1

Introduction: The Field of Contact Linguistics

1.1   The Subject Matter of Contact Linguistics

In offering his account of Caló, the mixture of Spanish and Romani used as an in-group language by Roma (Gypsies) in Spain, Rosensweig (1973) referred to it, in the very title of his book, as "Gutter Spanish." A flyer from a West Sussex bookseller advertising publications on "dialect and folk speech, pidgins and creoles," describes these forms of language, in boldface capitals, as "vulgar and debased English." Language mixture has always prompted strong emotional reaction, often in the form of ridicule, passionate condemnation, or outright rejection. Language purists have proscribed it as an aberration of the "correct" language, and their attitude is reflected in a lay perception of mixed languages as deviant, corrupt, and even without status as true languages. Thus Ambrose Gonzales, self-proclaimed student of the Gullah language, a "creole" language of mixed English and African ancestry spoken on islands off the South Carolina coast, explained its origins in this way:

> Slovenly and careless of speech, these Gullahs seized upon the peasant English used by some of the early settlers and by the white servants of the wealthier colonists, wrapped their clumsy tongues about it as well as they could, and, enriched with certain expressive African words, it issued through their flat noses and thick lips as so workable a form of speech that it was gradually adopted by the other slaves and became in time the accepted Negro speech of the lower districts of South Carolina and Georgia. (Gonzales 1922: 17–18)

While linguists and others might cringe at the sheer idiocy of this racist statement, many members of the public would probably accept the notion that languages like Gullah are the result of clumsy and ineffective learning. The truth, of course, is that these languages are testaments to the creativity of humans faced with the need to break down language barriers and create a

common medium of communication. Far from being deviant, language mixture is a creative, rule-governed process that affects all languages in one way or another, though to varying degrees. The kinds of mixture that characterize languages like Caló and Gullah may be extreme, but they are by no means unusual, and have played a role in the development of just about every human language, including some that are regarded as models of correctness or purity. Whenever people speaking different languages come into contact, there is a natural tendency for them to seek ways of bypassing the communicative barriers facing them by seeking compromise between their forms of speech.

Such contact can have a wide variety of linguistic outcomes. In some cases, it may result in only slight borrowing of vocabulary, while other contact situations may lead to the creation of entirely new languages. Between these two extremes lies a wide range of possible outcomes involving varying degrees of influence by one language on the other. More accurately, of course, it is the people speaking the respective languages who have contact with each other and who resort to varying forms of mixture of elements from the languages involved. The possible results of such contact differ according to two broad categories of factors – internal (linguistic) and external (social and psychological). Among the relevant linguistic factors is the nature of the relationship between the languages in contact, specifically the degree of typological similarity between them. There is also a variety of other linguistic constraints which operate in such situations, some of them specific to particular areas of linguistic structure (e.g., the lexicon, phonology, morphology, etc.), others of a more general, perhaps universal nature. These are discussed more fully in later chapters. Relevant social factors include the length and intensity of contact between the groups, their respective sizes, the power or prestige relationships and patterns of interaction between them, and the functions which are served by intergroup communication. Sociopolitical factors which operate at both individual and group level, such as attitudes toward the languages, motivations to use one or the other, and so on, are also important.

Most, if not all, languages have been influenced at one time or another by contact with others. In some cases, externally induced changes do not even require speakers of the different languages to have actual social contact. For instance, lexical borrowing can be accomplished through book learning by teachers, writers, lexicographers, and the like who pass on the new vocabulary to others via literature, religious texts, dictionaries, and so on. In other cases, prolonged social interaction between members of different speech communities may result in varying degrees of mixture and structural change in one or the other of the languages involved. In extreme cases, pervasive contact may result in new

creations distinct from their original source languages. The following examples illustrate some of the contact-induced changes that have affected English in various contact settings, leading to very different outcomes in each case. We might well ask whether these varieties are indeed forms of English, and if so, in what sense we can say they belong to the family of English dialects.

Sample (1) is an example of the form of pidgin English used as a lingua franca among ethnic groups of different linguistic background (English, Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, and Portuguese, among others) on the plantations of Hawaii during the nineteenth century. This particular extract is from a recording of an older male Japanese immigrant. Like all pidgins, this one shows evidence of loss of inflectional morphology, absence of grammatical categories such as tense and aspect, and overall simplification or reduction of grammatical apparatus as well as vocabulary:

(1)   samtaim gud rod get, samtaim, olsem ben get, enguru get, no? enikain seim.
     Sometimes good road get, sometimes like bend get, no? everything same.
     Olsem hyuman laif, olsem. Gud rodu get, enguru get, mauntin get, no? awl, enikain,
     Like human life, all-same. Good road get, angle get, mountain get, no? all, any kind
     Stawmu get, nais dey get – olsem. Enibadi, mi olsem, smawl taim.
     Storm get, nice day get – all-same. Anybody, me too, small time.

     "Sometimes there's a good road, sometimes there's, like, bends, corners, right? Everything's like that. Human life's just like that. There's good roads, there's sharp corners, there's mountains, right? All sorts of things, there's storms, nice days – it's like that for everybody, it was for me too, when I was young." (Bickerton 1981: 13)

Sample (2) is taken from Sranan Tongo ("Suriname Tongue"), a creole language spoken in Suriname, which emerged as a medium of interethnic communication among African slaves brought in thousands to the coastal plantations of this country in the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries. Like other creoles, its lexicon is drawn mostly from the language of the colonizers, while its grammar bears the mark of substantial influence from the native languages of the subjected peoples who created it. This of course is a simplistic way to describe the complex process of creole formation, but it will suffice for now. In this extract, an older woman talks about the good old days, when children had respect for their elders:

(2) Ma di   mi ben e gro   kon,   mi no ben mag taigi wan bigi
     but when I PAST IMP grow come, I NEG PAST may tell   one big
     suma   wan wortu. Uh? Efu mi seni a pikin a   no go, en mama
     person one word. Uh? If   I send the child s/he NEG go, his mother
     yere, a   e   fon en. Taki sanede meki te   owma seni yu,
     hear, she IMP beat him. Say why   make when granny send you,
     yu no go?
     you NEG go?
     Direct   a   e   priti en skin gi en.
     Immediately she IMP split 3p skin for 3p.

     "But when I was growing up, I wasn't allowed to say a word to an
     adult. Uh? If I sent a child [on an errand], and s/he didn't go, and his/
     her mother heard this, she would spank the child. [She'd] say why
     didn't you go when granny sent you? Right then she'd cut his/her skin
     for him/her." (Winford 2000a: 429)

Sample (3) comes from Singapore colloquial English, one of the so-called
New Englishes which arose in former British colonies, in many cases becoming
the everyday vernacular of the community. These "indigenized" varieties are
the result of "imperfect" (creative) second language learning, and are character-
ized by varying degrees of influence from the first languages of the groups who
created them. For instance, features such as the use of sentence-final discourse
marker *lah* and existential *get* parallel similar features in Cantonese, one of the
native languages involved in the contact. Here a taxi driver talks about his job:

(3) Passenger(s) depen(d) lah – good one(s) also go(t), bad one(s) also go(t).
     Some ah taxi driver(s) they wan(t) to go to this tourist area(s) like
     hotel(s) ah. They par(k) there, y'know. Then if the touris(ts) want to go
     an buy things, buy anything ah, they brough(t) the passengers go and
     buy thing(s) already. Then the shop(s) ah give commission to the taxi
     driver(s) lah.

     "With passengers, it depends, you know. There are good ones and bad
     ones. Some taxi drivers like to go to tourist areas such as hotels, yeah.
     They park there, you know. Then if the tourists want to go and buy
     things, they take them to the shops and straightaway they are buying
     things. Then the shops give a commission to the taxi drivers, yeah."
     (Platt et al. 1983: 35)

Finally, extract (4) is from Anglo-Romani, a well-known example of a bilin-
gual mixed or "intertwined" language. Its grammar is English, but much of its

lexicon derives from the Romani dialects brought by Roma (Gypsies) to England. Romani items are italicized in the extract:

(4) Once *apré* a *chairus* a *Rommany chal chor*ed a *rāni chillico*
'Once upon a time   a Gypsy   stole   a turkey (lit. lady bird)
and then *jāll*ed *atut*   a *prastraméngro 'pré* the *drum*
and then met (went on) a policeman   on the road
Where did *tute chore adovo rāni*?   *putcher*ed the *prastraméngro*.
Where did you steal that turkey? asked   the policeman.
It's *kek rāni*;   it's a *pauno rāni*   that I *kinn*ed *'drée* the
It's no turkey; it's a goose (lit. white lady) that I bought in   the
gav   to *del tute*. – *Tácho*, *penn*ed the *prastraméngro*, it's the *kusht*iest
village to give you. – Really, said the policeman,   it's the finest
pauno rāni mandy ever *dick*dus. *Ki* did *tute kin* it?
goose   I   ever saw.   Where did you buy it?
(Leland 1879: 208)

Exercise 1
Discuss the ways in which each one of samples (1)–(4) differs from Standard English, and list the features that characterize each. In what sense would you say these are varieties or dialects of English?

Examples such as these can be multiplied. Indeed, there are in principle no limits (except those imposed by Universal Grammar) to what speakers of different languages will adopt and adapt from one another, given the right opportunity. How can we explain such phenomena? What combinations of social and linguistic influences conspire to produce them? What kinds of situation promote one type of outcome rather than another? Questions like these are all part of the subject matter of contact linguistics. Its objective is to study the varied situations of contact between languages, the phenomena that result, and the interaction of linguistic and external ecological factors in shaping these outcomes. The diverse kinds of mixture, change, adaptation, and restructuring that result from interaction between (the users of) different languages have long been of interest to linguists. At the same time, scholars in the social sciences have devoted much attention to the social aspects of contact between different linguistic groups. For instance, they have investigated the nature of group relationships and group loyalty and how they are reflected in processes of accommodation in some circumstances, and by divergence and conflict in others. These two broad lines of research have converged significantly over the last few

decades, resulting in a new cross-disciplinary approach to language contact that attempts to integrate the social and the linguistic in a unified framework. To understand how this approach evolved, it is useful to survey briefly the history of research on language contact.

1.2   History of Research on Language Contact

The study of the effects of language contact has been a focal point of interest to linguists ever since the earliest period of scientific study of language in the nineteenth century. In fact, interest in the topic among students of language dates back much earlier than this. For instance, Schuchardt (1884: 30) (cited by Michael Clyne 1987: 452) mentions G. Lucio's discussion in 1666 of the mixture of Croatian and Romance dialects in Dalmatia based on Dalmatian records of the fourteenth century. During the heyday of historical linguistic scholarship in the nineteenth century, research on language contact became an integral part of the field and played a vital role in debate over the nature of language change. As Michael Clyne (1987: 453) reminds us, it was a topic to which such great linguists as Müller (1875), Paul (1886), Johannes Schmidt (1872), and Schuchardt (1884), among others, devoted a great deal of their attention. It continued to be a central topic well into the twentieth century, and was addressed by Sapir (1921), Bloomfield (1933), and other early pioneers of structuralism. In the heyday of structuralism during the 1940s to the 1960s, it became rather less central, though not completely marginalized.

   The major impetus for the concern with language contact among historical linguists arose from disagreement about the part played by contact-induced change in the history of languages. There was intense debate among nineteenth-century scholars as to whether the conventional Stammbaum or "family tree" model of genetic relationships among languages was compromised in any way by the growing evidence that many languages contained a mixture of elements from different source languages. The field split into two camps, though many scholars occupied a middle ground between the two. On the one hand there were those who maintained that language mixture – especially mixture in grammar – was rare if not non-existent and that each language evolved from a single parent as a result of purely internal developments over time. For instance, Müller (1875) claimed that languages with mixed grammar did not exist, and this belief in the impenetrability of grammatical systems was echoed later by scholars like Meillet (1921: 82) and more recently by Oksaar (1972: 492) (cited by Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 2). On the other hand there were many scholars who were equally convinced that language mixture was not only possible, but

clearly evidenced by actual cases of contact. For instance, Whitney (1881), responding to Müller, argued that both lexical and grammatical transfer occurred in cases of contact. In his (1884) paper, Schuchardt, the first great creolist and pioneer in the study of contact languages, provided numerous examples of structural mixture and contact-induced change from a variety of situations, including Slavic/German, Slavic/Italian, and Balkan contact, as well as pidgin and creole situations.

The evidence of mixture provided by these and other scholars posed a serious challenge to orthodox Stammbaum theory with its insistence on a single-parent source for every language and its belief that practically all language change resulted from internal causes. From another angle, the work of scholars like Johannes Schmidt (1872) also provided evidence that changes could enter languages as the result of diffusion from external sources – a process which his "wave" model of change attempted to capture. The issue of how contact affects "genetic" affiliation is still a highly controversial one today. On the one hand, "traditional" historical linguists argue that a distinction should be made between "normal" and "abnormal" transmission (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 11). The former would apply to languages whose components can for the most part be traced back to a single source language, even if they might have been subject to some external influence in the past. Such languages lend themselves to reconstruction via the traditional comparative historical model of single-parent genetic affiliation and gradual internal change. The label "abnormal transmission" would then apply to mixed languages whose various subsystems cannot all be traced back to a single parent language. They result from "broken transmission" and therefore have no genetic links to other languages in the standard sense of the term (1988: 11). Such cases include pidgins, creoles, and bilingual mixed languages, the three major types of contact language referred to earlier. However, many scholars have challenged this approach. They point, for instance, to the fact that all languages are mixed to some extent, and that the processes of change found in highly mixed languages such as creoles can be found in varying degrees in the cases of so-called "normal" transmission (Mufwene 1998; Thurston 1994; DeGraff to appear). From this standpoint, it is perhaps unfortunate that contact-induced change and its outcomes are still viewed by many as secondary, even marginal, to the central pursuits of historical-comparative linguistics.

Despite (or perhaps because of) the disagreement in the field, there developed during the nineteenth to mid twentieth centuries a strong tradition of research in contact-induced change, both within the ambit of Historical Linguistics, and in other disciplines. In addition to the theoretical issues referred to above, research within the former field focused on specific geographic areas of contact; linguistic processes and types of contact-induced change; specific instances of

mixture such as bilingual code switching or processes of pidgin and creole formation; and the possible constraints on contact-induced change. Most of the current topics in the field were already the object of serious enquiry as early as the nineteenth century. For instance, the language situation in the Balkans has attracted the attention of scholars since Kopitar (1829) and Schuchardt (1884), and there is a considerable body of research on this linguistic area. Troubetzkoy (1928) (cited in Weinreich 1953: 112, n. 4) provided the first definition of a Sprachbund ("union of languages" or "linguistic area"), and since then there have been numerous studies of linguistic areas around the world. Other topics such as lexical borrowing and the role of substratum influence (discussed later) in language change were investigated. And of course much attention was paid to pidgins and creoles, as classic examples of "new" mixed languages. Schuchardt's pioneering work in this field was complemented by that of Hesseling (1899, 1905), Olaf Broch (1927), and others. Early in the twentieth century, the phenomenon of code switching was studied by Braun (1937), who observed switches between Russian and German in the speech of a bilingual.

This line of more linguistically oriented research was complemented by other approaches concerned more with the social context of language contact. For instance, some scholars devoted their attention to the problems of long-established ethnic minorities faced with the strong influence of a majority national language. Systematic study of language maintenance began with Kloss (1927, 1929). Other scholars became interested in the fate of immigrant languages in North America and elsewhere (Herzog 1941; Reed 1948; Pap 1949; etc.). Studies like these established the foundation for the discipline known as the sociology of language, focusing on language maintenance and shift (see Fishman 1964; Fishman et al. 1966). It provided important insights into the social and psychological factors that determine the outcomes of language contact. Closely associated with this tradition is the growing body of research on the social psychology of language choice as exemplified, for instance, by the approach known as Speech Accommodation Theory, developed by Howard Giles and his associates (Street and Giles 1982). Within the historical linguistics tradition too, many scholars stressed the importance of social factors in language contact. They included Whitney (1881) and Schuchardt (1884), who was in many ways far ahead of his time. Much of Schuchardt's discussion of the linguistic aspects of language contact is accompanied by details of the social context, the groups in contact, and other relevant sociocultural data.

New vigor was injected into the field by the important work of Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1950a, 1950b, 1953). Working within the structural paradigm, they both emphasized the importance of studying language contact from both a linguistic and a sociocultural perspective. Michael Clyne (1987: 453) suggests that their work can be considered the beginning of American sociolinguistics. If

so, it is also true that their work established the ground for the re-emergence of language contact as a topic of central importance and as a subdiscipline of linguistics in its own right.

All of these various lines of approach, some primarily linguistic, others primarily sociological or anthropological, contributed to the emergence of the new field of contact linguistics. According to Nelde (1997: 287), the term was introduced at the First World Congress on Language Contact and Conflict, held in Brussels in June 1979. As noted earlier, the major turning point in the discipline was the work of Haugen and Weinreich, particularly the latter. As Michael Clyne (1987: 456) notes, despite all the previous research, "there was, before Weinreich (1953), no systematized theory of language contact." Both Weinreich and Haugen attempted to integrate linguistic analysis with social and psychological explanations to account for language contact and its consequences. Their major contribution to this enterprise was undoubtedly their formulation of a comprehensive framework for the study of language contact in its social setting. Perhaps the strongest recent impetus to research in this area came from Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) book-length study of a wide variety of contact phenomena, and their attempt to lay the foundations for both a typology of contact outcomes and an empirical/theoretical framework for analyzing such outcomes. Their work constitutes a major contribution to historical linguistic scholarship, in attempting to resolve the old controversy over the role of external linguistic influence as distinct from internal motivations and mechanisms in language development. Like earlier researchers, they emphasized the need for an interdisciplinary approach and refined several aspects of the terminology and descriptive framework employed in previous studies. The emerging field of contact linguistics owes its existence primarily to the work of all these pioneers.

1.3   The Field of Contact Linguistics

Despite Appel and Muysken's (1987: 7) assertion that "Bilingualism or language contact in itself is not a scientific discipline," the study of language contact is in fact a fairly well-defined field of study, with its own subject matter and objectives. It employs an eclectic methodology that draws on various approaches, including the comparative-historical method, and various areas of sociolinguistics. It is this very interdisciplinary approach that defines it and gives it its strength. One of the clearest statements of the goals of this subdiscipline is the following, from Weinreich (1953: 86): "To predict typical forms of interference from the socio-linguistic description of a bilingual community and a structural description of its languages is the ultimate goal of interference studies."

Though Weinreich focuses specifically on the phenomenon of bilingualism, his statement can, *mutatis mutandis*, apply equally well to the study of all contact situations. Moreover, the field of contact linguistics is not limited to just the study of "interference," but covers all the linguistic consequences of contact, including phenomena such as simplification and various other kinds of restructuring that characterize the outcomes of contact. Weinreich's goal of "prediction" is perhaps ambitious, but he himself is well aware of the complexity of the problem. In particular, he emphasizes that the components of an explanatory framework must include "purely structural considerations . . . psychological reasons. . . . and socio-cultural factors" (1953: 44). The need to explore the latter two types of factor arises from the fact that, first, contact situations which appear quite similar in terms of the linguistic inputs present can and do result in quite different linguistic outcomes. Moreover, for any given contact situation, predictions of contact-induced changes based solely on structural factors fail miserably. This point will be discussed in later chapters, when we consider the various linguistic constraints on such changes. Weinreich's outline of the main concerns of "interference" studies is worth quoting in full. He notes:

> In linguistic interference, the problem of major interest is the interplay of structural and non-structural factors that promote or impede such interference. The structural factors are those which stem from the organization of linguistic forms into a definite system, different for every language and to a considerable degree independent of non-linguistic experience and behavior. The non-structural factors are derived from the contact of the system with the outer world, from given individuals' familiarity with the system, and from the symbolic value which the system as a whole is capable of acquiring and the emotions it can evoke. (1953: 5)

It follows, first, that we need to distinguish among the various social contexts of language contact if we are to understand the nature and direction of contact-induced change. Second, it is necessary to examine, where possible, the actual speech behavior of persons in each contact situation in order to uncover the factors that motivate them to change their language in one way or another.

Scholars have long been aware that differences in the social setting lead to differences in the outcomes of contact. For instance, Wackernagel (1904) distinguished three kinds of contact situation – when a conquered group adopts the language of its conquerors, when the reverse occurs, and when there is mutual influence leading to a "mixed language." Every outcome of language contact has associated with it a particular kind of social setting and circumstances that shape its unique character. The goal of contact linguistics is to uncover the

various factors, both linguistic and sociocultural, that contribute to the linguistic consequences of contact between speakers of different language varieties. Toward that end, we need a framework of analysis that includes a variety of components. In the rest of this chapter, we provide a broad overview of types of contact situation, their outcomes, and the social settings in which they emerge. We will consider each of these situations in more detail in subsequent chapters. There too we will explore the mechanisms and types of change involved as well as the factors, both linguistic and non-linguistic, which influence the patterns of cross-linguistic influence.

1.4   Types of Contact Situation

We can in general distinguish three broad kinds of contact situation: those involving language maintenance, those involving language shift, and those that lead to the creation of new contact languages. Most cases of language contact can be assigned clearly to one or another of these categories. However, as we will see, there are many situations that cannot be classified so readily. Some are characterized by interplay between maintenance and shift, like the "fuzzy" cases found in Sprachbünde or linguistic areas such as the Balkans, discussed in chapter 3. Others involve types of interaction and mutual accommodation which make it difficult to place them in a single category, for instance the kinds of extreme structural convergence found in Northwest New Britain, where languages of the Austronesian and non-Austronesian families have become structurally isomorphic (see chapter 3). Similar difficulties arise in the case of the so-called "new" contact languages, pidgins (chapter 8), creoles (chapter 9), and bilingual mixed languages (chapter 6). These are cases neither of maintenance nor of shift in the strict sense, though they share characteristics with the latter situations. Each of them presents its own problems of definition and classification.

1.4.1   Language maintenance

1.4.1.1   Borrowing situations

Language maintenance refers simply to the preservation by a speech community of its native language from generation to generation. Preservation implies that the language changes only by small degrees in the short run owing to internal

developments and/or (limited) contact with other languages. Hence the various subsystems of the language – the phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and core lexicon – remain relatively intact.

Cases of maintenance may involve varying degrees of influence on the lexicon and structure of a group's native language from the external language with which it is in contact. This kind of influence is referred to as "borrowing." Since this term has been used in a variety of senses, it is necessary to emphasize that it is used here, following Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37), to refer to "the incorporation of foreign features into a group's native language by speakers of that language." This makes it clear, first, that the borrowing language is maintained, though changed in various ways by the borrowed features, and that the agents of change are its native speakers. As van Coetsem (1988: 3) points out, borrowing involves recipient language agentivity, and this crucially distinguishes it from the other major type of cross-linguistic influence that involves source language agentivity in cases of second language learning (see section 1.4.2 below). The borrowing language may be referred to as the recipient language, and the foreign language as the source language. Both of these terms may also be used in a wider sense, to refer respectively to (a) any language that incorporates features from another and (b) any language that provides the relevant input.

Borrowing is also sometimes referred to as "borrowing interference" (as opposed to "interference via shift"), reflecting a tendency within the field to use the term "interference" as a cover term for all kinds of contact-induced change (Thomason and Kaufman 1988). Since the term "interference" has been used in a variety of conflicting senses, some general, some rather narrow (for instance, Weinreich 1953: 1 defines it as "deviations from the norm of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language"), the term will be avoided as far as possible here. Instead, we will use terms like "contact-induced changes" and "cross-linguistic influence" as general labels to cover all kinds of influence by one language on another.

Borrowing may vary in degree and kind from casual to heavy lexical borrowing, and from slight to more or less significant incorporation of structural features as well. As already noted, situations involving primarily lexical borrowing, that is, borrowing of content morphemes like nouns, verbs, etc., are extremely common, and most, if not all, languages have been subject to this kind of influence at some time or another. Sometimes, as we shall see later, significant lexical borrowing may have effects on the lexical semantics as well as other aspects of a language's structure. Situations involving structural borrowing, that is, borrowing of features in phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, are somewhat rarer, though examples can be found. Borrowing situations will be discussed in chapter 2.

1.4.1.2   Situations of structural convergence

Structural diffusion often occurs where languages are spoken in close geo-graphical proximity, for example in border areas, or in communities charac-terized by a high degree of multilingualism. Examples of the former type of situation are Sprachbünde or linguistic areas. Perhaps the best-known of these is the Balkan Sprachbund, where long-standing contact between languages like Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Macedonian, and others led to significant diffusion of structural features. In cases involving bi- or multi-lingualism within the same speech community, the results of language contact are often manifested in increasing structural convergence between the languages involved. A well-known case in point is the village of Kupwar in India. Here, a long history of inter-action between speakers of Marathi, Kannada, and Hindi-Urdu led to a surprising degree of isomorphism in structure, to the point where it has been claimed that simple replacement of lexical items from each language within the same structural frame is often possible. Long-term pressure on the language of a minority group surrounded by a larger dominant group can sometimes lead to significant structural and lexical diffusion from the latter to the former. This can in some cases lead to a radically altered version of the recipient language. Cases in point include Asia Minor Greek, which incorporated many features from Turkish, and Wutun, a Chinese language heavily influenced by Tibetan.

Sometimes, diffusion of features across languages may be so widespread that the boundaries between the languages become blurred, even for the speakers themselves. Thurston (1987, 1994) describes situations like this in Northwest New Britain, an island that forms part of Papua New Guinea. Here, as in Kupwar, convergence has led to structural isomorphism among the languages involved, with lexicon serving as the primary means of distinguishing one from the other. Thus, though they belong to quite distinct language families (Austronesian versus non-Austronesian), or to different subgroups within these families, all languages use practically the same syntactic strategies. For example, requests for items follow the same pattern: first the requested item is named, followed by a third person form of the verb come; then there is a first person verb expressing what the speaker will do with the desired item. The following examples illustrate. Anêm is non-Austronesian. Mouk and Lusi belong to the Bibling and Bariai subgroups of Austronesian respectively. Amara is an Austronesian isolate:

(5) Anêm: uas   gox   o-mên   da-t
     Mouk: uas   silaŋ   max   ŋa-ŋan
     Lusi: uasi   eta   i-nama   ŋa-ani

> Amara: aguas   kapso   i-me   e-kenen
>   tobacco   some   3s-come   1s-eat
>   "Hand me some tobacco to smoke" (Thurston 1987: 69)

In cases like these, it is often difficult to identify the agents of change, whether they may be native speakers of language A who maintain it while borrowing, or speakers of language B who shift to A and introduce features of B which native speakers of A eventually adopt. These situations will be discussed more fully in chapter 3.

1.4.1.3   Code-switching situations

Language maintenance situations also include more or less stable bilingual speech communities in which bilingual mixture of various types is usual, leading to the phenomena known collectively as code switching. This involves the alternate use of two languages (or dialects) within the same stretch of speech, often within the same sentence. For example, Puerto Ricans in New York city switch between Spanish and English with great facility, as illustrated in the following example from Blanca, a 9-year-old girl living in Spanish Harlem, New York city. Spanish items are italicized:

 (6) Hey Lolita, but the Skylab, the Skylab *no se cayó pa(-ra) que se acabe el mundo*. It falls in pieces. *Si se cae completo*, yeah. The Skylab *es una cosa que (e-)stá rodeando el* moon taking pictures of it. *Tiene tubos en el medio. Tiene tubos en el medio*. It's like a rocket. It's like a rocket.

 (Hey Lolita, but the Skylab, the Skylab ("didn't fall for the world to end"). It falls in pieces. ("If it falls whole"), yeah. The Skylab ("is something that's going around the") moon taking pictures of it. ("It has tubes in the middle") [repeated]. It's like a rocket [repeated]. (Zentella 1997: 117)

Notice how Blanca switches languages from clause to clause, but also mixes items from the two languages within the same clause. These are examples of inter- and intra-sentential switching, which reflect somewhat different kinds of bilingual competence, as we shall see.

In many bi- or multi-lingual communities, the choice of one code or another is dependent on the situation or domain of use, so that the codes tend to be used in mutually exclusive functions. Such situations are referred to as cases of diglossia, or (where more than two languages are involved) polyglossia. An example of the former is Spanish/Guaraní bilingualism in Paraguay, while the

latter is exemplified by the situations in Singapore and Malaysia, where speakers alternate between English, Malay, and other ethnic languages like Mandarin depending on the interlocutor and the situation (Platt 1977). Situations like these, of course, also allow for a certain degree of code alternation and code mixture within a single interaction. The social and linguistic aspects of code switching will be discussed in chapters 4 and 5 respectively.

1.4.2 Language shift

In other situations, contact between different linguistic groups can lead to language shift, the partial or total abandonment of a group's native language in favor of another. In some cases, the shift results in successful acquisition of the target language (TL), with little or no influence from the native language (L1) of the shifting group. For instance, by the third generation, most immigrant groups in the United States succeed in achieving native proficiency in American English. In many cases, however, shift is accompanied by varying degrees of influence from the group's L1 on the TL. Such situations fall into two broad categories. First, there are cases involving immigrant or other minority groups that shift either partially or completely to the language of the dominant majority, but carry over features of their L1 into their version of the TL. Sometimes, the shifting group is eventually absorbed into the TL community and the innovations that they introduced are imitated by the TL community as a whole, thus becoming permanently established in the language. This happened, for instance, when speakers of Norman French shifted to English in the late Middle English period, leading to significant lexical and some structural (especially phonological) influence from French on English. In other cases, a minority group may preserve its L1 for certain functions, while acquiring the dominant language for other uses. Such situations typically result in significant L1 influence on the TL, as for example in the second language varieties of German used by "guestworkers" in Germany from the late 1950s on. Such influence tends to be confined to the minority group and does not usually spread into the language of the host community as a whole.

The second category of situation where shift leads to L1 influence on a recipient language involves languages that become targets of shift after being introduced into new communities by invaders or colonizers. The indigenous community then adopts the foreign language either as a replacement for its original native language(s), or as a second language to be used in addition to the latter. Such "indigenized" varieties of a foreign language are especially common in areas that were formerly colonized by external powers. Indian English and Irish (Hiberno–) English are two examples. Second language versions of target

languages such as these, which result from untutored learning in "natural" community settings, are clearly similar in certain ways to the varieties of second or foreign languages acquired in formal settings such as the classroom. "Interlanguage" phenomena in classroom second language acquisition (SLA) often arise from the same kinds of L1 influence that characterize "untutored" SLA, that is, targeted language shift. Moreover, both types of learning may be subject to other principles and constraints, such as the universal tendency toward simplification of target structures, at least in the early stages of learning. There is therefore much to be gained from a close comparison of all these types of language acquisition.

Language shift obviously implies the gradual or complete abandonment of a previous native language in favor of the TL. Such situations provide interesting insight into the phenomenon of *language death*, the slow attrition and decay of the language previously used by the shifting group.

As noted above, many of the changes in a TL which accompany shift are the result of influence from the shifting group's L1. Such changes have been referred to by various names, including "interference through shift," "transfer," "substratum influence," and "imposition." Some of these labels are problematic in one way or another. We've already seen that "interference" is used in several conflicting senses. The same is true of "transfer," which is used by some as a cover term for all kinds of contact-induced change (hence "borrowing transfer" versus "substratum transfer"), and by others to refer only to L1 influence on an L2. Most SLA researchers use the term "transfer" to refer only to L1 influence on (learner versions of) a target language. Van Coetsem (1988: 3) introduced the term "imposition" to refer to this kind of contact-induced change. Though this term has failed to gain currency, his description of the change itself is quite insightful. As he notes, it involves the agentivity of source language speakers who "impose" their L1 habits on the recipient or target language.

The term "substratum influence" is popular among creolists, who use it to refer to much the same phenomena that SLA researchers describe as (L1) transfer – hence the growing rapport between these fields, as we shall see in chapter 9. Creolists use the term in a somewhat different sense from historical linguists. The latter generally use it to refer to influence from the language of a subordinate group, distinguishing it from "superstratum" and "adstratum" influence from the languages of dominant and equal groups respectively. Creolists on the other hand use it to refer specifically to influence from a subordinate group's language on pidgin and creole formation. Henceforth, we will use the term "L1 influence" or "substratum influence" to refer to the influence from a speaker or group's L1 on an outcome of language contact. It is immaterial whether the outcome is a second language variety of a TL or a new creation

such as a creole, or what the relative statuses of the languages (groups) in contact may be.

Thomason and Kaufman seem to have this sense in mind when they define substratum influence as the result of "imperfect group learning during a process of language shift" in the course of which the learning group commits "errors" that may spread to the TL as a whole. This definition may not be precise enough. In the first place, the results of "imperfect learning" may include strategies ("errors") other than substratum influence, such as simplification of TL structures. Second, not all cases of substratum influence result in spread of such influence to the TL as a whole. There are indeed such cases, usually when the shifting group is absorbed by the TL community. However, there are also cases where the shifting group constitutes a separate community in its own right, and the changes they introduce remain restricted to their version of the TL (e.g., Hiberno-English and other "indigenized" Englishes). In addition, we may want to distinguish between individual and group shifts. Thomason and Kaufman are right to note that group shifts promote substratum influence in a TL. But we can gain much insight into this type of cross-linguistic influence by investigating the strategies employed by individual learners in both "natural" and "tutored" contexts. As Mufwene (1990: 2) notes, "interference" from an L1 at the individual level is the first stage in the establishment of substrate influence in the language of the group. When the same types of change are replicated by various individuals and are adopted by many others, they become conventionalized as part of the community's linguistic system and at this point they can be described as substratum features.

Substratum or L1 influence, like borrowing, may be found at all levels of linguistic structure. But, in general, borrowing begins with vocabulary, and the incorporation of structural features into a maintained language comes only after substantial importation of loanwords. By contrast, substratum influence begins with sounds and syntactic patterns and sometimes also morphology, and is therefore characterized by more structural than lexical influence from the L1 on the TL. Thomason and Kaufman offer a sketch of the difference between borrowing and shift as illustrated by Rayfield's (1970: 85) description of mutual influence between English and Yiddish as spoken by a group of bilinguals in the United States (see table 1.1).

As table 1.1 shows, the process of borrowing from English into the Yiddish of these immigrants involves the lexicon much more than either phonology or morphosyntax. On the other hand, structural influence from Yiddish on the English of this group is much more pronounced than lexical influence.

These differences in the patterns of contact-induced change in borrowing as opposed to shift situations appear to be quite common, perhaps even predictable, and the distinction is therefore crucial to our understanding of what goes

Table 1.1 Degrees of "interference" in bilinguals' languages

	English → Yiddish (borrowing)	Yiddish → English (substratum influence)
Lexicon	Very strong	Moderate
Phonology	Weak	Strong
Morphosyntax	Moderate	Strong

Source: Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 40, table 2

on in different contact situations. It has important implications for both our methodology and our theories of contact-induced change. Methodologically, it means that we must understand the precise nature of the contact situation to determine the directionality of change and its agents. As far as theory is concerned, it means that explanations or predictions of the results of contact will vary depending on which of the two major vehicles of change is involved.

Exercise 2
Rayfield (1970) predicts that in situations of second language learning, lexical borrowing from the L2 will be much more frequent than structural borrowing in the L1 of the learners, while structural changes due to L1 influence will be more frequent in the learner's version of the L2. Investigate the use of English or any other language as a second language by international students at your university. Does Rayfield's prediction hold true as far as their usage is concerned?

1.4.3   *Language creation: new contact languages*

In addition to maintenance and shift situations, there are other kinds of contact setting which have yielded rather special outcomes: the contact languages referred to as pidgins, creoles, and bilingual mixed languages. These outcomes involve such extreme restructuring and/or such pervasive mixture of elements from more than one language that they cannot be considered cases of either maintenance or shift in the strict senses of those terms. It is also difficult at times to decide which outcomes of contact should be included in each of the above categories of contact language. The labels "pidgin" and "creole," for instance, have each been applied to a very heterogeneous group of languages,

which differ both in the circumstances of their creation and in their structural characteristics. For this reason, it is necessary to refer to "prototypical" examples of each category, and attempt as far as possible to relate other potential members of the class to the prototype (Thomason 1997c).

1.4.3.1 Bilingual mixed languages

Bilingual mixed or intertwined languages arose in settings involving long-term contact between two ethnic groups leading to bilingualism and increasing mixture of the languages. In these cases, that mixture became conventionalized as a community norm, resulting in the creation of hybrid languages whose components could clearly be traced to one or the other source language. We saw one example of a bilingual mixed language, Anglo-Romani, earlier in this chapter. Another example is the Media Lengua of Ecuador, a language which incorporates Spanish lexicon into a virtually unchanged Quechua grammatical framework. The latter preserves intact not just the syntactic rules of Quechua, but also its highly complex morphology. Here is a brief example, in which a Media Lengua speaker explains how the language is made up. Items derived from Spanish are in italics:

(7) *Media Lengua*-ga   *así*   Ingichu-munda *Castallanu*-da *abla*-na
     Media Lengua-TOP thus Quechua-from Spanish-ACC talk-NOM
     kiri-xu-sha,   *no abla*-naku-ndu-mi *asi*,   chaupi-ga *Castellanu* laya,
     want-PROG-SUB not talk-pl-SUB-AFF   thus, half-TOP   Spanish like,
     i   chaupi-ga Ingichi   laya *abla*-ri-na ga-n.
     and half-TOP   Quechua like talk-REFL-NOM-be-3.

   "Media Lengua is thus if you want to talk Spanish from Quechua, but you can't, then you talk half like Spanish, and half like Quechua." (Muysken 1997a: 377)

Other somewhat similar examples are Michif, a language in which Cree VP structure is wedded to French NP structure, and Mednyj Aleut, in which Russian finite verb morphology and other structural features have been fused with Aleut grammatical systems. In general, it is fair to say that these vernaculars fuse the grammar of one source with the lexicon (at least the phonological representations of the lexical items) of another. However, this picture is simplistic, since it ignores many respects in which a bilingual mixed language may differ from either of its source languages. Moreover, no single formula can be applied to describe or predict the mixture, even though there are many similarities in design among them. These and other aspects of the genesis and structure of bilingual mixed languages will be discussed further in chapter 6.

1.4.3.2 Pidgins

Trading contacts between groups speaking different languages have often led to various types of linguistic compromise to facilitate communication. Such compromises often result in pidgins, highly reduced languages with minimal vocabulary and grammar whose functions are restricted primarily to barter and exchange. An example of the pidgin English used for trading between English speakers and Pacific islanders in the nineteenth century was provided earlier in this chapter. Pidgins are a rather mixed bag of languages. Some involve more lexical mixture than others. For instance, Russenorsk, used in trade between Russians and Norwegians up to the nineteenth century, employed vocabulary from both groups' languages. Other pidgins, like Eskimo Trade Pidgin and Chinese Pidgin English, derive their vocabulary primarily from one source, Eskimo in the former, English in the latter. The primary source language in these cases tends to be the language of the group that has control of the trade or its location. Pidgins have also arisen in contexts other than trade, for instance in cases of military occupation (Pidgin English in Japan during the post-war period) or in domestic settings for communication between employers and servants of different language backgrounds (Indian Butler English) or on plantations (Hawai'i Pidgin English).

The cases mentioned so far are all examples of prototypical pidgins. The label is necessary because there is in fact a great deal of controversy over the scope of reference of the term "pidgin." The reason is that the degree of reduction in structure as well as range of functions may differ significantly from one case to another. Prototypical pidgins are severely restricted in terms of their social functions, and clearly reduced in form and structure, containing a minimal lexicon and a rudimentary grammar. Bickerton (1981) describes them as lacking inflectional morphology, tense/mood/aspect sytems, movement rules, embedding strategies, and other structural characteristics associated with fully developed natural languages. The sociohistorical and structural criteria by which such pidgins are defined will be outlined further in chapter 8.

By contrast, other languages to which the term "pidgin" has been applied, for example, Tok Pisin, Nigerian Pidgin, etc., are far more elaborate in terms of social function and structure, and hardly meet the criteria for inclusion in this class. These more elaborate contact languages may be placed in two broad categories: extended pidgins and simplified languages, though once more, the boundaries between these two are not always clear.

So-called extended pidgins apparently began as highly reduced (prototypical) pidgins which then underwent varying degrees of elaboration in both vocabulary and grammar when their range of functions extended beyond the confines of their original contexts of use. In such cases, there is usually incorporation of

features from both the lexifier (superstrate) language and the native (substrate) languages of indigenous groups. Contact vernaculars like these can achieve such a degree of elaboration in this way that they become indistinguishable from other fully developed natural languages. Examples include Tok Pisin and Bislama, official languages of Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu respectively, both descended from an earlier plantation pidgin, in turn rooted in early Pacific Trade Pidgin. Other examples include varietes of West African Pidgin English, such as Nigerian Pidgin English, that are used as lingua francas in various parts of West Africa. These contact languages have much more in common, both functionally and structurally, with creoles than with prototypical pidgins.

There are other contact vernaculars to which the label "pidgin" has been applied which do not appear to involve the degree of structural reduction characteristic of prototypical pidgins. For instance, languages like Trade Motu or Pidgin Yimas appear to be somewhat simplified forms of Motu and Yimas respectively, only partially reduced so as to facilitate their use by non-native speakers in trading and other contacts with native speakers. Their degree of reduction is not nearly as extensive as that found in, say, Russenorsk. Hence they should arguably be referred to as simplified languages, rather than pidgins. All of these cases and others like them will be discussed more fully in chapter 8.

1.4.3.3   Creoles

European colonial expansion during the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries led in many cases to the creation of new communities peopled primarily by groups transplanted from distant regions of the world. In the plantations of the New World, where huge numbers of slaves were transplanted from West Africa, contact between the latter and European settlers led to the emergence of creole languages, so called because they were used by the creole or locally born descendants of slaves (as well as Europeans and other freemen) in the colonies. A typical example is Sranan Tongo, a brief sample of which was provided earlier in this chapter. Other well-known Caribbean creoles include Jamaican and Guyanese creole (English lexicon); Haitian creole (French lexicon); Papiamentu, a creole used in the former Dutch islands of Aruba, Bonaire, and Curacao (Spanish/Portuguese lexicon) and Berbice Dutch, once spoken in the interior of modern Guyana (Dutch lexicon).

Similar languages emerged in the Indian Ocean and other areas where European colonies were established. For instance, there is Isle de France creole, a French-lexicon creole with varieties spoken in Mauritius and the Seychelles. In South East Asia, we find creoles such as Daman Creole Portuguese, spoken in India, and Papia Kristang, spoken in Malaysia and Singapore. There are also

several other creole languages spoken in West Africa, including Krio (English-lexicon), spoken in Sierra Leone, and Guinea Kriyol (Portuguese-lexicon), spoken in Guinea-Bissau. Some of the earliest creoles known arose on plantation settings on islands off the West African coast. Well-known examples include Cape Verde Crioulo and other Portuguese-lexicon creoles spoken on São Tomé, Principe, and other islands in the Gulf of Guinea.

The formation of these languages involved varying degrees of input from the superstrate languages of the colonizers and the native languages of the subjected peoples. Creoles, like other contact vernaculars, differ significantly in the nature and extent of the respective inputs. Just about every aspect of these languages, their origins and sources, their typological characteristics, their classification, etc., remains a matter of controversy. These issues will be discussed more fully in chapter 9.

As with "pidgins," there are substantial differences among so-called "creoles" in terms of both their processes of formation and their structural make-up. Essentially, such differences have to do with the nature and extent of the substratum contribution to the creole's formation. On the one hand, there are radical creoles like Sranan and its Surinamese relative Saramaccan, and varieties of the Eastern Maroon Creole, a substantial part of whose grammar can be traced to West African (especially Gbe) sources. For this reason, it is difficult to accept Thomason and Kaufman's characterization of them as cases of shift "whose structure can be accounted for under a hypothesis of extreme unsuccessful acquisition of a TL" (1988: 48). One might just as well argue that they are akin to cases of maintenance, though, as usual, the truth lies somewhere between these two extremes.

By sharp contrast, the so-called intermediate creoles of the Caribbean, such as Bajan, urban Guyanese, or Trinidadian creole, are arguably cases of shift and far more akin to products of "unsuccessful" acquisition of a TL such as Hiberno-English, Singapore English, Taiwanese Mandarin, etc. than they are to radical creoles. Once more, between these poles lie many other points on a continuum that includes contact vernaculars in the Caribbean, Pacific, Indian Ocean, and elsewhere to which the label "creole" has traditionally been applied.

1.5   Overview of Contact Situations and their Outcomes

At this point, it may be useful to provide a brief taxonomy of contact situations and the types of cross-linguistic influence they involve. Table 1.2, based partly on Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 50), illustrates the major outcomes of language contact. The table distinguishes three general categories of outcome, those

Table 1.2 Major outcomes of language contact

(A) Language maintenance

I Borrowing situations

Degree of contact	Linguistic results	Examples
Casual	Lexical borrowing only	Modern, English borrowings from French, e.g., *ballet*
Moderate	Lexical and slight structural borrowing	Latin influence on Early Modern English; Sanskrit influence on Dravidian languages
Intense	Moderate structural borrowing	German influence on Romansh

II Convergence situations

Type of contact	Linguistic results	Examples
Contiguous geographical location	Moderate structural diffusion	Sprachbünde, e.g., the Balkans
Intra-community multilingualism	Heavy structural diffusion	Marathi/Kannada influence on Kupwar Urdu
Intense pressure on a minority goup	Heavy structural diffusion	Tibetan influence on Wutun; Turkish influence on Asia Minor Greek
Intense inter-community contact (trade, exogamy)	Heavy lexical and/or structural diffusion	The languages of Northwest New Britain; the languages of Arnhem Land, Australia

(B) Language shift

Type of shift	Linguistic results (substratum)	Examples
Rapid and complete (by minority group)	Little or no substratum interference in TL	Urban immigrant groups shifting to English in the US
Rapid shift by larger or prestigious minority	Slight to moderate substratum interference in TL	Norman French shift to English in England

Table 1.2   (*cont'd*)

Type of shift	Linguistic results (substratum)	Examples
Shift by indigenous community to imported language	Moderate to heavy substratum interference	Shift to English by Irish speakers in Ireland (Hiberno-English); shift to English dialects in seventeenth-century Barbados (intermediate "creole")

(C) Language creation (new contact languages)

Type	Characteristics
Bilingual mixed languages	Akin to cases of maintenance, involving incorporation of large portions of an external vocabulary into a maintained grammatical frame
Pidgins	Highly reduced lingua francas that involve mutual accomodation and simplification; employed in restricted functions such as trade
Creoles	Akin to cases of both maintenance and shift, with grammars shaped by varying degrees of superstrate and substrate influence, and vocabulary drawn mostly from the superstrate source

pertaining to language maintenance situations (here subdivided into borrowing and convergence situations), those relating to language shift, and those involving the creation of new contact vernaculars, viz., pidgins, creoles and bilingual mixed languages.

1.6   The Social Contexts of Language Contact

Precisely what factors determine the varied outcomes of the contact situations we have just surveyed? We have already emphasized the complementary roles of external and internal factors in shaping such outcomes. Early scholars such as Müller (1875) and Jakobson (1938) argued that structural (linguistic) constraints were the primary determinants of contact–induced change. But the wide body

of evidence available to us now shows that practically any linguistic feature can be transferred from one language to another, if the circumstances are right. The reason is that extralinguistic factors – the social ecology of the contact situation itself – can override any purely structural resistance to change. Moreover, it is such factors that explain one of the key problems of language contact studies – why all potential forms of contact-induced change may not actually materialize in a given situation. This does not mean, of course, that explanations in terms of purely linguistic constraints are not possible or relevant. It is of prime importance for us to seek explanations as far as possible in linguistic structure, But ultimately, as Weinreich (1953: 3) so aptly stated: "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."

We will consider the various linguistic constraints on contact-induced change in some detail in our discussions of specific contact situations and their outcomes in later chapters. For the present, let us survey briefly the sociocultural factors that play so important a role in regulating these outcomes.

1.6.1   *Language contact in its social settings*

It bears repeating that the broad distinctions we have made between situations involving language maintenance, language shift, and the creation of new contact languages are crucial to explaining the linguistic outcomes of contact. Without a clear understanding of the history and social dynamics of the contact situation, we are in no position to explain anything. Not just the mechanisms of change but also its directionality and agentivity vary according to the type of situation involved. It follows that the constraints on the changes that can occur will vary from one case to another as well. In general, however, the same set of sociocultural factors is present in every contact situation, though the particular mix varies from case to case, with consequent variation in the results. These sociocultural factors include the types of community settings, the demographics of the populations in contact, the codes and patterns of social interaction among them, and the ideologies and attitudes that govern their linguistic choices. Other factors that play a role include the degree of bilingualism among the individuals and groups in contact, the history and length of contact, the power relationships between the groups, and so on. Obviously, it is no easy task to integrate all the relevant factors into a comprehensive and coherent picture of the social ecology of a given contact situation. In the following chapters, we will try to examine the social setting of each type of contact in more detail, and show, as far as possible, how it contributes to the particular outcome in

question. For the moment, let us just attempt a broad outline of some types
of setting.

1.6.1.1   Speech communities and language contact

The unit of analysis for investigating the social ecology of language contact is
the speech community. The concept has sometimes been difficult to pin down
but it has proven useful and revealing in the study of language in its social and
cultural setting. Speech communities can be defined at different levels of gener-
alization, from communities of practice to the local neighborhood to the nation
state. They can also be identified in terms of social criteria such as ethnicity,
social class, gender, and so on. What unites each of these social constructs is the
fact that its members share certain linguistic repertoires and rules for the
conduct and interpretation of speech. Essentially, it is social interaction within
and across speech communities that leads to diffusion of linguistic and other
cultural practices. So, in order to understand the products of language contact,
we have to understand the speech economies of the communities in contact,
and the dynamics of their patterns of interaction.

It would be very useful to design a comprehensive classification of all the
community settings within which language contact takes place. But this would
be a daunting and immensely complex task, one that is well beyond the reach of
the present chapter. By way of illustration, however, we can at least attempt a
broad overview of some types of community setting. For instance, Loveday
(1996: 16) has suggested that communities might be categorized according to
the degree of bi- or multi-lingualism within them. He suggests that there are six
"archetypal contact settings," each characterized by different arrays of contact
phenomena. I here follow the broad outlines of Loveday's typology, but amend
his labels and descriptions where it seems appropriate to do so.

At one end of the spectrum we find relatively homogeneous communities of
monolinguals most of whom have little or no direct contact with speakers of
other languages. Still, foreign influence may be introduced into the language
by individuals who travel, or by the mass media, or through language teaching
in schools, churches, etc. Such "distant" contact typically results in lexical
borrowing alone. Examples include Japanese, Russian, and other languages
that have borrowed words from English. Further discussion can be found in
chapter 2.

In the middle of the spectrum we find a variety of situations involving
varying degrees of bi- or multi-lingualism within the community. One such
setting involves contact between linguistic minorities and a dominant host
group. In some cases, the minority group may be relatively isolated or socially

distant from the majority group. Some examples include Gaelic speakers in Scotland, Basques in southern France, and the Pennsylvania "Dutch" of the midwestern US. Such groups may preserve their language(s) for a long time, though shift to the dominant language may eventually take place. Other bilingual situations are characterized by higher levels of individual bilingualism. There are cases where minority groups become bilingual in the host community's language, for example, Hispanics in the US. There are also cases where different ethnic groups vie for equal status in the same territory, each preserving its own language, but also learning the other. Examples include French and English in Montréal, and Flemish and French in Brussels. We can also find communities that typically employ two or more languages in everyday interaction, and treat them as relatively equal or at least appropriate in their respective domains of use. These communities are characterized by "diglossia," a situation in which two languages, one High (H) and the other Low (L), fulfill complementary functions in the community. Examples include the use of Spanish and Guaraní in Paraguay, and Standard German and Schwyzertüütsch in Switzerland.

When stable bilingualism collapses, through either the erosion of ethnolinguistic boundaries or the resolution of diglossia or some other cause, the result is language shift. This is a common outcome of situations involving bilingualism among minority groups subject to strong cultural pressure from a dominant group. A classic example is the community of Oberwart in Austria, which has undergone shift from Hungarian to German (Gal 1979). Many immigrant groups in the United States have lost their ancestral languages and shifted to English.

Some situations involve bilingualism in an ancestral language as well as a superposed (usually colonial) official language. This can lead to the emergence of new vernaculars which draw on the resources of both the H and L languages, as witness the "New Englishes" in India, Singapore, and various African countries.

Finally, at the other extreme of the continuum, we find highly heterogeneous communities characterized by high degrees of individual multilingualism, such as the village of Kupwar in India, described by Gumperz and Wilson (1971). There are also situations where different speech communities engage in constant interaction, and the fluidity of their social boundaries is matched by the fluidity of their linguistic practices. The Aboriginal groups of Arnem Land, Australia (Heath 1978), and the villages of Northwest New Britain in Papua New Guinea (Thurston 1987, 1994) are examples of this type. They are discussed further in chapter 3.

All of these multilingual communities offer a rich range of possibilities for contact-induced changes of one type or another. There may be borrowing

across languages, code-switching behaviors, substratum influence on varieties acquired as second languages, various types of convergence, and so on. The particular outcomes, as usual, have to do with a range of social factors, some favoring the preservation of language boundaries, others favoring different degrees of language mixture, switching, and convergence, yet others promoting language shift. It is simply impossible to list here all the factors that may be relevant to the nature and outcome of the contact.

It should also be obvious that there is no clear or consistent correspondence between the type of community and the pattern of contact-induced change within it. Bilingual communities, for instance, may be characterized by stable maintenance in some cases, by language shift in others, or by both. Long-term stability can translate into rapid shift, given the right circumstances.

Finally, it bears repeating that this overview of contact settings is far from complete. For instance, it does not include the social contexts that lead to the formation of pidgins, creoles, or bilingual mixed languages. These contact outcomes and their social settings will be discussed more fully in the relevant chapters.

Exercise 3

The following are some questions you might want to ask of a particular contact situation, in order to understand the outcomes of the contact:

1   What is the nature of the community setting in which the contact takes place?
2   What are the demographics of the groups in contact?
3   Is the situation one of language maintenance or shift?
4   What languages are spoken by the groups in contact?
5   What is the direction of influence?

Suggest other questions you might want to ask about the social setting of the contact, the linguistic inputs, and the processes of change that may occur.