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Trends and Approaches of Language Contact

2.1. Introduction

The use of more than one language is inevitable when people of different linguistic and cultural inhabitation come in contact with each other. The studies conducted within the theories and methods of historical linguistics (the field of inquiry of languages studied that has dominated 18th and 19th century linguistic science) hold the view that the development and spread of the present form of languages of the world are the synthesis of contact between people pertaining to linguistically unrelated/partially related/related languages. This has been put into common practice throughout much of the human history. “Even in hunter-gatherer times, this practice of using more than one language was not uncommon as people need to communicate with neighboring people, who often spoke different languages”. <www.ling.ohio-state.edu/publications/osu_wpl/osuwpl>

Language contact occurs when the speakers of distinct speech varieties (speech communities) interact; therefore, it is typical for their language to influence each other. And, if there is much variation in their languages, it is obvious for them to learn two or more languages. However, language contact is not only understood as geographical contact, it could be also due to other reasons like trade, cultural and religious contacts. For example, Bynon states that “The most superficial kind of language contact is probable that which exists between producers or conveyors of some commodity and their clients in other language areas, and it is a well-documented fact of recent language history that the name of such objects of international trade as tea, coffee, or tobacco readily travel with them and become a part of the consumers’ language. And at the other end of the scale the most intensive kind of contact may be said to exist in fully
bilingual communities and here not merely lexical items but even phonological and grammatical rules may come to be shared by the languages in question". (1977:216).

We can say language is a tool that makes multiple range of communication possible to meet various ends so as to complete communication gap that carries the transfer of information as well as sustain interaction between individuals, societies and nations. Simultaneously, “variation and change in language and language behaviour at the group as well at individual and interpersonal levels are not the exception but the norm. This is because language, in addition to being a tool for communication and a cognitive organizer, is also a symbol and an instrument of individual and group’s identity and norms, and of intergroup power relations. As these relations, identities and norms change, so do language and language behaviour. But variation and change are not uniform; individuals and groups behave differently and change at different rate on different dimensions. As a result, language contact has differential and at times opposite consequences for language and language behaviour”. (Hamers and Blanc 2003: 307)

When speakers of mutually unintelligible languages often asymmetrical status come in contact, it is palpable, from such varied language contact situations, will inevitably leads to bilingualism within and between countries. According to Weinreich “The practice of alternately using two languages will be called ‘BILINGUALISM’, all the remarks about bilingualism apply as well to multilingualism, the practice of using alternately three or more languages”. (1953:1). The complexity in linguistic situation all over the world is so common that most of the population ratio acquires more than one language and that's why become bilinguals. This fact is near to the truth that, “bilingualism is present in practically every country of the world, in all classes of society and in all age groups. In fact it is difficult to find society that is genuinely monolingual”. (Grosjean 1982:1). As a result, bilingualism is the norm of every country. Lewis says “Bilingualism has been and is nearer to the normal situation than most people are to believe” (1976:151). Practically speaking, bilingualism is a social need for hundreds of millions of people all over the world. “It is probably true that no language group has
ever existed in the isolation from other language groups, and the history of languages replete with the examples of language contact leading to some form of bilingualism” (Grosjean 1982:1).

Consequently, when an individual or a group with first language come in contact with the other language of some value for him/them, will definitely start learning the second language. Thus, “Language contact inevitably leads to bilingualism” (Apple and Muysken 1987: 2). Language contact has been broadly defined as the co-occurrence of two or more language either at individual level (bilinguality) or at the societal level (bilingualism). In the language contact situation “two or more languages will be said to be in CONTACT if they are used alternatively by the same person. The language-using individuals are thus the locus of the contact” (Weinreich 1953:1).

The influence of one language on the other in contact situation is extremely an important multidimensional issue which has been debated where various questions have been put forward like; can languages borrow linguistic elements from each other? Why do people borrow linguistic elements between the languages? What are the categories that are borrowed? Can we develop the hierarchy of borrowable categories from least borrowed towards frequently borrowed? Can one language influence another structurally or differently? etc. However no appropriate answers have been reached. One of the reasons for this is that there are widely divergent views on what language is really like. At the two contradictory ends we have “the ‘system’ view and the ‘bag of tricks’ view. The system view holds that languages, or more specifically grammars, are tightly organized wholes, of which elements are related by complex systematic and paradigmatic relationships. A prominent advocate of the system view was Ferdinand de Saussure, the founder of structuralism, who claimed that language was a system ‘*ou tout sê tient*’ (where every things together). The bag of trick view holds that languages are primarily complex tools for referring to the world and for communication, and that these tools easily adapt to new communicative and referential needs. A prominent
proponent of this bag of trick view was Hugo Schuchardt, the creolist.” (Apple and Muysken 1987:149)

In the contemporary linguistics, generativist like Noam Chomsky and others can be associated with the system view while as Roman Jackobson, Dell Hymes and other functionalist with the bag and trick view. On the other hand, the concept of system in itself has undergone into changes i.e. when we borrow anything in a system, it is not borrowed as a whole however modularized by the systems in its own way. Apple and Muysken state that “These systems contain a number of independent components; the lexicon, the phonological component, etc. The implication of this conception of grammar for borrowing is that borrowing a word does not imply necessarily that the sounds of which words are composed are borrowed in the same way. Of course words are phonological adapted in the process of borrowing. What this means is that words are borrowed in a fairly abstract shape, which is then mapped onto the sound patterns of the language.”(ibid: 149).

Vogt puts it differently as, “every enrichment or impoverishment of a system involves necessarily the reorganization of all the old distinctive opposition of the system so admit that a given element is simply added to the system which receives it without consequences for the system would ruin the very concept of system”. (quotation in Weinreich 1953: 1). But, by taking the notion of the language change into consideration that means language like anything else is always in the state of flux. According to Humboldt in 1836, “there can never be a moment of true stand still in language, just as little as in the ceaseless flaming thought of men. By nature it is a continuous process of development.”(quotation by Aitchison 2001:139). And one of the important factor of this change by which language consequently keeps on changing is a situation in which one language influence on the other when these languages come in ‘contact’ with each other. The languages leads to interferences of one on the other in various ways, that depends on the structure of the language, difference and similarities between the
languages, time of contact, status of the language, attitude etc. like, Aitcheson says “The longer the contact, the deeper the influence” (2001:138)

According to Weinreich, “Those instances of deviation from the norms of language which occur in the speech of the bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with the more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact, will be referred to as ‘interference’ phenomena”. (1953:1). By the term interference he refers to “the rearrangment of the patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of the morphology and syntax and some areas of vocabulary” (ibid). Therefore the greater the difference and the longer contact, the greater is the chance of interferences and chance of learning second language.

If we take bilingual person in to account, at times consciously or subconsciously uses foreign elements into in speaking other tongue (second language) or in speaking mother tongue (first language). For example,

1. The native language interference is explained here in the framework of phonological system of Kashmiri where [sk] cluster is not found. English speaking Kashmiri bilinguals whose first language is Kashmiri will insert a vowel in-between s and k
   i. ‘I go to səkool’ instead of ‘I go to ‘sku:l’
   ii. ‘John is a sukAA traversal’ instead of ‘John is a ‘skalə’
   iii. ‘Mary got a beautiful ‘sikaa scarf’ instead of ‘skarə’
   iv. Let’s have a ride on new ‘sokuutər instead of ‘sku:tə’

2. Similarly, the second language interference by Urdu English Speaker is explained here in the framework of morphological system of English using plural marker –s of English with lexical items of Urdu as:
3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural markers of English in Urdu</th>
<th>Plural formation of Urdu Nouns</th>
<th>English plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kitaabIz</td>
<td>kitaabeN</td>
<td>‘books’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lADkiiz</td>
<td>lADkiyaaN</td>
<td>‘girls’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aXbaarIz</td>
<td>aXbaraat</td>
<td>‘newspaper’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dargenIz</td>
<td>Dargen</td>
<td>‘dozens’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mAkaaanz</td>
<td>mAkaanaat</td>
<td>‘houses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piYaalIz</td>
<td>piiyliyAN</td>
<td>‘cups’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in sentence like:

a. mane sari kitaabIz padi.
I all books read
I have read all books’

b. wahan bohaut lADkiiz thii
there many girls were
‘There were many girls’.

4. Similarly, the native language interference at semantic level by Kashmiri Urdu speaker is explained as under:

a. I. darwa:za de do instead of
II. darwa:za band karo.

door give
door shut do

‘shut the door’

Thomason and Kaufman reserves the term borrowing to refer to “the incorporation of foreign elements in to the speakers native tongue and if the influence goes the other
way, native language structures the second language, means substratum interference” (1988:21)

The degree to which one language influence or interferes the other depends upon the degree of difference between two languages or dialects or varieties. The contact between the two varieties is not confined to two different languages. For Fishman “varieties not yet recognized as constituting separate languages”. (1972: 97). Weinreich states that “The greater the difference between the system, i.e. the more numerous the mutually exclusive forms and patterns in each, the greater is the learning problem and the potential area of interference” (1953:1). He further states “The mechanism of interference abstracted from the amount of interference, would appear to be the same whether the contact is between Chinese or French or between two sub-varieties of English used by neighboring families”(ibid:1-2).

Consequently, language contact between two different languages leading to the process of “bilingualism”, which at the same time giving emergence to the linguistic minorities due to various reasons. Wherever languages come in contact with each other, there exist greater needs for at least some individuals to become bilingual. An individual “tend to valorise some functions more than others: the cognitive function, for example”. (Hammers and Blanc 2003: 125). Similarly in case of multilingual communities, one or more languages may be valued, while others may be devalorised”. (ibid). In multilingual, multicultural and multiracial societies, marginalization results in grouping of people in dominant and subordinate groups ultimately leads to unequal status of language i.e. majority language and minority language. Bilinguals have proven very interesting to linguists who want to know how people cognitively and mentally put in order the structure of their language(s) and how those structures may work together. Bilingualism is also of great curiosity to sociolinguists who want to make out how communities decide which language is to be used to speak with whom and when. As Grosjean puts it “bilingualism is often a consequence of contact between two linguistic groups that do not have the same numerical, political, and economic importance” (1982:24). In virtually
every nation, in the world, linguistic minorities can be found which have came up due to the different historical and social process. With the result, this has led in hundreds of cases of ‘language contact’.

2.2 Interdisciplinary nature of the field of Language Contact

The field of language contact is also referred to as “Contact Linguistics” in literature of the discipline. Language Contact is a broader field that has become famous for its interdisciplinary nature. It is the subject of diversified academic fields that involves the disciplines like linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, education and anthropology etc. On one hand, some linguist feel that it is the subject matter of linguistics where it specifically deals with the interference at phonological, morphological, syntactical or semantic level, while on the other hand, some believe in its affinity with sociolinguistic and psycholinguistics. Like Myers-Scotton (2005) states, “While of course contact linguistics has affinities with both psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. It is something else. It deals specifically the grammatical structure of the language if bilinguals”. (quoted in Bernd & Kuteva 2005: 5).

It also appears that bilingualism and language contact are two interrelated fields. As Apple and Muysken states “bilingualism or language contact in itself is not a scientific discipline. It is an issue, a subject or a field of study to which various disciplines can contribute. The disciplines can interact or, on the other hand, functions independently, because of differing viewpoint, methodologies or terminologies”. (1987: 7)

The distinction made between linguistic, sociological, psychological, and sociolinguistic contribution to the study of bilingualism and language contact is unsatisfactory as the two fields are intricately interrelated. For example, it is impossible to find out the cognitive consequences of individual bilingualism without taking social factor in to consideration like the status of the language(s) involved.
The studies in the language contact from linguistic perspective can contribute by investigating:

1) How new languages can emerges out of language contact, e.g. creole and pidgin?

2) What happens to the structure of the language when they are in contact?

3) Can languages mix?

4) Do languages change when they are in contact?

5) Can they borrow rules of grammar or only words? etc.

In Psychological and socio-cultural perspectives which are counted as extra linguistic influence of language contact can contribute by investigating

1) What is the relative proficiency of the bilingual in each language?

2) What is the attitude of the bilingual towards each language?

3) What is the attitude towards the culture of each language community?

4) What is the attitude of the bilingual towards bilingualism as such?

5) What are the socio-psychological and political factor which account for the need, motivation and objectives of the second language learner?

6) What is the status of the two languages in contact? etc.

2.3. Principle situations for language contact

To give the situations pertinent to the process of language contact, it is important to shed light on the situations which have been considered significant by different scholars at different times to know the nature and scope of contact between two languages.

2.3.1. Social/Historical Circumstances
Sorensen (1967) and Sankoff (1980) states, “Language contact have, historically, taken place in large part under conditions of social inequality resulting from wars, conquests, colonialism, slavery, and migration-forced and otherwise. Relatively being in contacts involving urbanization or trade as a contact motivation are also documented, as are some situations of relative equality”. (Quoted by Sankoff 2000:3)

Similarly Apple and Muysken attempted to describe various dominant language contact situations in recent history which are as under:

I. **Linguistic Archipelago**: “A first historical situation of language contact is the linguistic archipelago: many often unrelated languages, each with few speakers, spoken in the same ecosphere. Such situations are rare at this moment, but must have been frequent in the precolonial era. Examples now are the Amazon basin and the Australian basin and the Australian desert, where many aboriginal people still live in tribal groups. Sociolinguistically, these areas are characterized by extensive bilingualism. Linguistically by widespread diffusion of words and elements of grammar from language to language”. (1987:5-6)

II. **Unstable Borders between Language Families**: “…the language contact involves more or less stable borders between language families. One such borders runs between the Romanic and Germanic languages through Switzerland (where French and Romansch are spoken in the south and Swiss German in the north) and Belgium (where Dutch and German are spoken in the north and French in the south)…” (ibid)

III. **Colonialism**: “…language contact occurs is the result of European colonial expansion. Colonialism has not only created a number of societies in which high-prestige European languages coexist with the native languages of the conquered people. New varieties of the colonial languages were created also, resembling the original in the case of English, French, Portuguese and Spanish in the new world and in Australia, but also on often unrecognizable form, as in the Creole languages of the Caribbean …” (ibid)
IV. National Languages Vs Minority Languages: another situation “reflects individual pockets of speakers of minority languages, cut off by the surrounding national languages. Example include welsh and Gaelic in Great Britain, Frisian in the Netherlands, Basque in French and Spain, often these groups reflect traditional populations, already in existence when new people and languages swept in”. (ibid)

V. Migration: “The final situation is in some sense the result of a reverse migratory movement: the influx of people from the post-colonial third world societies into the industrial world. People from the Caribbean have migrated to North America and Europe ….” (ibid)

However, as they are of the view that such a survey can only be very conditional and tentative for the reason that what seems like a stable situation today may change tomorrow, or be the result of an extremely important change that have not struck the minds of these two scholars.

2.3.2. Education

Another very important factor which plays active role in language contact is education. Many sociolinguistics like Dorian (1981; 1989), Gardner-Chloros (1991) and so forth have put stress on the significance the functional use of language in education. “education has been found to be one of the most powerful social parameters influencing language choice in different speech communities” (Matsumoto Kazuko 2001:98). Particularly in bilingual speech community “the functioning of two languages requires a particular set of norms for the speakers and a functional specialization of the languages involved” (Apple and Muysken1987: 22). It would seem natural that children in bilingual community should have the opportunity to be educated in two languages i.e. the language of other groups in the community. But the reality is different because in most bilingual communities as already mention the two languages do not share the equal status. This give rise to “often called home –school mismatch or switch and this
mismatch can have several negative consequences, for example poor education achievements”. (ibid: 45). Language used in education- schooling and higher-education, provides a range of language choice and language combination which will generate a vital condition for language contact. Additionally, it individual’s background is strongly allied to first of all to generation to which he/ she belongs to and second to the sociopolitical and historical conditions of his society. In case of Palau, for instance, “It is the older Palauan born under Japanese administered who were associated with the Japanese schools, while it is the middle-aged Palauan raised during the American education. Teenagers with experience of nationalist movements have experience of Palauan schools, with the new education policy of English and Japanese as Foreign languages. In other words, the effect of education reflect what language was available in schools during their school days, rather than medium choice, since different types of schools( Japanese, American and Palauan) were not available in the same way to all Palauan throughout the century”.( Matsumoto Kazuko 2001:98)

In many societies, non-indigenous language is used for education which gives rise to language contact situation, e.g. English/Urdu/Hindi languages in the education system in Kashmir, in the entire Private and the Government educational institutions, Urdu, Hindi and English are three language used in formal education and at present, use English for medium of instruction. The government educational institutions have altered from Urdu medium to English medium in 2003. Kashmiri was not taught as a subject and used for medium of instruction because very few books of the primary and secondary level were written in this language with the result most of the Kashmiri people are less proficient in writing and reading skills of Kashmiri language. However, in primary schools, Kashmiri was recently introduced as a subject from 5th class onwards. In secondary schools Kashmiri is taught as an optional subject. In some of the colleges and only in university of Kashmir, it is taught as subject and offer research programs.

2.3.3. Media
In present day circumstances, mass media plays an important role in language contact. But “the effect of the mass media on the speech of its audience are not well established as a field of research yet, due to the uncertainty to which media may affect people’s habits”. (Matsumoto Kazuko 2001:99). Some sociolinguistics are of the view that frequent exposure to pronunciation on television can result in change (Naro and Sherre (1996:223-8). “… it is worth mentioning that there is a small amount of evidence that sheer exposure of people who show no other sign of identifying with upper social class.” (Naro 1978 quoted in Hudson 1980: 171). Therefore, “[t]he effect of the mass media on people’s speech [and attitude] deserves careful study.” (Hudson 1980:171); while others assume that face to face interactions necessary before change take place (Trudgill 1986; Chambers 1997). Holmes suggest that, “television can soften people up by presenting new forms used by admired pop stars or TV personalities, so that when they ultimately get exposed to a particular form in speech of a real person, they are more ready to adopt it”. (1992:236).

In both the domains of the mass media and education, “the role of institutional support is often very important for the maintenance and promotion of the indigenous language and the minority language”. (Matsamoto Kazuko 2001:99)

Riggins for instance, illustrates that “due to minority language media, … skills of imperfect speakers are improving, languages are being modernized by addition of new technological vocabulary related to contemporary life, and … standardized”. (1992:283)

2.3.4. Concluding observations of the principle situations of language contact

In the multilingual perspective, which language should be used for which domain is the major issue for language planners, academicians and politicians, like language in education and used for medium of instruction in education, mass communication, administration etc. are among such issues. A language survives when it is learnt as a mother tongue by its native speakers, grows, and develops when it is used progressively
in major domains for example, education, media – print and electronic means of communication like internet, etc. Education and Media are the primary tools in the society to work for the mechanism of language consciousness. However the linguistic power of mainstream, official or colonial language or global language – English, in education, media, administration, trade, etc at present is such that it certainly threatens mother tongues of the people in multilingual nations like India. Education and Media reinforces the non-indigenous languages rather than encouraging the retention of the indigenous or mother tongue. Therefore at any rate there has been increasing attention to the effect of mass media upon language behaviour. E.g., Clyne (1991:11-13, 15), Riggins (1992:276:88).

Thus, the principle situations envisaged from foregoing studies of language contact, may be summed up as under:

1. Language contact takes place when interaction among mutually unintelligible linguistic communities is indispensable. This interaction is through tourism, business; battles and/or when regional stability has been interrupted by political upheavals. This phenomenon of language contact gives birth to pidgin and Creole.

1. Due to political reasons, like colonization, annexations and invasions, migration and eviction, can bring people from different linguistic, cultural, ethnic, religious or ethno-linguistic backgrounds together. These political measures sometimes bring people together speaking different language or divides people speaking the same language. For example, Colonization results into language contact as the colonizers dominate colonized population by imposing their language habits (i.e., the language of colonizers) upon indigenous language of people either by force or from necessity. It helps colonizers to maintain the order and transfer political and other forms of doctrines into grass root level of society. For example, South Asia Sub Continent especially India and Pakistan as the Policy of imperlistic power of Britain. The study carried out by Gal (1979), Fishman (1972) and others draw some idea on this issue.
2. Adopting language of wider communication for education, literacy, administration, media etc. A society may decide to make a second language available or even compulsory in order to gain wider markets of information. An example of this is the increasing use of English as global language across the universe at present in many countries of the world and its role as an international language and official language in many countries like India, Pakistan, Singapore, etc. resulting into “English linguistic and cultural imperialism”. (Phillipson 1992: 52)

3. Use of language other than native language of the soil for media, for example language contact situation in Kashmir, Kashmiris speak Kashmiri as native language, use Urdu as the *lingua franca* and use English, as the official language. Urdu and English are used as the language(s) of media particularly the print media.

4. Migration of people for economic reasons can bring people of different languages/varieties in to contact. For example, again in Kashmir, soldiers and large proportion of labourers from other parts of India speaking different languages visits Kashmir every year as necessity to earn.

5. Social mobility of people using different language(s).

6. Religion of different linguistic group who share the same belief to live together or conversely different religious communities may split up a country along linguistic lines; “for instance, in 1947, at time of partition, the Indian subcontinent split up along religious lines, thereby dividing a common *lingua franca* (Hindustani) into two distinct official languages: Hindi, used by the Hindu community, and Urdu, used by Muslims community”. (Hamers and Blanc 2003: 275)

### 2.4. Conceptual Frameworks of Various Pioneering Researchers

In describing the linguistic outcome of language contact phenomena, scholar may differ as to what extent and which aspect of linguist structure is impinged on by language contact. However, there is a broader consensus among the scholars, following Weinreich (1953), that the focus in contact linguistics is the bilingual speaker, and tried
to find out the inter-lingual identifications when the two languages in contact undergoes language change.

### 2.4.1 Weinreich’s framework (1953)

Weinreich believes that the interlingual identification of expression and the content units can be best understood by considering, “the structuralist theory of communication ... necessarily considers that, “every speech event belongs to a definite language”... Only on this assumption it is possible to conceive of an utterance belongs to another language than the rest. Because it is usually known, to either the speaker or describer or both, to which language an utterance as a whole belongs, the non-belonging elements can be separated as “borrowed” or TRANSFERRED. This is one of the manifestations of linguistic interference. But there is also a type of interference, extremely common in language contact, which does not involve an outright transfer of elements at all. It can affect both expression and content and is analyzed most effectively in structural terms if it is assumed that the basic unit of expression and content – the phoneme and semantemes – are defined within each language by oppositions to other phoneme and semantemes of that language. For example, /p/ in Russian, or р/р/, is defined, among others, by its distinctive feature of non-platality (in opposition to р/р/), while the definition of /p/ in English, or е/p/, involved no such restriction. From the point of view of languages, therefore, р/р/ and е/p/ cannot be “the same”. However, the physical resemblance of [p] in certain renditions of both phonemes in speech - for example, in р/т/ ‘type’ and е/tip/ ‘tip’, both pronounced with similar[-p]-tempts the bilingual to identify the two phonemes astride the limits of language. Even syllables and the whole words in two languages are occasionally equated by dint of their “identical” or “similar” phonemic shape; a Yiddish-speaking immigrant in the United States, for example, reported that to him English cold and his dialectal Yiddish /kәlt/ ‘cold’ were, phonemically, “the same word.”

Interlingual identification can also be made between grammatical relationships and procedures other than segmental morphemes, such as word order. By comparing
English and Russian sentence of the order SUBJECT+ VERB + OBJECT, a bilingual may identify the English order with the Russian, even though its function in English is denotative, in Russian largely stylistic.

Finally interlingual identifications of unit occur on the plane of content. In English, a certain area of meaning is included in, and divided by, the semantemes ‘foot’ and ‘leg’. Russian has no identical opposition; instead, it divides approximately the same content into three semantemes: ‘nóżka’ (furniture leg), ‘nógá’ (entire animal leg), and ‘fut’ (12-inch length). Thus, the semantemes in each language are differently defined. In contact situation, however, the material similarity between some of the referents of, say, _E_ ‘foot’ and _R_ ‘nogá’ suggests to the bilingual an interlingual identification of the two”. (1953:7-8)

Weinreich have examined various types of interference which were classified into three main types as under:

1. **Interference at phonic level or phonic interference:** the types of phonic interferences due to contact according to Weinreich are, “Under-differentiation of phonemes”, Over-differentiation of phonemes”, “Reinterpretation of relevant feature”, “phone substitution”, “Integration of loanwords”. (ibid: 18-19, 26-8).

2. **Interference at grammatical or grammatical interference:** “Transfer of morphemes”, :transfer of grammatical relations”, “Change in function of “indigenous” morphemes of category”, “Abandonment of obligatory categories” or “Integration of loan words” are types of possible types of grammatical interferences.(ibid: 31-46).

3. **Interference at lexical level or lexical interference:** “The ways in which one vocabulary can interfere the other, there are possible of types of lexical interferences are “Outright transfer of words”, “Phonic adjustment of cognates”, or “Specialized retention of an “indigenous” word after borrowing of an equivalent”. (ibid: 47-55)
He has also summarized the various factors governing these types of interferences. The phenomena of interference were considered, “as resultant of two opposing forces: STIMULI of interference and RESISTANCE to interference. Both stimuli and resistance factors can be structural or non-structural in linguistic sense”. (ibid: 66). These types interference and the factors governing interference presented in tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMS OF INTERFERENCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLES1</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
<th>NON-STRUCTURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIMULI</td>
<td>RESISTANCE FACTOR</td>
<td>STIMULI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Interferences</td>
<td>Any points of differences between two systems</td>
<td>Stability: requirement of intelligibility</td>
<td>Social value of source (model primary) language; bilingual interlocutors; affective speech; individual propensity for speech mixture; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonic</td>
<td>/d/ and /t/ not differentiated</td>
<td>Absence of corresponding distinctions in primary language.</td>
<td>Functional yielding of the distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-differentiation of Phoneme</td>
<td>[k] and [kh] treated as separate phoneme</td>
<td>Presence of distinction (only) in primary language</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-differentiation of relevant features</td>
<td>Voiceless /p/ treated as phonemically</td>
<td>Different phonemic system</td>
<td>Existence of appropriate holes in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. For examples see Uriel Weinreich. 1953. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. The Hague, London: Mouton & CO. (pp.18-19, 26-8, 31-55)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tense and only comitantly voiceless.</th>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>Social value primary language</th>
<th>Loyalty to secondary language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone substitution</td>
<td>[r] for [R] where there is only one trill phoneme</td>
<td>Danger of confusion with another phoneme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of loanwords</td>
<td>English /rajs/ into Hawaiian /laiki/</td>
<td>Different phonemic systems; homogene ous but different types of word structure in recipient language</td>
<td>Potential homonymy (?)</td>
<td>Intolerance of recognizable loanwords; unilingualism of speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grammatical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer of morpheme</th>
<th>Slovak-German in Pressburg-u; Yiddish-English job-shmob</th>
<th>Congruent system, much common vocabulary, relatively unbound morphemes, greater phonemic bulk</th>
<th>Non-congruent systems; complicated functions of morphemes</th>
<th>Affectiveness of categories</th>
<th>Loyalty to secondary language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of grammatical relations</td>
<td>German-English I come soon home.</td>
<td>Different relation patterns</td>
<td>Conflict with existing relations</td>
<td>Affectiveness of categories</td>
<td>Loyalty to secondary language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in function of &quot;indigenous&quot; morpheme of category</td>
<td>German-English how long are you here?</td>
<td>Greater explicitnes of model (usually)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Loyalty to secondary language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandonment of obligatory categories</td>
<td>Loss of old French tense in Creole</td>
<td>Very different grammatic al systems</td>
<td>Make shift language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Loyalty to secondary language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of loanwords</td>
<td>English change in Amer. Portuguese chinjar</td>
<td>Homogeno us word structure in recipient language</td>
<td>Intolerance of recognizable loanwords; unilingualism of speaker</td>
<td>Social value of source language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lexical interference as such**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural weak point in recipient vocabulary, need to match differentiation in source language</th>
<th>Existence of adequate vocabulary</th>
<th>Lexical inadequacy in face of innovations; oblivion of infrequent words, need for synonyms, prestige of source language, stylistic effect of mixture</th>
<th>Loyalty to secondary language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Outright transfer of words (rather than semantic extension)**

| German Telephone rather **fern sprecher** | Congenial form of word; possibility of polysemy (?) | Potential homonymy (?); uncongenial word form | Bilingualism of interlocutors | Loyalty to secondary language |
|---|---|---|---|

**Phonic adjustments of cognates**

| Spanish /eu’ropa/ into ju’ropa/ on English model | Economy of a single form | - | - | Loyalty to secondary language |
|---|---|---|---|

**Specialized retention of an “indigenous” word after borrowing of an equivalent**

| French chose, retained and distinguished from cause | No confusion in semantem es | Elimination of superfluous term | - | - |
|---|---|---|---|

| **Table 2.1. Weinriech’s summary of the various factors governing interference at different levels** |

His study gives the significant understanding of the difference between structural and non-structural forces which acts as resistance or stimulus (acceptance) of the interferences. Though much of his work, he tried to investigate the structural linguistic factors of interference and how these structural factors could be associated with outcome of language contact. The disagreement of the structural factors deal with some of the technical, non-social problem was to a degree rectified by taking into account the social and cultural factors involved in language contact. According to him, from structural point of view, “interference is to be expected in BOTH languages that are in contact. If, in practice, the interference occurs only in one direction, it is again such non-structural factors [external factors] as speakers’ linguistic life-histories and the cultural setting which are decisive”. (ibid: 67).
2.4.2. Fishman’s Frame work (1972)

In developing the proper understanding about the contact of either the two varieties of a language or the two different languages, which ultimately depends on the role of the said varieties or languages, for which, we must consider the Fishman’s discussion about diglossia and bilingualism, which is actually characterized by the role specialization of particular linguistic varieties or languages, which in turn, select the linguistic repertoire of each speech community. “Languages or varieties of languages are separated by norms associated with social roles which, in turn, are separated by, among other things, distinctive values. In effect, norms tend to be equated with values which are implemented in terms of social roles”. (Williams 1992: 100). For Fishman “varieties not yet recognized as constituting separate languages” (Fishman 1972: 97). He claimed that “diglossia could refer to any difference from the most minute stylistic variation within a single language to the use of two totally unrelated languages. Significantly the defining criterion for was the functional feature of linguistic differentiation. Evidently he is discussing both what Ferguson referred to as diglossia and what is customarily referred to as “bilingualism”. (ibid: 98). Fishman presented his typology in schematic form as give below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIGLOSSIA</th>
<th>BILINGUALISM</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>1. Both diglossia and bilingualism</td>
<td>2. Bilingualism without diglossia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3. Diglossia without bilingualism</td>
<td>4. Neither diglossia nor bilingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, in this four-fold typology “Fishman distinguishes between diglossia seen as sociolinguistic in the sense of relating to the use of different linguistic forms within society; and bilingualism seen as psycholinguistic, involving as it does the capacity of individual to use more than one language, leading to a consideration of the attitude of the individual when confronted with more than one form”. (Williams 1992: 98). The linguistic repertoire of a person depends on various factors, among which Fishman stressed on the role theory. It is claimed that diglossia and bilingualism in association exist in type first is a “fairly large and complex speech community, that its members have available to them both a range of compartmentalized roles as well as ready access to these roles’ (Fishman 1972: 96). Thus, there is a relationship between the complexity of speech community and linguistic varieties mediated with social roles. As Fishman further states:

“If the role repertoires of these speech communities were of lesser range, then their linguistic repertoire would also become more restricted in range, with the result that one or more separate languages or varieties would become superfluous”. (ibid)

Consequently, the result of this complexity of speech community and social roles is linguistic diversity in terms of either varieties of language (diglossic forms) or of the number of languages that eventually evolve into the social, cultural or ethnic class system. The individual is able to categorize himself with the help of his linguistic repertoire with a particular group and if “… widespread access not available to the range
of compartmentalized roles... the bilingual population would be a small privileged cast or class...” (Fishman 1972: 96-7)

The type fourth involving neither diglossia nor bilingualism is restricted to the “very small, isolated, and undifferentiated speech communities (ibid: 106)

The type of four-fold typology which has drawn most attention is type fourth, which involves bilingualism without diglossia, involving what Fishman referred to as one where “bilingualism is essentially a characteristic of individual linguistic versatility, whereas diglossia is a characteristic of the social allocation of functions to different languages or varieties” (ibid: 102)

“[T]he four cells which encompass the typology are presented as an evolutionary continuum. The dynamic force associated with this continuum is political and economic order which opens closed systems which are subsequently integrated into a harmonious whole”. (William 1992: 105).

2.4.3. Thomason and Kaufman’s framework (1988)

Thomason and Kaufman distill out only two dimensions from the potential knot of social parameters:

a. The first is the directionality of the influence, in terms of speakers’ native language. They investigated two alternative directions in which language contact can go, which results in two different linguistic processes: “Borrowing” and Substratum interference”. The term borrowing refers to “the incorporation of foreign elements in the speakers’ native language”. (1988:21). And when the influence goes the other way i.e. “native language structures influence the second language is substratum interference”. (ibid: 21).

b. The second dimension is the scale of relative pressure of one group’s language on the other, which can be classified as external constraints.
They stated that, “as far as the strictly linguistic possibilities go, any linguistic features can be transferred from any language to any other language”. (ibid: 14). Even Campbell supported this statement as, “Thus I conclude with Thomason and Kaufman, “as far as the strictly... to any other language”. This being the case, it is safer to think of these proposed universals and principles of borrowing as general tendencies, and as absolute constraints”. (1993: 104)

Thus by setting a scale of relative pressure of one on the other, they take social factors into consideration which are called as external forces. From a sociolinguistic perspective, Thomason and Kaufman have tried to explore the types where socio-historical forces that have given rise to different linguistic outcome. As already mentioned, they deny the importance of internal linguistic constraints on interference. They argued the internal constraints (structural factors) on linguistic interference are ultimately based on the outside influence.

2.4.4. Van Coetsem’s framework (1988, 2000)

Van Coetsem in an independent work enunciated the distinction between borrowing and substratum interference proposed by Thomason and Kaufman. Like Thomason and Kaufman, Van Coetsem also distinguishes between “source language” and “recipient language”, and regards the ‘factors of agency’ as primary. His term “phonological borrowing” is parallel to borrowing in Thomason and Kaufman as restricts this process to “recipient language agentivity”. (1988: 10).

Perhaps the most comprehensive and slightest appreciated attempt to sort out the terminological confusion in discussions of contact phenomena was made by Van Coetsem (1988, 2000). Other scholars who have called attention to Van Coetsem’s model include Guy (1990) and Smith (1996). Smith describes this model as one based on a psycholinguistic perspective, and contrasts it with Thomason & Kaufman’s model, which is based on a socio-cultural perspective. Van Coetsem makes a broad distinction between two transfer types, borrowing and what he calls imposition. The latter
corresponds to what researchers in second language acquisition (SLA) refer to as “transfer.” By the recipient language agentivity, means native speakers of the recipient language import their language something from another, source language. The reverse of this, parallel Thomason and Kaufman’s notion of substratum interference is called “imposition”. (1988: 11). Imposition occurs when foreign language speaker impose its own language’s phonological habits in the use of second language.

Van Coetsem defines borrowing as follows:

“If the recipient language speaker is the agent, as in the case of an English speaker using French words while speaking English, the transfer of material... from the source language to the recipient language is borrowing.” (1988:3). In imposition, on the other hand,

“the source language speaker is the agent, as in the case of a French speaker using his French articulatory habits while speaking English” (ibid: 3)

Further, he notes that, “… the imposition does not carry negative connotations; it simply denotes an agent other than the recipient language speaker”. (ibid: 11).

2.4.5. Gillian Sankoff’s framework (2000).

Another sociolinguist Gillian Sankoff, have also discussed the linguistic outcome of language contact in terms of four major domains. These linguistic inter-influences are at

1. The Phonetic/ phonological level.
2. The lexical level.
3. The syntax and discourse/pragmatics level.
4. The morphological/ grammatical level.

According to him, “The first two of these constitute a privileged window of linguistic inter-influence: the phonetic/ phonological level and the lexical level. These are two
corridors which, in my view, constitute the major “gateway” to all aspects of contact-influenced change…” (2000:5)

Regarding the phonological interferences Sankoff is of the view that, “phonological interferences or transferences is overwhelmingly observed. It would appear likely, then, that farther along on the contact history, in the process, of acquiring bilingual competence, the version of the second language spoken by such people would still contain many phonological features derivable from their native language, i.e. substratum phonological influence. However, such a development constitutes a long-term linguistic influence only in so far as the descendants of these people have acquired and carried forward the substratum-influence version of their parents, perhaps even transmitting it, or some of its features, to descendants of the native speakers”. (ibid: 6).

In describing lexical aspects of language in contact, “it is overwhelmingly clear that the major process involved is borrowing. In the majority of contact situations, borrowing occurs most extensively on the part of minority language speakers from the language of wider communication in to the minority language. On the other hand one can readily identify words that have become accepted within the majority language communities that derive from language shift by various immigrant groups and would thus clearly fall under the definition of “substratum influence””. (ibid: 11)

The linguistic interference in case of grammar or syntax can be borrowed or not, is still in question. Many students of contact linguistics conceive the view that grammatical or syntactic borrowing is impossible or close to it (e.g. Lefebvre 1985; Prince 1988; King 2000). Among varied proposals regarding the chain of events that can lead to contact-induced syntactic changes, Sankoff believes that “four lines of explanation have been proposed. The first derives from the type of phonological changes widely attested, attributably in the first instance to substratum influence …. The second derives lexical borrowing. The third, variously described as “camouflage” (Spears 1982); “covert interference” (Mougom and Beniak 1991)… and also, I believe, related to the equivalence constraints in code switching (Poplack 1980) appears to be a syntax-internal
process related more substratum than to borrowing, ... Fourthly, in a related line of work, several studies have traced a discourse-to-syntax path in bilingual inter-influence, also apparently more characteristic, though not perhaps uniquely so, of substratum influence.” (2000:13)

Many researchers are of the opinion that the adoption of bound morphemes, at morphological/grammatical level, are among the most resistant features of language contact induced changes. Sankoff (2000) states that, “After reviewing the literature, I am more convinced than ever that this is true. Only few cases came to light, and almost all involved morphemes that are, if not entirely free, not really bound either”. (ibid: 17).

He further states which is important to mention here that, “Though most language contact situation leads to unidirectional, rather than bidirectional linguistic results, conditioned by the social circumstances, it is also the case that linguistic structure overwhelmingly conditions the linguistic outcome. Morphology and syntax are clearly the domains of linguistic structure least susceptible to the influence of contact, and this statistical generalization is not vitiated by a few exceptional cases. On the other hand, lexicon as clearly the most readily borrowable element, and borrowing lexicon can lead to structural changes at every level of linguistic structure ... And phonological is very susceptible to change, both on the part of the individual L2 speaker and a result of word borrowing, where most studies documented the influence of the recipient-language structure on foreign borrowings as well as long-term influence on the phonology of the recipient language”. (ibid: 19).

2.4.6. Heine and Kuteva’s Framework (2005)

Recently, Heine and Kutena are of the opinion that, “contact-induced language change ... not infrequently extends over centuries or even millennia. Not all components and stages of this process are necessary an immediate product of language contact. It may happen, for example language contact provides the trigger for other changes to occur, and that is change that are independent of language contact. But it may also
happen that some linguistic changes not involving language contact at some stage is affected by language contact. Most of the data that are at our disposal do not provide any clues as to which of such developments, or of many other conceivable developments, were involved. As long as there concrete evidence to the effect that contact-induced transfer of linguistic material was involved in some way or the other, we will treat such process as “contact-induced language change”. What this means is that this notion includes in some range of different phenomena and on some of them, language contact may have played at best the marginal role”. (2005:5)

Speaking about the contact –induced influence that manifests itself in the transfer of linguistic material from one to another language, they classified the following possible situations:

a. “Form, that is, sound or combination of sound.

b. Meaning (including grammatical meaning or function) or combination of meaning.

c. Syntactic relation, that is, the order of meaningful element.

d. Any combination of (a) through (d)” (ibid: 2).

2.5. Implications of Language Contact

All languages are dynamic in nature, which are subjected to various types of changes. These changes may have arisen due to number of different reasons. And if we find similarities between languages i.e. similarities in form, meaning or structure, are also due to various reasons. For example Heine and Kutena states that similarities among the languages are due, “… to universal principles of linguistic discourse and historical development to share genetic relationship, or simply to chance”. (2005:2).

The changes that take place as a consequence of ‘contact’ of languages which deals with how one language may influence the other if they are in contact though may belong to different families? How People can change their linguistic habits if they are
exposed to other language? This is due to nature of contact-induced language changes, which is a complex process, has got affinities with various field.

2.5.1. Nature of the forces for language contact

The interferences in the bilinguals’ speech are due to the various structural factors as well as non-structural factors (extra-linguistic). These factors were first investigated by Weinreich. He observes that, “The precise effect of bilingualism on person’s speech varies with a great many other factors, some of which might be called extra-linguistic factors because they lie beyond the structural differences of the languages or even their lexical inadequacies. A full account of interference in a language contact situation, including the diffusion, persistence and evanescence of a particular interference phenomenon, is possible only if the extra-linguistic factors are considered”. (1953:3).

Therefore when two languages are in contact, it is not limited only to the linguistic aspect of influence/interference/impact in contact situation; the studies of the subject matter reveals that other aspects like, world view, cultural, social, psychological and political dimensions are also considerably significant for language contact situations. “Modern anthropologist are concerned with the relationship between language, culture and world view trace their intellectual genealogy through “Worps hypothesis: that the form of meaning created in the syntactic, morphological and phonological patterns of language can vary more or less without limit, and that these forms, which constitutes reifications of the world, are powerful mediators of human understanding, which should in its own turn assumes a more or less unlimited range of forms”. (quoted in Newmyer 1988: 2). The speaker perceives world which is conditioned by the different linguistic categories of the language he/she has internalized. Hence it is the structure of language which determines the thought, and how one experiences and views the world. Thus the main issue for the linguist’s interested in understanding the linguistic outcome of language contact is to understand the nature of socio-psychological forces resulting in different language contact situations and the linguistic outcome of the languages in contact. Weinreich states, “Of course, the linguist is entitled to abstract language from
considerations of a psychological of sociological nature. As a matter of fact he SHOULD pose purely linguistic problems about bilingualism. He may then see the cause of the susceptibility of a language to foreign influence in its structural weakness; he may trace the treatment of foreign material in conformity with the structure of the borrowing language. But the extent, direction and nature of the interference of one language with another can be explained even more thoroughly in terms of speech behavior of bilingual individuals which in turn conditioned by social relations in community in which they live. In other words, more complete findings can be expected from coordinated efforts of all the disciplines interested in the problem”. (ibid: 4-5). Thus he also believes in the advantages of interdisciplinary approach to the contact-linguistics.

2.5.2. Internal and External Forces

The linguistic outcomes of language contact are largely determined by the internal and external forces. The external factors are by the history of social relation among population, including economic, political, and demographic factors, language factors, and the attitude towards bilingualism, language and speech community with these languages, relation between the two language groups, tolerance and intolerance towards mixing of languages. Most of the sociolinguists ignored the internal forces and attributed their research to the socio-historical factors. These socio-historical factors by many were considered a unique casual weight in determining the language contact outcomes. Thomason and Kaufman devoted a major of the chapter to “the failure of linguistic constraints on interference”. (1988:14). They argue that, “linguistic constraints on linguistic interferences...are based ultimately on the premise that the structure of a language determines what can happen to it as a result of outside influence. And they all fail”. (ibid: 14-15)

2.5.3. Classification and processes of Contact-induced changes
Contact-induced influence like the linguistic interference of one language on other, the transfer of linguistic material from one language to another and the influence of one language on other e.g., status, esteem, race, etc manifest itself in different ways:

a. When languages are in extensive long-term contact, begins to share more properties i.e. undergoes the process of language convergence

b. The transfer of linguistic material from one language to other due alternative use of two languages by bilingual leads to different process e.g. borrowing, code mixing, code switching etc.

c. When bilingual speech community or a bilingual person with the passage of time shifts from lower prestige’s language to a higher prestige’s language i.e. the process of language shift.

d. When speaker shifts to a set of language spoken by socio-economically dominant groups leads to the dying of their native languages i.e. the process of language death.

e. The most interesting area of study in contact linguistics is the process of creation of pidgins and creoles.

Some of the important above mentioned phenomena arising from language contact situation are described with the help of examples:

A) *Language convergence and language divergence*

When languages happen to be in extensive and long term contact, such language can start sharing more and more features though belong to different language families. This process is known as convergence. Due to this process of language convergence, these languages form union of language known as “*Sprachbund*” (this term was developed by Trubetzkoy in 1928. *Sprachbund* is also known as a linguistic area, convergence area, diffusion area as group of languages that have become similar in some way because of geographical proximity. These may be genetically unrelated. According to Hammers and Blanc, “when individuals and groups come in
contact, their language inevitably also come in contact. These may either converge or
diverge, or converge and diverge at one and the same time. This because the degree of
variation in intralingual and interlingual uses depends on the relative strength of the
two tendencies in society: the tendency to reduce intergroup and interpersonal
differences (convergence) and the tendency to accentuate these differences
(divergence). The former, convergence, which Le Page (1978) calls ‘focusing’ – is found
where speakers are in close and constant contact and where there is consensus on the
norms of language behaviour. It is characteristic of small communities with dense and
multiplex social networks, or else societies where standard written language as imposed
as the legitimate norm of a linguistic ‘commonwealth’ (e.g. International French of ‘le de
la Francophonie’ or Koranic Arabic on the Islamic world). The latter tendency,
divergence – prevails in situations where there are no imposed or self-imposed norms,
where social network links are loose and simplex, leading to wide variations in usage”.
(2003: 307-308)

As a consequence, “In a situation in which several languages have been spoken in
the same area and mostly by the same people for a long time they may start converging.
This convergence is most apparent on the phonetic level: the sound systems of the
languages may grow more and more to be similar, without clear influence in one

For example, “in several cases, for instance, unrelated languages spoken in the
same area have developed a tone system. Chinese and Tibetan are one example, and
another is formed by the languages of the Baltic Sea: Swedish, Norwegain (excluding the
Northwestern dialects), most dialects of Danish, some dialects of North German, North
Cashubic, Estonian Latish, Lithuanian”. (ibid: 155).

However in the Balkans, the situation is different, where complete grammatical
system convergence is claimed. For example, “the replacement of the infinitive by a
subjunctive construction. Instead of something like ‘je veux partir’ (I want to leave)
speakers of Balkan languages will say something like ‘je veux que je parti (subjunctive)’ (I want to that I leave):

Albanian due te shkue

Bugarian iskam da otida

Romanian veau sa plec

Greek thelo na poa

‘I want that I leave’

The verb after the complementizer is the present tense and corresponds in person and number to the main verb. Hence it is completely redundant information and this corresponds with the idea that this construction emerged in a language contact situation…” (ibid: 155).

Similarly, “the 3000 inhabitants of Kupwar, a small border village in south India, between them speak four languages: Marathi, Urdu (both indo-European), Kannada and Telugu (both Dravidian). The community is divided into clearly distinct groups or castes, each identified by its language. As the villagers need to communicate, they (especially the men) learn each other’s languages. These languages have coexisted for centuries and they have converged, at least as far as the syntax is concerned. They have become much more similar than they elsewhere (the convergence is essentially towards Marathi, the state language). However, they are still totally distinct in their vocabularies, which serve as a powerful symbol of each group’s ethnic identity and distinctiveness (Gumperz and Wilson 1971). This case contradicts universal rule of borrowing, according to which lexical are the easiest to borrow and syntax the most resistant”. (Hammers and Blanc 2003: 308).

The position that grammar is largely impermeable to external influences has been upheld by many scholars. Consistent with this view is the idea that in situations of language contact, entirely foreign structural features are not incorporated into the
syntax or morphology of the recipient linguistic system. However, “under situations of very extensive contact and long-term contact radically incompatible foreign features can penetrate into a recipient language, e.g., Turkish agglutinative patterns of noun and verb inflection in Asia Minor Greek.” (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988:219).

Hudson put forward a hypothesis the “Syntax is the marker of social cohesion; in contrast, vocabulary is a marker of caste and religion; pronunciation reflects the permanent groups with which a speakers identifies. This results in a tendency for individuals to suppress alternatives, but in contrast to the tendency with syntax, different groups suppress different alternatives in order to distinguish themselves from each other, and some individual keep some alternatives alive in order to be able to identify their origin even more precisely, by using them in particular and distinctive proportion relative to other alternatives”. (1980: 48). In the recent statement on the capacities of contact-induced change is Thomason’s observation is that “It is not just words that get borrowed: all aspects of language structure are subject to transfer from one language to another, given the right mix of social and linguistic circumstances” (2001: 11).


As already mentioned in section 2.4.4, the distinction between borrowing and imposition as shown by Van Coetsem (1988,2000) on the basis of agentivity.

Most of the researchers are of the view that borrowing is when borrowed elements are adopted phonologically and morphologically. An example of borrowing, where the transfer of vocabulary from an external source language to a dominant recipient language is “the growing influence of (especially American) mass media, music and youth culture in general has led to importation of hundreds of English words into the Japanese lexicon. Indeed, such words now make up some seven and a quarter percent
Some examples of these loanwords in different domains in Japanese is as under

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport:</th>
<th>Food:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>geemu setto &lt; game and set</td>
<td>sarada &lt; salad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress/Fashion:</td>
<td>Music/Leisure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sangurasu &lt; sunglasses</td>
<td>songu &lt; song</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that these loans have been completely integrated into the phonology and morphology of Japanese.

In case of imposition, Van Coetsem notes, as noted earlier in section 2.4.4, “the process of imposition is typical of second language acquisition, and, corresponds to what has traditionally been called “transfer” in that area of study. It is well known that learners employ features of their L1 to compensate for their limited proficiency in an L2. Such L1 (SL) features are imposed on the L2 (RL). They may include vocabulary and semantics, as well as phonology, morphology, and syntax”. (1988:18)

For example, Nemser studied the German-speaking Austrian students, “[who] used German lexical items like grammatik for ‘grammar’ and brills for ‘eyeglasses’ in their L2 English. They also imposed the semantics of German words on English words of similar phonological shape. Thus they used meager to mean ‘thin’ (compare German mager ‘thin’) and guilty to mean ‘valid’ (compare German gültig ‘valid’). They also produced loan translations based on German models, such as ill-car “ambulance” (cf. German Krankenwagen), and alp-dream “nightmare” (cf German Alptraum). Some advanced learners produced derivational formations based on German patterns, such as nervosity (cf G. Nervosität), respectless (cf G. respektlos) and unguilty (cf. G. unschuldig).

With regard to morphology, some of them produced plural forms like dog-e ‘dogs’ and girl-en ‘girls’, using German plural suffixes”. (1991: 353)
In syntax, they produced English sentences in which the argument structure of the verb corresponded to that of German rather than English. The following are examples:

(1) Explain me something (compare German *Erklar mir was*), (ibid: 360)

(2) You just finished to eat (Cf G. *Du hast gerade aufgehört zu essen*). (ibid: 360)

(3) I would suggest him to go (Compare German *Ich empfehle ihm zu gehen*). (ibid: 360).

We also find imposition of English word order on the L2 English sentences of more advanced learners, as in the following:

(4) All of a sudden will be coming too much [ketchup] out. (ibid: 353)

(5) She took a woman away her husband (“took a woman’s husband away”) (ibid)

(6) Went you home? (ibid)

It seems clear that in all these cases, the direction of the influence is from the learner’s dominant language (the SL) to the less-dominant one (the RL). Moreover, unlike the case of borrowing, the transfer has significant effects on RL structure.” (ibid: 356)

In practice it is not possible to distinguish between borrowing and some of the contact - induced changes like imposition, code switching and code mixing. Any vagueness in the use of these key terms poses serious problems for understanding of what is actually involved in the types of cross-linguistic influence. Moreover, it can lead to inaccuracy in our assignment of changes to one or the other category. In case of borrowing and imposition, the distinction is already explained on the basis of agentivity.
The distinction between borrowing and code switching and borrowing and code mixing will be shown in section (2.5.3(E))

Here, “borrowing” is treated as mechanism or processes without any clear explanation of what these terms mean or what they involve. Haugen points out that “borrowing as here defined is strictly a process and not a state, yet most of the terms used in discussing it are ordinarily descriptive of its results rather than of the process itself.” (1950:213). He further notes that the classifications of borrowings into loanwords, loan translations and the like “are merely tags that various writers have applied to the observed results of borrowing.” (ibid: 213)

More importantly, it is worth to mention here that incorporation of borrowed elements is very slow and gradual process. “Casagrande (1954:5) cites a number of linguists working on Amersindian language in support of the idea that the integration of borrowed elements is a very gradual process, which may take generations, and that the degree of integration is generally indicative of the time of the borrowing.” (quoted in Apple and Muysken 1987: 173)

Also the incorporation of borrowed elements depends on proficiency of the two language is important issue. As Van Coetsem explains, “A bilingual speaker ...is linguistically dominant in the language in which he is most proficient and most fluent (which is not necessarily his first or native language).” (1988:70). In borrowing, materials from a non-dominant source language are imported into an RL by means of the agency of speakers for whom the latter is the dominant or primary language, i.e., RL agentivity. Transfer of this type typically involves mostly vocabulary, though some degree of structural borrowing is possible, as discussed above. In imposition, the source language is the dominant (usually the first or primary) language of the speaker, from which materials are transferred into an RL in which the speaker is less proficient, i.e., SL agentivity. Transfer of this type tends to involve mainly phonology and grammatical features, though imposition of vocabulary can occur as well. It is important here that we distinguish clearly between linguistic dominance and social dominance. “The former
refers to the fact that a speaker is more proficient in one of the languages involved in contact, which is typically his first or primary language. Social dominance refers to the social and political status of a language”. (Van Coetsem 1988:13). Commonly, the socially dominant language is also happening to be the linguistically dominant language of the community. However, there are many situations in which a speaker is linguistically dominant in a subordinate language or minority language. Evidently the dominance of a particular thing whether a group or language both social and linguistic can change over time.

C) Language Maintenance and Language Shift

In a language – contact situation and bilingualism, the result of contact of two languages can be setback to the mother tongue or leads to replacement of mother tongue by the other. When two languages are used for different societal domains, the natural result of bilingualism is return to monolingualism. “The usual outcome of bilingualism, however, is return to monolingualism: this may take the form of maintenance of group’s original language and the disappearance of the second language; a shift to the group’s second language and disappearance of the first language (often referred to as mother-tongue displacement or language shift; or the evolution to a new language through process of pidginization and creolization”. (Grosjean 1982: 38).

For example, “In a number of instances a group that has become bilingual through military invasion and colonization reverts to its original monolingualism when the foreign influence diminishes or is removed. This was the case in many nations that belonged to the Hapsburg and Ottoman Empire, whose official language were German and Turkish, respectively. Because of the rather duration of contact, the monolingualism of the groups involved, and the few opportunities given to the colonized group by the colonizers, German and Turkish never implanted themselves in these empire in the same way that Latin spread throughout the Roman or Spanish invaded South America. Admittedly, some inhabitants of Hungary, Romania, and other Hapsburg Empire countries learned and used Germany in addition to their own mother tongues (and the
same is true of members of the Ottoman Empire vis-à-vis Turkish), but the official language never resulted in prolonged bilingualism or displaced the mother tongue after the dismembering of the empire”. (ibid: 38-39).

When a group shifts from using a by and large lower status language to a higher status language, this process is known as Language shift. About Language shift, Weinreich is of the opinion that, “A language shift may be defined as the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another”. (1953: 68). “Instead of maintaining of the group’s original language and the disappearance of the second language, bilingualism may lead to a language shift to the group’s second language, as in case of Germanic invaders in Italy and Gaul in the sixth and seventh centuries. This mother-tongue displacement frequently occurs when a nation is established or when a group of people migrate to another land”. (Grosjean 1982: 39). Weinreich believes that, “language shift should be analyzed in terms of the function of the languages in the contact situation ... since a mother-tongue group may switch to a new language in certain functions but not in others. For example, under a foreign occupation, or in migration to a new country, the adult members of a mother-tongue group may come to use a new language in its dealing with governmental authorities, while children use it in school; at the same time, the old language may live on in the home and in informal gatherings of the group. In such a case we may speak of PARTIAL rather than a TOTAL shift. While language shift among urban immigrants in America are usually rapid and total, the language shift among rural immigrant communities are often rather a partial type for two or three generations, at least”. (1953: 107). Apple and Muysken put forward the same type of idea as under:

“The general pattern of language shift in immigrant groups is as follows. The first generation (born in the country of origin) is bilingual, but the minority language is clearly dominant, the second generation is bilingual and either of the two language might be strongest, the third generation is bilingual with majority language dominating,
and the fourth generation only has command of the majority language. This is only a general pattern...” (1987: 42).

Therefore the nature of shift and the functions of the language should always be considered before any analysis of language shift process.

D) Pidginization and creolization

When languages in contact leads to creation of new language, the processes involved is Creolization through pidginization. A pidgin, oftenly called as contact language, is the name given to any language created, usually out of a mixture of other languages as a means of communication between speakers of different tongues when these speech communities are mutually unintelligible. Pidgin evolves as a code usually used in trade situation where the speakers of different languages come in contact. Therefore, the important necessity is the means of communication for the purpose of communication with one other. Researchers have found that Pidgins have simple grammars most, called as auxiliary contact languages. Pidgin is not the native language but is learned as second language. Blanc and Hammers states “Pidgins are auxiliary languages (form) developed for the purpose of minimal communication between individuals/groups speaking mutually unintelligible vernaculars (functions). In the pidginization process, limited and simplified linguistic forms are developed. As a need for communication increases in the society (function), so new forms are created by the speakers. Gradually these new forms serve extended function. Eventually the pidgin evolves in to a Creole (form), becomes the mother tongue of the next generation, and thereby serves new functions”. (2003: 12).

According to Grosjean, formation of new language “occurs when one or more language group’s start using a lingua franca a simplified form of another group’s language and inserting in that language some feature of their own language; this is called pidginization. When the “new” language becomes more developed lexically and
grammatically and is passed on to children as their mother tongue, the stage is called creolization. (19982: 41)

All language contact situation do not lead to formation of new language. “Some situations of language contact have been productive of new, third languages, while others have not”. (Weinreich 1953:104). He further states that only those languages can achieve the status of new language if they have attained some or all of the following criteria:

“(1) a form palpably different from either stock language; (2) a certain stability of form after initial fluctuations; (3) functions other than those of workaday vernacular (e.g. use in the family, in formalized communication, etc.); (4) a rating among the speakers themselves a separate language”.(ibid: 69)

The most popular example of creation of new language is “Haitian Creole, Jamaican Creole and Neo-Melanesian (Tok Pisin) are the result of pidginization and creolization. Haitian Creole evolved from contact of different dialects of French, of Spanish, of native Indian languages, and African languages. It was first a pidgin and was used as a between–group mean of communication, but little by little it became the mother tongue of the Haitians, is now the language of 85 percent of population of Haiti, most of whom are monolingual in this language”.( Grosjean 1982: 41).

Similarly “Caribbean pidgins were the result of colonialism. As tropical islands were colonised their society was restructured, with a ruling minority of some European nation and a large mass of non-European laborers. The laborers, natives, slaves or cheap immigrant workers, would often come from many different language groups and would need to communicate. This led to the development of pidgins. These pidgins have since died out although some, such as Haitian, Jamaican, and Papiamento, have become Creole languages”. (http://www.Wikipedia.com).

D) **Code Switching and Code Mixing**
“Until the 1970s, only the latest of these three phenomena [code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing] had been studied extensively. The main reason for this lack of interest was the presumed deviant nature of code-switching and code-mixing judged against the prevalent paradigm of monolingualism and of the ideal speaker-hearer in a homogenous speech community, who knows his language perfectly. (Chomsky: 1965). Even very renowned linguists as Haugen (1950:211) and Weinreich (1953: 60) saw them as abnormal oversight on the part of bilingual speakers. Since the 1970s, however these phenomena have received considerable empirical and theoretical attention, as witness the creation of European Science Foundation Network on Code-switching and Language Contact (Milroy and Muysken, 1995) and the fact the International Journal of Bilingualism devoted many of its articles to these problems”. (Blanc and Hammers 2003:258).

It is important to mention here that to account for whether the linguistic behaviour of bilingual while Code switching is rule governed or not, Labov states that “no one has been able to show that such rapid alternation is governed by any systematic rule or constraints and we must therefore describe it as the irregular mixture of two distinct systems”.(1971:457). However, we know today that code-switching is not an abnormal linguistic behaviour. “A bilingual also develops patterns of behaviour that are unique to his state of bilinguality”. (Grosjean 1985a:467).

Like many aspects of Language contact (borrowing or code-mixing, borrowing or code alternation, borrowing or imposition etc) in research on code-switching, confusion in terminology is also witnessed. Not all the researchers use the same terms in the same way nor do they agree of the state covered by such terms like code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing, code alternation. Several criteria have been proposed to distinguish between code-switching and borrowing; code switching and code-mixing. Milroy and Muysken, for example define code switching as “alternative use by bilinguals of two or more language in the same conversation”. (1995:7). They use code switching as a core term under which different forms of bilingual behaviour are taken into consideration.
The term intra-sentential is used to refer to switch within the sentence, in contrast with the term inter-sentential is used to refer for switches between sentences as the relevant unit for analysis.

Poplack (1980), distinguished between three types of code-switching as under:

1. “extra-sentential code-switching, or the insertion of a tag, e.g. ‘you know’, ‘I mean’, from one language into an utterance which is entirely in other language;
2. Intersentential code-switching, or switch at clause/sentence boundary, one clause being in one language, the other clause in the other, e.g. ‘Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in English y termino en español’ (Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in English and finish it in Spanish’) (Spanish-English bilingual recoded by Poplack (1980) in Puerto Rican community of New City).
3. Intrasentential code-switching, where switches of different type occur within the clause boundaries, including within the word boundary (i.e. loan blend, e.g. check-er (English verb check + French infinitive morpheme –er).(quoted in Blanc and Hammers 2003: 259-260)

“The following is an example of intersentential code-switching: kio ke six, seven hours te school de vic spend karde ne, they are speaking English all the time (‘because they spend six or seven hours a day at school they are speaking English all the time’) (Punjabi-English bilingual in Britain recorded by Romanie,1995)”. (ibid)

However, Sridhar & Sridhar 1980; Kachru 1983; Singh 1985 reserves the term code-switching for inter-sentential switches only, and instead prefer to use code –mixing for intra-sentential switches. The reason is that only code-mixing (inter-sentential coed-switching by Milroy and Muysken 1995) requires the integration of the rules of the two languages involved in the discourse. But as far as the syntactic constraints are concerned, Milroy and Muysken were able to show the intra-inter sentential distinction as two types of switches. Myers-Scotton also defined as “alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation”. (1993b: 1). Gumperz refers to terms as “the
juxtaposition within the same speech as exchange of passage of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems”. (1982: 59). This definition emphasize that the two systems cannot always be two different languages but also different varieties of language.

Also the norms of code-switching vary from one group to another. For example Gumperz has pointed out that:

“In a relatively small Puerto Rican Neighbourhood in New Jersey, [as mention above], some members freely used code-switching styles and extreme forms of borrowing both in everyday casual talk and in more formal gatherings. Other local residents were careful to speak only Spanish with minimum of loans on formal occasions, reserving code-switching style for informal talk. Others again spoke mainly English using Spanish or code-switching styles only with small children or with neighbors”. (1982a: 68)

As for as linguistic aspect of code-switching is concerned the grammatical constraints for it was first attempted by Poplack to suggest explanatory principle mentioned as under:

The free Morpheme Constraint

Codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme.

The Equivalence Constraint

Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language. (1980: 586)

Code mixing on the other hand, is alternating use of two languages which follows the grammatical rule of not only one but both the languages by a bilingual to convey social meaning. “Code-mixing, ... is a process characterized by the transfer of elements
from a language $L_y$ to the base language $L_x$; in mixed utterance which results we can distinguish monolingual chunks of $L_x$ alternating with chunks of $L_y$ which refer to the rules of two codes. Unlike borrowing, which is generally limited to lexical words which may be better assimilated or less well assimilated, code-mixing transfers elements of all linguistic levels and units ranging from a lexical item to a sentence, so that it is not always easy to distinguish code mixing from code-switching. Code-mixing can of course express a lack of competence in the base language, such as for example, lexical items, and in this case code-mixing can be bilingual’s specific code which enables him to express attitudes, intentions, roles, and to identity with a particular group”. (Blanc and Hamers 2003: 270) For example, Kachru (1978), “who has studied code-mixing in the multilingual and multicultural context of India. He defines three main varieties. The base language can be any one of the languages of the India; three languages may be mixed with that language: English, Sanskrit or Persian”. (quoted: ibid)

The three examples of mixed compound verbs in Punjabi by Romaine 1995: 131

- Englishized ‘pity kerna’
- Sanskritised ‘daya karna’
- Persianised ‘reham kerna’

In these examples the basic meaning of the compound verb is determined by the first element ‘to pity’ and modified by verbal operator ‘to do’.

**E) Code-switching and borrowing**

According to Poplack and her associates showed code-switching and borrowing as different mechanism. Worked on data of code-switching from bilingual of Puerto Rican community in New York City, they proposed three types of criteria which determine the status of foreign elements in bilingual utterances. It depends whether or not the lexical items from the source language integrated either phonologically or morphologically of syntactically in to what she called Base language. She identified four possible combinations of integrated as shown in Table 2.2.
### Levels of integration into Base language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>phonological</th>
<th>Morphological</th>
<th>Syntactic</th>
<th>Code-Switching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Poplack’s (1980) identification of Code-Switching Based on the types of integration into Base language

However, Hill and Hill note that code switching and borrowing are often difficult to separate: “In practice, it is quite difficult for linguists to distinguish between cases of borrowing and cases of code-switching. Since code-switching occurs in situations where two languages are in contact, foreign material in the usage of bilinguals can be of both types. It is not possible to divine the nature of speaker self-consciousness about foreign materials, so linguists have generally tried to distinguish between borrowing and code-switching on strictly linguistic grounds.” (1986: 345)

### 2.6. Approaches Developed So Far to Study the Problems of Language Contact

There are mainly three approaches for the study of language contact, which are as follows:

#### 2.6.1. Second Language Acquisition Approach (SLA Approach)

In this approach the notion “interlanguage “emerged in 1970’s and scholars like Selinker (1970), Richard (1972) and Schumann (1974) applied the approaches for language contact. Interlanguage means those instances of deviation from the norms of
either of the languages (L1 and L2) which occurs in the speech of bilinguals, as a result of their familiarity with more than one language i.e., as a result of language contact. SLA researchers feel that the language contact is the inability of individual to keep their language entirely separate. In SLA approach, first of all there is focus on bilinguality rather than on bilingualism. Second, the idea of acquisition is central. Third, building models and theory that have emerged from language contact.

2.6.2. Sociolinguistic Approach

Sociolinguistics as developed by mid 20th century has led to great success in the study which focused on discovery of speech variation in the social contact. From beginning of modern sociolinguistics, a major goal has also been the study of speech characterized by language contact. Weinreich (1951), Ferguson and Gumperz (1960) and Gumperz (1964) have recognized that language is always the historical product of social process. Their goal was to understand the linguistic and sociolinguistic outcome of language contact. The study also attempted to explore nature of valorization/devalorization in the phenomenon of language contact in societal bilingualism.

2.6.3. Variationistic Model

Apart from above mention two fields, a number of sociolinguists worked out a rapprochement with SLA and have successful in establishing a tradition of Variationistic model. Dickerson 1975; Adamson 1988; Trone 1985; Major 1998 and others have analyzed language contact within this model.