borrowings.

Bilingualism resulted from language contact facilitates Code-Switching where the language users move from one language to another and back again with the same sentence. Code-switching is preferred either when speakers have to talk about the phenomenon or concepts in the second language or speakers feel that the second language is more prestigious and switch to it to make their speech appear more fashionable.

When considering degree of hierarchy of borrowings, it can be find that some linguistic items are more flexible for changes that others. The distinction between closed and open classes has made based on the degree of
changes in the linguistic categories. While lexicon is considered as an open class, the morphology and syntax are included in the closed class, as it is affected only in the situation of direct and intense contact.

2.3 VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

Language contacts take place under diverse social conditions such as wars, conquests, colonialism, trade, commerce and migrations. Under various historical and social conditions, language contact invokes wide range of linguistic changes. Historical linguists explore these changes from a diachronic perspective where as Sociolinguists emphasis on processes involving contact by analyzing synchronic variation.

According to Gillian (2009), “the imposition of a language of wider communication has occurred both as a result of conquest and in the establishment of standard languages via institutions like universal elementary education. Historically, many conquered or colonized peoples, or those who have found themselves newly formulated into a nation state, have felt the linguistic effects of these social changes only very slowly, giving rise to language contacts that have endured over decades, generations, or even centuries”. He futher states that “these situations of stable bilingualism are perhaps the most likely of all to lead to what Weinreich called “integration”: the acceptance of structures due to interference as part of the receiving language, and even to structural convergence. It is certainly not historically
the case that all political conquests have resulted in a shift to the language of
the conquerors, and the number of attested instance of conquerors or their
descendants eventually shifting to the language of the conquered is also very
numerous”.

In some situations, immigration causes the assimilation of the
newcomers to the linguistic situations of the place where they happen to be
immigrated. Haugen (1955; 1970) affirms, “Short duration of contact has
often led to borrowing into the immigrant languages”. The pressure of
immigrant languages on the language to which immigrants have shifted has
also tended to be limited “unless descendants of particular immigrant groups
have been numerically dominant, or in a position such that their speech
patterns influence those of the wider community rather than the reverse. A
major variable here would seem to be the duration of contact: whether
linguistic assimilation is relatively rapid (often only one generation) or
relatively slow, possibly over many generations” (Gillian 2001:642).

In a situation where the immigrant learns a common language of the
natives or introducing a new language to the resident population, there will be
a tendency to incorporate lexical items of the newly introduced language in
the conversation with bilinguals in their original first language. This process
is termed by Weinreich as ‘nonce borrowings’ (Weinreich 1968:47). “Nonce
borrowings are clearly the route for the later adoption or integration of these
lexical items as loan-words in the immigrant or minority language” (Poplack & D. Sankoff 1984).

With the adoption of lexical items by the recipient language, several phonological alterations are also likely to occur with the influence of the phonological system of the source language. Such phonological alteration will not be limited to the foreign origin vocabulary; in due course, it may filter down to the phonological system of native language.

Gillian (2001:642-43) proves that “Phonological change is also almost universally characteristic of adult L2 speakers, but for social reasons, the “substratum potential” such speakers have is usually very limited. When they do may have a very strong influence in bringing about phonological changes that can have far-reaching influences in morphology and syntax as well. So the introduction of foreign lexical material carries not only phonological baggage, but often may carry morphological and syntactic baggage as well”.

2.4 THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Weinreich (1953) introduced the term interference to signify the phenomena that takes place when one language system is fundamentally changed as a result of foreign input. Besides linguistic typological reasons for language change in contact situations, he also mentions that the extra-linguistic factors (i.e., socio-cultural and psychological factors) are not to be dismissed. Thomason and Kaufman (1998) also mention that, ultimately,
social factors are highly involved in language change in both genetically transmitted languages and mixed languages (see Thomason and Kaufman’s definition of mixed language).

Like Thomason and Kaufman, Mufwene (2001) suggests that the social environment in which language change takes place is a significant factor in determining the eventual outcome. He adopts the concept ecology to refer to such social environments and states that both internal ecologies (i.e., L1 structure and direction of change before language contact) and external ecologies (i.e., L2 influences on structural change) affect the language contact outcomes.

Mufwene argues that both internal and external ecological factors can contribute to this language altering process. He uses pidgins, creoles, and koinés as examples of language evolution and shows that the ecology in which these languages originated plays a significant part of the nature of the language (Mufwene, 2001).

Winford (2002) examines different types of language contact and explains that the different outcomes we see stem from different social situations. In other words, language contact phenomena can be categorized and better understood by considering the situations under which they were formed. He names different contact outcomes such as ‘language maintenance’, ‘language shift’, and ‘language creation’ and shows that
different circumstances and differing levels of contact intensity produce slightly different linguistic results within these general outcomes. He also states that there is an obvious socio-environmental context in which all language contact happens and this context is important in shaping the linguistic outcome.

Although each author mentioned above has provided different approaches to explain language contact phenomena, it is evident that social context seems to be a connecting theme. Not unlike language contact in general, social factors are the main influences in language change involving any contact situations.

### 2.5 REASONS FOR CONTACT

Languages contacts can take place in diverse ways. Broadly speaking, it can be occurred either directly or indirectly. In direct contact speakers of one language happens to interact the speakers of another in various domains of social life which is necessitated by the situations like invasion, emigration etc. Languages can also be influenced each other through the mediation of literature or nowadays television and radio.

In any contact situation there will be two possible settings for change. One is the lexical borrowing takes place from source language to target language. The second is where structural features from source language leads to syntactic changes in target language. There must be a degree of
bilingualism, which act as vehicle for structural interference in the community for the structural borrowings to be taken place in target language. In the case of indirect contact situations, borrowing can take place without bilingualism. However, in this case, the contact only results in lexical borrowing.

2.6 CONTACT AND BILINGUALISM

In some conditions, language contact may lead to extensive bilingualism, which eventually leads to the simplification in morphological features of both language. “It can be seen in the history of English where the periods of contact appear to have led to an accelerated movement from a synthetic to an analytic type. The most extreme case in this respect is that of pidgins which, given the type of imperfect bilingualism which is characteristic of them, always result in severely analytic language types” (Ruth: 2000).

In many cases, bilingualism leads to linguistic hegemony when one language dominate over other, unless the languages involved are able to keep equilibrium in its social and political status. The extremity of stable bilingualism may lead to the specific situation called diglossia. “The term ‘diglossia’ refers to the compartmentalized use of two languages or two dialects of one language in mutually exclusive settings” (Ferguson: 1959). This is a situation where two languages or two distinct varieties of the same
language are used side by side in separate domains of life, typically in the public and private sphere.

The direction of contact is determined by factors of social prestige. Of two languages, one will be of higher standing than the other. This is termed the ‘superstrate’ language. The other is then the ‘substrate’ language. In a few cases where both languages are approximately equal in social status, one speaks of ‘adstrate’ languages. Normally the superstrate one influences the substrate language. A substrate language may exert an influence, but this is usually low level and not of any immediate relevance to the structure of the superstrate language, though substrate influence may be the source of changes in cases of delayed effect contact.

Interference is another phenomenon found in bilingualism, which is the transfer of a structure from one language into another language in which it is not permissible. It is termed as negative transfer often from the mother tongue of the speaker.

2.7 CONTACT-INDUCED STRUCTURAL CHANGE

The traditional linguists who stick on the ‘internal evolution of language’ are always in debate with the theories on ‘contact induced linguistic evolutions’. “The internal evolution of language was assumed to be regular and rule-governed, while externally-motivated changes could be arbitrary unpredictable and idiosyncratic” (Romaine 1988: 349).
Rejecting the idea of categorical constraints Thomason proposed that under the right social and linguistic conditions tremendous alterations including structural changes will be taken place. “In phonology, loss or attrition of entire phonetic and/or phonological categories in native words and of all kinds of morphophonemic rules, in syntax, sweeping changes in such features as word order, relative clauses, negation, coordination, subordination, comparison, and quantification and in morphology, typologically disruptive changes such as the replacement of flexional by agglutinative morphology or vice-versa, the addition or loss of morphological categories that do not match in source and borrowing languages and the wholesale loss or addition of agreement patterns” (Thomason 2001: 71).

“The nature and makeup of the community allow us to test hypotheses about the extra-linguistic factors often claimed to be relevant to contact-induced change. These include intensity, length of contact, status of the languages in the community (minority or majority) and demographic feature” (Romaine: 1995). “Other characteristics relevant to the contact situation include density of contact on the local level, individual bilingual ability and relative tendency to borrow or code-switch” (Poplack: 1989).
2.8 GENERAL OUTCOMES OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

The general effects of language contact can broadly be categorized as: language creation, language shift and language maintenance.

2.8.1 Creation of Pidgin-Creole

Language contact lead to the creation of new languages. When people without a common language come into contact and forced to interact closely in the absence of a common language to communicate, a simplified register called as pidgin may develop, which may eventually become a full-fledged Creole language through the process of creolization.

“Pidginization is really a process of language-simplification. In order to make the communication process between two mutually unintelligible languages as efficient and as fast as possible, most irregularities of the languages are removed. Any simplification will necessarily allow the speaker to be better understood by the listeners. This simplification process usually includes the removal of inflection, reduction of prepositions used, overgeneralization of rules, and making tense distinctions by markers such as “now,” and “after,” rather than modifications of the verb itself” (Todd, 1984: 13). Comrie (1990: 26). notes that “what arises in such a situation is, initially, an unstable pidgin, or jargon, with highly variable structure—considerably simplified relative to the native languages of the people involved in its
creation—and just enough vocabulary to permit practical tasks to be carried out reasonably successfully”

Schuit (2008) views that “a pidgin can be thought of as a combination of simplified register, or less-formal language, and broken language, which is characteristic of the under-developed utterances spoken by a second language learner”. In *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*, Valdman (1977: 100) reviews this concept stating, “Simplified registers are reductions of a source language; broken language is a reduction of a target language; and a pidgin is both…”

Thus a pidgin can be viewed as an amalgamation of the two lower register, to make the communication process more simpler than the pure varieties of either of the language that come into contact. It is very much similar to the broken language used by second language learners at the initial stages of their learning. Pidginization is thus a unique manifestation of second language acquisition.

Since the factors responsible for the origin and development of Pidgins are diverse in character, a universal explanation based on the generalization of a few would be insufficient in the description on the process of pidginization. The process of pidgin formation is entirely subject to the specific environments of each language involved. Therefore, pidginization is to be treated as a socio-linguistic phenomenon. Jourdan (1991: 189).notes in his article “Pidgins and Creoles: the Blurring of Categories” that “pidgins and
creoles emerged in very diverse social conditions, and did not necessarily follow the same developmental path”.

Although the factors responsible for the formation of pidgins and creoles are varied, the European colonialism was instrumental in the formation pidgns and creoles across the world. “Most modern pidgins are the result of colonial expansion and thus they have evolved from a master-servant type of contact between speakers of European tongues and speakers of so-called “exotic” languages”(Todd 1998: 12). Pidgin languages are found to be used for both inter-group and intra-group communication. “As in the example of Papua New Guinea, Tok-Pisin was initiated to serve communication purposes between colonizers and indigenous people. However, it is probable that the indigenous peoples found the pidgin language to be useful for communication amongst their own varying language groups and for this reason took advantage of the newly created tongue”(ibid).

Creoles are a developed form of pidgins. What makes the creoles differ from pidgins is that they become the mother tongue of the children as they use it as their primary language. Smith (2008) analyzes that “the vocabulary of a Creole language is largely supplied by the parent languages, particularly that of the most dominant group in the social context of the Creole's construction, though there are often clear phonetic and semantic shifts. On the other hand,
the grammar often has original features that may differ substantially from those of the parent languages”.

The amalgamation process in the development of creole is made explicit in the detailed evaluation made by Thomason. “By contrast, the grammars of pidgins and creoles that arise in multilingual contexts are not derived from the grammar of any single language, but appear instead to be a combination of features shared by the languages in contact and features that are universally preferred, perhaps because they are relatively easy to learn” (Thomason: 1988: 17).

2.8.2 Language shift: second language acquisition and language death

The term ‘language shift’ denotes the process in which one language is replaced by another. It may be a gradual or sudden process depending on a series of sociopolitical factors. Language shift is normally unidirectional as only one of the speech communities in contact give up its native language for that of the other community. The shifting community will have a lower place as a result of colonization by a foreign group or domination by one sector of the same society. From this perspective shift is imposed on the subordinate community by the hegemonic group.

Rendón (2008) vies that “Language contact not always results in language shift. The literature describes a large number of cases in which the subordinate group learned the language of the hegemonic group but did not
abandon their own. A number of factors influence the decision of speakers to maintain or shift their native language. These factors are also responsible for speeding up or slowing down the shift. Ethno linguistic loyalty and positive attitudes towards one’s language in general promote maintenance. Negative evaluations of one’s language usually trigger shift. Of course, negative evaluations are not gratuitous but the result of social subordination”.

Language shift is not a necessary consequence of language contact but an expected result of social subordination. The position of the shifting speech community with respect to other speech communities is decisive. Thomason (2001: 23) identifies “four positions in a contact situation which may influence shift or maintenance: indigenous super ordinate; migrant super ordinate; indigenous subordinate; and migrant subordinate. Each position is associated with either shift or maintenance: for example, an indigenous super ordinate group will never shift but a migrant subordinate group will do so rapidly. In general terms, super ordinate groups tend to maintain their language while subordinate groups usually shift to the language of the dominant group”.

2.8.3 Language maintenance and mixing

The contact between one language in super ordinate position and another in subordinate position does not end necessarily in language shift. It may lead to the higher or lower degree bilingualism and language mixing.
“Contact-induced language change requires some knowledge of a second language at the level of the speaker and certain degree of bilingualism at the level of society for a rapid dissemination of innovative forms in the speech community. Speakers with higher or lower levels of bilingualism develop a number of communicative strategies a cover term of which is language mixing. Language mixing refers to the mixture of lexical and/or grammatical elements of languages in contact. Speakers with higher levels of bilingualism tend to mix their languages frequently with a variety of purposes” (Thomason 2001: 53).

2.8.4 Formation of Bilingual Mixed Language

It is found that some bilingual communities do not wish identify with the cultures of either of the languages they speak, and seek to develop their own language as an expression of their own cultural uniqueness.

Winford (2010) explains, “Bilingual mixed or intertwined languages arose in settings involving long-term contact between two ethnic groups leading to bilingualism and increasing mixture of the languages. In these cases, that mixture became conventionalized as a community norm, resulting in the creation of hybrid languages whose components could clearly be traced to one or the other source language. Bilingual mixed language may differ from either of its source languages”.
Peter Auer (2000:101) analyzes that “Mixed languages arise out of very different needs and in very different sociolinguistic contexts, usually in order to display a certain social affiliation with a given group (or disaffiliation with another, usually main stream or majority group); these different needs and contexts then result in very heterogeneous mechanisms of language contact”

Matras (2000) provides a conceptual clarification as “the term ``mixed languages'' is somewhat ambiguous that many researchers on bilingualism use ``mixing'' in a much wider sense in order to describe a way of speaking which includes (frequent) alternation between two languages or varieties beyond code-switching. If the term mixed language is used it should be kept in mind that it refers to more than (code-) mixing in this latter sense. Mixing may result in ``fusion'' and it requires some kind of structural sedimentation. In short the fused variety –mixed language- is a variety in which language alternation has intruded into the grammatical system”.

Matras clearly demarcate the normal usage of ‘mixed’ from the ‘bilingual mixed’. He further states that “most languages are to some extent at least ``mixed'', in the sense that they have components that can be traced back to more than one source language as a result of a situation of contact in the language's earlier history. So when languages are referred to in the literature explicitly as ``mixed” (as for example in Bakker and Mous, 1994b;
or Bakker and Muysken, 1995), it is presumably in order to highlight that they
go beyond the commonly attested patterns of mixture. Mixed languages are
thus understood implicitly at least to breach conventional constraints on
contact-induced language change. The point of interest for a theory of
grammar is therefore in defining and explaining qualitative and quantitative
differences between the effects of contact in mixed languages, as opposed to
more conventional linguistic systems”(ibid).

However, it is very difficult to find our a common structural criteria for
the mixed languages as the social factors responsible for its origin are diverse.

2.9 DEFINITIONS OF MIXED LANGUAGE

Genetic affiliation and historical factors are considered to form a
theoretical base in defining mixed languages. “Thomason and Kaufman
(1988) consider a language as mixed if it does not offer opportunities for
historical reconstruction of its parent language (see also Bakker and Mous,
(1994, 27) puts this in more positive terms, defining mixed languages as
idioms that evoke identification on the part of speakers of two separate source
languages”(ibid).

“Contrasting with pidgins and creoles, mixed languages are assumed to
be products of full bilingualism” (Thomason: 1997). What distinguishes
mixed languages from pidgins and creoles is the fact that “they show
continuity of significant portions of the grammar from the grammaticiser parent language (or from both parent languages), yet it is precisely the interrupted transmission or non-continuity of a significant portion of structural material that identifies mixed languages as opposed to cases of "normal" language development" (Matras 2000).

“Mixed languages have been argued to be the outcome of mixed marriages giving rise to new ethno-cultural identities” (Bakker, 1994). Several contact linguists relates the formation of mixed language with the emergence of new ethno groups and the process of their conscious identity (Bakker, 1997, Thomason and Kaufman, 1988, and Thomason, 1995, 1997). Smith (1995) pointed out that “the cultural motivation behind the emergence of mixed varieties can just as well be retention, re-gaining, or re-definition of ethnic identity, defying pressure to change or assimilate. As regards the overall social context of emergence, an expression of cultural defiance might therefore seem a more accurate indicator”. He has suggested a distinction between "plain" mixed languages, which serve as everyday community languages, and "symbiotic" varieties, which are specialized varieties of a non-mixed language used in the same community, typically secret languages. “Like pidgins, secret languages are not native languages and have a restricted functional scope. Like creoles, so-called "plain" mixed languages are full fledged native community languages that reflect a newly emerged ethnic identity” (Thomason: 1997).
According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988) “mixed languages arise in situations where language shift is partly resisted, and so parts of the original language are retained while significant portions are replaced by the pressure-exerting language”. Matras (2000) points out that “a similar idea is expressed by Thomason (1995: 29) with regard to the general phenomenon of abruptly emerging mixed languages, and Bakker (1997, 213) similarly admits that intertwined languages are created “more or less consciously”. From the discussion made above it is evident that mixed languages are the creation of social motivation to maintain a unique linguistic system in a community.

Mixed languages rarely share uniform linguistic features as they are developed out of diverse social and linguistic factors. Therefore, it is a very complex task to find a universal process and make general predictions about the linguistic outcome of the ‘mixture’. However linguists like Matras(2000) views that “it is possible to explain the reasons behind the creation of fusion languages in which literal interference of one system with another can be found. It can also be predicted the types of social and communicative circumstances in which lexical re-orientation might occur, or where selective replication is likely to be encountered”.

A theory of origin for hybrid or mixed language would presumably deal with both the social situation and the linguistic processes involved. The
entire effects of language contact have directly connected with the specific social setting and contexts that forms its distinctive nature.

The present study offers new observations on both the social situation and the linguistic process of origin and development of the mixed language, AM. Since the study on the emergence of the mixed language is one of the key areas of sociolinguistics, the primary aim of the present study is to explore the sociolinguistic process in the Arabic and Malayalam language contact situation and to find out how AM was evolved as a result of this process. It mainly concentrates on social aspects of language contact and how they influence linguistic processes. The study aims at exploring the socio-cultural and linguistic factors, which were instrumental in the hybridization of Arabic and Malayalam, and there by, formation of the new mixed language, AM.