CHAPTER 5  
CONTACT INDUCED ELEMENTS IN AM

5.0 ANALYSIS ON CONTACT ELEMENTS

Languages emerged out of the contact situations reflect the sociolinguistic factors and the language attitudes of the linguistic community. Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 35) state that “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers and not the structure of their language that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact”.

Differentiating the changes due to language contact from those due to genetic inheritance, independent innovation, chance, and typologically natural tendencies is the chief challenge for a contact linguist. There is rarely one single reason for any particular contact-induced change: numerous factors work together in contact situation.

Foreign forms and patterns make their way into a language through a number of paths—enhancement of an already existing feature, or extension by analogy, or reinterpretation and reanalysis, or a really induced grammaticalization, or grammatical accommodation, or loan translation, or lexical and grammatical parallelism. The status and the expression of a category in interacting languages determine the path. No linguistic feature is
entirely ‘borrowing proof’. A number of other factors are also favouring the
diffusion of features and of forms.

The overall result of language contact also depends on degrees of
knowledge of each other’s language, on regularity of contact, and, most
importantly, on relations of dominance or rough equality between languages.
‘Balanced’ language contact, without one language trying to throw out the
other, goes together with long-standing multilingualism and promotes
contact-induced increase in language complexity. This is conducive to
language maintenance. In the situation where either of the languages is
dominant over other, creates language loss and tends to diminish linguistic
diversity.

Converging languages in an area are likely to adopt new patterns from
multiple sources, or acquire new shared grammatical structures, creating a
‘compromise’ pattern. Alternatively, one language may adopt the grammar of
another—this is a typical result of displacive contact.

The present study evaluates diffusion and linguistic convergence at
various levels in AM language contact situations, by analytically
concentrating on diffusion of patterns and diffusion of related forms.

Mixes consisting of the grammar from one language and the lexicon
from another may also be the result of a compromise between two different
groups wishing to mark a new identity. Thus, the mixed language serves as an
expression of an altered identity, be it new, or differing significantly from an older identity. Another sociolinguistic feature, which has been discussed in relation to mixed languages, is whether speakers constitute a separate ethnic group or a continuation of an older identity (Bakker and Mous 1994: 2). As Thomason (2003: 25) suggests, the new language is either associated with a new ethnic identity, or it is seen as a means of continuing an ancestral group membership.

The main factor that distinguishes mixed languages from other contact varieties is that they emerge as expressions of identity rather because of a communicative need. There is much less agreement on the kinds of grammatical processes, which are required for a relatively stable language to emerge.

Generally theories of genesis are divided over whether mixed languages are the extraordinary results of ordinary contact processes (Thomason 1995), or whether special processes are required. Ordinary contact processes include borrowing or code switching, whereas Bakker's (1997) language intertwining theory and Muysken's relexification theory are an examples of special processes.

Theories of mixed language formation take on two main forms - (i) unidirectional approaches- for example borrowing (Matras 2003; Thomason 2001), code switching (Auer 1999; Myers-Scotton 2002, 2003), relexification
(Muysken 1981), paralexification (Mous 2003a), or Matras et al's (2008) language repertoire approach; and (ii) fusion approaches such as Bakker's language intertwining theory, language competition approaches (Ansaldo 2008; Meakins 2007) and McConvell's (2002, 2008) centre of gravity hypothesis. In general, these diachronic accounts of mixed language genesis are based on synchronic descriptions of the languages. Further, the diversity of genesis theories is largely the result of extending an explanation for the formation of one mixed language to other varieties. In this respect, no single theory provides a unified account of mixed language genesis that accounts for all languages that has been identified as mixed.

5.1 SOCIOLINGUISTIC PARAMETERS IN LANGUAGE CONTACT

No contact situation is ‘context free’. Social-historical environment is crucial in determining the nature of language contact situation. The process and the outcomes of language contact depend on several factors.

The bird’s eye view on socio-cultural parameters would be helpful in the exploration of various patterns of language contact. “The significant socio-cultural parameters include size of community, interaction between rural and urban communities, marriage patterns, patterns of trade and warfare, the lifestyle of speakers, division of labour between the sexes and between
generations, social organization and the kinship system and religion/mythology” (Nurse 2000: 260–2).

“A variety of language-external circumstances underlies the ‘how’ and the ‘why’ of language contact. Languages can change due to incomplete language acquisition, foreigner talk, koineization, situations of di- or polyglossia (with functional differentiation of languages), or stable multilingualism without such functional differentiation.. With loss of traditional culture over the past decades, the social factors, which may have been instrumental in producing a language contact situation, have to be reconstructed, or even conjectured”(Aikenvald : 2001).

5.1.1 Knowledge level of each other’s languages

The central factors to be considered in understanding types of language contact are the level of multilingualism or bilingualism and demographic composition of the community or social groups. Extensive grammatical borrowing can be found in a situation of stable, well-established multilingualism. “Knowledge of each other’s languages is a necessary condition for the creation of a linguistic area. The impact of a prestigious second language in a predominantly monolingual community typically results in an abundance of loanwords, but hardly any structural influence—English loans in Japanese are a prime example” (Loveday : 1996).
Diglossic language situations, normally involve two (or more) varieties that coexist in a speech community and the degree of mutual intelligibility between languages within an area may influence the direction of contact-induced change.

Even irregular contact with other communities at different social levels are also brings contact induced changes. This can be found in the case of ritual language, e.g. the influence of Classical Arabic on the vernacular languages of Muslim peoples, exclusively through the Quran.

The degree of language interaction depends on the nature of community involved. The open communities share a high degree of grammatical forms and patterns than the closed communities.

5.1.2 Language attitudes

Attitudes towards non-native language in contact are also significant in the formation contact outcomes. “Borrowed forms are easier to detect than borrowed patterns, and this is why many linguists think—in all likelihood, erroneously—that they are always more common. A careful inductively based analysis of individual language contact situations suggests the opposite. Languages with few if any borrowed forms tend to show a variety of borrowed patterns. Borrowing forms is by no means a prerequisite to borrowing patterns” (Aikhenvald : 2001).
5.1.3 Balanced language contact

The relationship between languages in the multilingual environment is very significant in determining the contact outcome. In a stable multilingual situation where neither or the language dominate each other, the language contact is ‘balanced’. It does not bring about language loss, but enrich each other, which ultimately leads to increasing linguistic complexity and typological diversity. In contrary, if one group exercises dominance over other the language contact results in language shift, loss of the language’s own features and, ultimately, language death.

5.1.4 The net result of language contact

Aikhenvald (2201) evaluates that “a major factor behind the diffusion of patterns is the desire to be able to say what one neighbour can says”. Sometimes the semantic and lexical items are copied each other as “the categories existing in the languages that are in contact mutually compatible and more readily inter- translatable” (Heine and Kuteva 2003: 561).

“Contact-induced change in typologically different linguistic structures produces different results, even if they are influenced by language(s) of a similar type. When languages converge, they gain some features and lose others. In all languages in a diffusion area, the erstwhile patterns come to coexist with new ones, and new rules develop governing the functional differentiation of new and old patterns. Konkani has adopted Indo-European
type relative clauses, together with Dravidian-type relative clauses; both are now used under different circumstances’ (Nadkarni: 1975).

5.1.5 Degree of Contact Borrowing

Thomason and Kaufman's (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, p. 74-75; Thomason 2001) presents a scale of borrowing in contact situation.

1. Casual contact lexical non-basic vocabulary before basic lexical functional vocabulary e.g. conjunctions and adverbs

2. Slightly more intense contact syntactic only new functions borrowed lexical pre/postpositions, derivational affixes, inflect, affixes (attached to stem), pronouns, low numerals

3. More intense contact syntactic change in word order, borrowing postpositions in a preposition language

4. Strong cultural pressure syntactic extensive word order change, inflectional affixes (e.g. case)

5. Very strong cultural pressure syntactic typological disruption, changes in word structure (e.g. adding prefixes in suffixing language), change from flexional to agglutinative morphology.
5.2 AM AS A LAYERED, ‘MIXED’ OR ‘INTERTWINED’ LANGUAGE

Bakker viewed languages known as ‘mixed’ or ‘intertwined’ arise as a result of peculiar sociolinguistic circumstances with semi-conscious efforts to ‘create a language’, in which parts of grammar and lexicon come from different languages. “Several studies are attested for the emergence of the mixed languages that come about as a result of semi-conscious language engineering, and reflect as an effort to forms a new ethnic group” (Matras 2003: 151–3). As Bakker (1996) has convincingly shown, “the documented intertwined languages do not result from code switching or code mixing; neither is they products of heavy borrowing. The ways in which they come about are closely linked to speakers’ awareness of different components of a ‘language’ used for ‘identity flagging’, and to the extent of conscious language engineering”.

Since Arabi Malayalam emerged out of a semi conscious effort of the community to propagate and express their ideal and to form a literary tradition, it can be considered as a Mixed Language. While analyzing the socio cultural and political factors of 15th to 18th century Malabar, it can be found that the Mappila community experiences a sense of insecurity and the socio-cultural and political background of the period necessitated the formation of a conscious identity among them. A consciously created
language was essential as a medium for the process. So there is much
evidence to prove that this language is typically the result of an attempt to
purposely create a special language, or a language register, by the Mappila
ethnic group asserting its identity.

5.2.1 Contact-induced linguistic features in Arabi Malayalam and its
mechanisms

“Languages borrow forms and patterns. Borrowed forms may include a
lexeme, a pronoun, an affix, a phoneme or intonation pattern, or a way of
framing discourse” (Campbell: 1997). Borrowing patterns does not
presuppose borrowing forms. Some languages share patterns, but have hardly
any loan morphemes. Based on the general linguistic evaluation made in the
Chapter 4 of the thesis, the patterns and forms adopted from Arabic (Donor
Language) in the formation of AM are analyzed here. The patterns and forms
investigated here would be applicable to all the Mixed Languages formed in
the similar socio cultural settings.

5.2.2 Borrowing of a grammatical system

Some grammatical features of Malayalam are reduced to the
grammatical ways of Arabic. For example, in Standard Malayalam the
marker ‘uM’ for the conjunction ‘and’, is suffixed with both the Malayalam
nouns. In Arabi Malayalam ‘uM’ is suffixed only with either of the nouns in
several places. (See table 4.35)
E.g. /aakaaSaboomiyuM/ (the sky and earth)

It can be treated as a grammatical borrowing from Arabic, where the conjunction ‘-/va/’ is added between nouns only once.

E.g. /raamaavasiita/ (Rama and Sita)

Here AM gave up one of the Malayalam grammatical features and adopted the Arabic grammatical way in the place of it. Such replacements of grammatical systems in language contact are found in many contact induced linguistic changes.

5.2.3 Adding a term to an existing system

“If one language has a number system consisting of just singular and non-singular while a neighbour has singular, dual, and plural, then the first language may innovate a dual either by internal grammaticalization, or by borrowing a dual form from the second language” (Aikhenvald : 2001). In Arabi Malayalam also the writers used Arabic dual marker with Arabic loan words which can be treated as an addition to the grammatical system in to the language in contact.

Examples for dual ending nouns used in AM

/swahaabiyaaani/ = Two followers
/jabaalaani/ = Two mountains
/jamaalaani/ = Two camels
5.2.4 Lose of grammatical categories from loan forms

The grammatical categories of source language may also be vanished in contact language situation. That is, the borrowed system is reduced or even made irrelevant without being modified.

Examples for the loose of grammatical categories in Arabic loan forms

/saahlihiinkaL/ (the virtuous persons)

In the word cited above the Malayalam plural marker /–kaL/ is added with the Arabic plural form of /saalih/. Even if the Arabic plural marker /–iin/ is there it is reduced and becomes irrelevant with the addition of Malayalam plural marker /–kaL/. Hence, the significance of the loan plural marker is lost in effect with the addition of native plural marker, even if the word part /–iin/ is retained with the root form.

5.2.5 System-Altering Changes

It is also found out that several new patterns are developed out of the language’s own resources in the situation of AM language contact. Formation of new verbs and nouns in an unfamiliar and unaccepted ways of native language using the roots of native word elements can be treated as a system altering change.

E.g. /tanicc/ -- /tanippiccu/ (see 4.5.5 for detail examples and description)
Further system-altering changes involve case-marking patterns in AM works. General descriptions of the case marking patterns are made in the Chapter 4 (see 4.5). Here, case marking systems of native language are found to be altered with the phonemic variations of the case markers (accusative case suffix /a/ instead of /e/) and deletion of phonemes from the case markers (/–ooTu/ becomes /–Tu/ with /a/ ending sounds in sociative case marker. Some case markers even appear in the place of others (locative case markers in the place of sociative marker).

5.2.6 System-preserving pattern along with the supplements of loan items

System-preserving pattern is noted in the case of numbering patterns in Arabi Malayalam. Here, the borrowed numbering patterns tend to supplement the regional one. This can be treated as the examples for the new terms added to the already existing category (number system) complementing the indigenous numbering system. The compounding of native and loan cardinals can also be found. The detailed analysis and examples are given in 4.3.12.

E.g. /sala:salf/ (three thousand)

/anfata:lf/ (five thousand)
5.2.7 Reinterpretation of newly introduced patterns

A few examples are noted in the AM contact situation where a new pattern did not last long enough for the system to be restructured. The borrowed Arabic plural morphemes were reinterpreted as singular markers and thus integrated into the Malayalam plural marker system already in place.

E.g. /Sahiid/ -> /Suhadaa/ -> /SuhadaakkaL/

/swaalih/ -> /swaalihiin/ -> /swalihiinkaL/

It is interesting to note that in the muscular word ending with /–i/ and additional /–an/ is suffixed as masculine gender marker even if the word itself without any marker signifies masculinity in Standard Malayalam.

Eg. /adipadiyaN/= /an/ as gender marker

In standard Malayalam /adipadi/ itself indicates the Masculine form. Since the word is ended with /–i/ and the /–i/ is a feminine marker, /-an/ is added in order to avoid confusion.

This can be treated as an interference of Arabic linguistic ways in which all the nouns are strictly demarcated with gender marker. It is also to be noted that AM does not prefer the nouns related to human beings without gender marker. In standard Malayalam there is another word /adhipan/, which can be used, in the same context. However, the poet used the word /adipadi/ by adding /–an/ as the gender marker.
5.2.8 Emergence of marginal subsystem

Fries and Pike (1949) point out that “contact-induced change results in creating a new somewhat marginal subsystem within a language without affecting the ‘core’. This is often found as the effect of an influx of loans. Unassimilated loans are likely to produce ‘loan phonology’, much in the spirit of the ‘coexistent phonemic systems’ and such loans stand out as phonologically different from the rest”.

The process of borrowing words from Arabic into AM is accompanied by adoption of the Arabic phonological system into the native phonological system. The adopted phonemes are:

/ʕ/, /θ/, /ð/, /tˤ/, /dˤ/, /q/, /θ/, /ʃ/, /r/, /h/, /h/, /ʃ/, /sˤ/, /z/ /l/ /z/ /s/ /z/ /s/

All these adopted phonemes except /ʕ/ are occurred only with Arabic loan words, not with native words. The labio-dental fricative /ʕ/ is largely used with native words as a substitution for labial plosive /p/, for /p/ is absent is Arabic phonemic system and /ʕ/ is phonemically closer to it, with regard to the effort for pronunciation.

It is interesting to note that the phonological change like consonant and vowel epenthesis, consonant deletion, consonant substitution, vowel lowering and vowel strengthening do not occur with Arabic loan words. The social force behind this might be the notion of purity assigned to Arabic language as
the language crept into the native dialect mainly through religious propagation.

5.2.9 Integration of phonemes, morphological markers or processes, prepositions and conjunctions

5.2.9.1 Phonemes integrated with native words

Phonemes in the loan subsystem of AM language is found to be get integrated into the Mappila dialect of Malayalam.

E.g /f/. There is a tendency to pronounce the voiceless aspirated /pʰ/ (PHA) as /f/ among Mappilas. (Example /phalaM/ - /falaM/)

Since most loan words containing /f/ have now been assimilated, it is now part of the main-stream phonological system Mappila dialect of Malayalam. Apart from phonological subsystem, Arabi Malayalam has another loan subsystem of adjectives. Several Arabic adjective forms are used to qualify Malayalam nouns. The Arabic adjective forms are phonemically adapted form with Malayalam by suffixing link or Zero morpheme. A detailed analysis with examples can be found in 4.3.6.2.

5.2.9.2 Combined use of Arabic and Malayalam conjunction

The Arabic and Malayalam conjunction marker are used together in several places
Example:

/salaatuM va tasliimuM/

(/-va/ is a conjunction in Arabic to denote and, /-um/ is the conjunction in Malayalam, here both are used)

Several Arabic prepositions are blended with Malayalam words and the detail examples and analysis have been done based on the table 4.42 in Chapter 4. The more frequent Arabic prepositions in AM are /-bi/, /-min/, /-an/, /-fi/, /-ila, /-va/, /-kad/ etc.

5.2.9.3 Arabic Pronoun Forms

The table 5.15 shows the Arabic Pronoun used in the literature as part of Quranic verses and pure Arabic sentences used to express religious matters. Oblique forms are more frequent than nominative forms in the Arabic words and usages found in the AM works under study.

5.2.9.4 Diverging tendency in borrowed patterns

Once borrowed, a form or a pattern is to be expected to deviate from what it was in the source language, in terms of its formal adaptation, and in its semantics function. Such divergences are also found in the case of Arabi Malayalam. The divergence is not limited only to Arabic loan words. Several semantic deviations are noted in the Arabi Malayalam forms of
Sanskrit loan words incorporated in several contexts. Such semantic divergences are discussed in 4.5 with detailed examples.

5.2.9.5 Reinforcement of an already existing feature

If languages in contact share a category or a construction, language contact may increase its frequency or its productivity. This is found to be true in the case of Arabi-Malayalam in the detailed analysis of gender verb agreement. In modern Malayalam, no markers are used for gender-verb agreement. However, Tamil still follows the gender-verb agreement, which was used in Malayalam too in ancient periods, which was attested by several studies on earlier inscriptions and literatures in Malayalam. Since the gender-verb agreement with inflections is one of the important feature of classic Arabic language (the donor language), the AM adopted and sustained the older feature of gender-verb agreement under the influence of Arabic. Thus the gender-verb agreement feature, which had been about to give up totally by main stream Malayalam language, was retained and reinforced under the influence of the donor language Arabic.

Examples for Gender-Verb Agreement

/caaRRinaan/ (AM) = he said

/jaaha/ (Arabic) = he came

/jaahat/ (Arabic) = she came
5.2.9.6 Extension by analogy

An existing structure can develop additional meanings, matching the ones in a contact language.

E.g. /padaccavan/ (The direct meaning is creator. Extended meaning is God)

/niskaaraM/ (The word is a modified form of /namaskaraM/ that denotes the way of respecting elders and pious persons in a particular way. In AM the meaning is extended to the particular ritualistic worship of God that the Muslims do five times in a day.

5.2.10 HYBRID WORDS, PHRASES AND SENTENCES

5.2.10.1 Compound Nouns

AM has developed peculiar compound nouns in imitation of Arabic which has been analyzed in detail in chapter 4 and the examples for which are shown in table 4.9. In addition with Standard Malayalam nouns and nouns used in Mappila dialect of Malayalam, several hybrid nouns derived from the amalgamation of Arabic and Malayalam are also found. Such fused nouns are termed as Compound Nouns in the present study. The Arabic and AM compound nouns are one of the apparent linguistic outcomes of AM language contact.

Example: /kuZalihuuRikaL/
AM Compound Nouns are found in two combinations. Noun + Noun and Adjective + Noun with either of the parts are Arabic or Malayalam is found to be very common in AM literature written between 16\textsuperscript{th} to 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries. However, the frequencies of such forms are comparatively uncommon in the literature came out in the later period.

5.2.10.2 ARABIC ADJECTIVE WITH MALAYALAM NOUNS

It is found that several Arabic adjective forms are used to qualify Malayalam nouns. The Arabic adjective forms are phonemically adapted form with Malayalam by suffixing link or Zero morpheme. The pure Arabic adjective forms are found vey rarely. The occurrence of phonemically adapted adjective forms is higher than the pure forms.

5.2.10.3 Arabic sentence parts

As a contact induced feature, it is to be noted that the Arabi Malayalam poets occasionally use pure Arabic sentences, especially when they illustrate the religious rituals and beliefs and for the citation from Holy Quran. This indicates that they tend to maintain the religious identity while keeping the process of assimilation in several other cultural aspects. The syntactic interference includes a full sentence and part of a sentence. A few examples are listed below:
It is also found that AM was influenced by Arabic grammatical base forms in addition with borrowed Arabic words and the formation of AM compound forms. The blending of Arabic grammatical base is found not only with Arabic root word, but also occasionally with Malayalam lexical items. Arabic case morphemes, tense suffixes, prepositions, Postpositions etc are properly blended with native words mainly to create the rhythmic and rhyming patterns of AM poems. Examples are illustrated in 4.42.

5.2.11. The Existence of a Perceivable ‘Gap’ Facilitates Diffusion.

Borrowing a practice may facilitate borrowing a set of linguistic expressions, which correlate with it. Speakers of languages in contact may share cultural practices, as for instance, food, dress, religious ideology etc. Often these borrowed cultural practices will not have alternate linguistic expression in native language. In the absence of such words to express the cultural practices, a semantic gap will be perceived and it facilitates diffusion of linguistic items.

In AM a lot of loan words are enrooted as a result of shared cultural practices. For example: /baːnkə/ (calling for prayer), /cɛɛRNi/ (sweets-
derived from /Shireen/), /vuLu/(ablation), /daRs/(religious seminaries), /uruus/ (ritualistic prayer), /Raaatiib/ (ritualistic worship) etc.

This gap was filled not only through borrowed forms, but by exploiting native resources by matching the expression in the source language. The concept of God in Islam and the monotheism is expressed in AM using the native word forms. For example:

/padaccavan/, /periyoon/, /udayoon/ etc.

5.2.11.2 Nouns derived from Arabic noun forms

In Arabi Malayalam, nouns derived from Arabic nouns are used without any semantic deviation. The peculiarity in such nouns is the inflection form with the Malayalam forms like /aayoon/, /aayavan/. Such nouns are found in abundance in the Arabi Malayalam works analyzed here and all of them are used as homonyms for Allah (the God). A few examples are given in the table 4.11.