

Rudolf Filipović

Some Basic Principles of Languages in Contact Reinterpreted

(Illustrated by the English Element in Serbo-Croatian)

1.0 In studying the process of language borrowing our chief interest is directed toward the transfer of a *model* (a foreign element at any level) in the lending language into a *replica* (an integrated element) in the system of the borrowing language. This entire process takes place according to principles which have been established and described over the past 100 years in various studies of the theory of linguistic borrowing.¹ These principles have been especially well studied in the past 25 years in that branch of linguistics which is today usually called "languages in contact". Numerous studies by the two most active linguists in the field, Einar Haugen and Uriel Weinreich, have very successfully developed a theory of language contact and the principles of linguistic borrowing.²

1.1 The aim of this paper is to analyze, on the basis of the results of many years' work on the project "The English Element in European Languages"³ and on the basis of an analysis

¹ Filipović, Rudolf (1971), *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi*, (Language Contacts in Theory and Practice), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, pp. 91—103.

² I will cite just one work by each which is relevant for this topic:

a) Haugen, Einar (1953), *The Norwegian Language in America: a study in bilingual behavior*, Philadelphia (repr. Indiana, 1969).

b) Weinreich, Uriel (1953), *Language in Contact: Findings and Problems*, New York.

³ Filipović, Rudolf (1966), "The English Element in the Main European Languages", *Studia Romanica et Anglicae Zagrabiensia*, nos. 21—22 Zagreb, pp. 103—112.

(1973), "Prilog metodi proučavanja anglicizama u evropskim jezicima", *Suvremena lingvistika*, 7—8, Zagreb, pp. 3—10.

of linguistic borrowing in 20 European languages⁴ (deliberately chosen according to specific criteria), some basic principles of language borrowing, to develop them further, to make them more precise, and finally to reinterpret them.

1.2 We began with the basic assumption that in analyzing linguistic borrowing we must establish not only the factors causing it but also the sequence of its stages. In this way we ensure that our description of the adaptation of a model into a replica and the application of the principles of languages in contact follow the most natural order.

1.3 The variety and richness of these principles can be best seen when the languages in contact are genetically different. The majority of the 20 borrowing languages studied in my project are either genetically different from English, the lending language, or are not closely related to it. I have chosen to illustrate my reinterpretation of certain principles with examples from Serbo-Croatian. Serbo-Croatian is so different from English in structure that it offers an abundance of examples for my thesis. The analysis of the other 19 European languages also offers ample evidence for my assumptions.

1.4 There is one more reason why we have chosen Serbo-Croatian as the language from which to take examples for our conclusions. We are examining the English element in Serbo-Croatian as spoken in Yugoslavia at the same time that we are studying the influence of American English on Serbo-Croatian as spoken by first- and second- generation Yugoslav emigrants in the U.S.A. This parallel research has led us to several important conclusions which form the basis for our reinterpretation of some principles of language contact.

(1974) "A Contribution to the Method of Studying Anglicisms in European Languages", *SRAZ* no. 37, Zagreb, pp. 135—148.

"English Words in European Mouths and Minds", forthcoming in: *Folia Linguistica*, Tomus XI, 1/2.

The English Element in European Languages. Theory and Method, Zagreb. (in press).

A — Albanian	I — Italian	S-C — Serbo-Croatian
Da — Danish	L — Lithuanian.	S — Slovak
D — Dutch	M — Macedonian	Sl — Slovene
Fi — Finnish	N — Norwegian	Sp — Spanish
F — French	P — Polish	Sw — Swedish
G — German	R — Romanian	T — Turkish
H — Hungarian	Ru — Russian	

2.0 Our observations of the differences in contact between English and, on the one hand, Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian and, on the other, American Serbo-Croatian give us our first principle. It defines the levels on which the analysis of the process of linguistic borrowing can be carried out. Language contact is established in Europe between English and other European languages, and language borrowing takes place under various conditions. These conditions are typical for cultural borrowing.⁵ When the two languages in contact, English as the lender and some European language as the borrower, are spoken in a topographically and politically unified community, the conditions for intimate borrowing⁶ are created.

2.1 The type of contact and the amount of influence in these two types of borrowing are so varied that on the basis of the type of borrowing we can establish in advance the levels on which research can be done. Thus, in the case of Serbo-Croatian we have established that in cultural borrowing the process of adaptation can be very successfully studied on the phonological, morphological, and semantic levels; for the syntactic level, however, we lack examples. On the other hand, our studies show that the conditions of intimate borrowing do allow the syntactic constructions of one language to pass into another, and we have many examples of this. Accordingly, under conditions of cultural borrowing it is very difficult to study the syntactic level. For this level the conditions of intimate contact are necessary.

3.0 In the process of a model becoming a replica two phenomena appear: substitution and importation. If the lending language's elements are replaced by elements of the receiving language, *substitution* occurs. If elements of the lending language are transferred into the receiving language, *importation* takes place. These changes are carried out concurrently, and we give them the same name, "adaptation of a model." Since these changes in a model take place gradually, transitional forms can be found, called "compromise replicas". When the adaptation of a model is complete, we have a replica which has been integrated into the system of the borrowing language. We can observe the phenomenon of substitution on the phonological and morphological levels, and importation on the phonological, morphological, and semantic levels.

⁵ Bloomfield, Leonard (1933), "Cultural Borrowing", in: *Language*, New York, pp. 444—460.

⁶ *Ib.*, "Intimate Borrowing", pp. 461—475.

3.1 By examining the changes found when a model is becoming a replica and those reflected in the various stages of adaptation, i.e. in compromise replicas, and by comparing later changes after a replica has been integrated into the system of the borrowing language, we can establish that these two groups of changes differ not only chronologically but also qualitatively. Thus, we have introduced two new concepts into the methodology of studying adaptation: the concepts of "primary" and "secondary".⁷ Both contain two components, one chronological and one qualitative. On the basis of these distinctions we have divided adaptation and its concomitant changes into two stages: a) primary changes which take place during the primary stage of adaptation, and b) secondary changes during the secondary stage of adaptation.

3.2 Primary changes are found during the adaptation of a model until the transfer of a compromise replica into a replica. They are in quality typical for the initial phase of transferring an element from one language system into another, and they are by nature "bilingual" because they contain elements of both systems. All forms of substitution and even of importation are still unstable and variants appear as a result of the existence of several possible stages of substitution.

3.3 Secondary changes originate at the moment of integration. After this, when a replica has already become a loanword, it behaves as does any native word. Secondary changes are much more stable and there is less possibility of variant formation; also, they develop within the system of the borrowing language without any influence from the lending language.

The introduction of this new conceptual division into the classification of changes and of stages of adaptation makes possible a more precise analysis and a more logical systematization of them.

3.4 The analysis on three levels, phonological, morphological, and semantic, which we did on the basis of this division confirmed the above conclusion. In determining the accent of English loanwords in European languages with an expiratory stress accent, the primary adaptation regulates changes in that field during the stage of a compromise replica as well. The determination of the musicality of accent in English loan-

⁷ Filipović, Rudolf (1977), "Primary and Secondary Adaptation of Loan-Words", *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, Band 23, pp. 116—125.

words in European languages having tone accent is carried out during secondary adaptation, and changes taking place then in the accent of loanwords are classified as secondary.

3.4.1 Changes occurring in the phonological adaptation⁸ of words ending in consonant clusters are primary changes. Their further adaptation, as a result of the non-nativeness of their final consonant clusters, is classified as secondary (chronologically and qualitatively).⁹

3.4.2 We shall note the adaptation of verbs in Serbo-Croatian as an illustration from the morphological level. The formation of a new verb loanword¹⁰ by adding an infinitive suffix and the infinitive ending *-ti* is done in primary adaptation. The morphological marking of aspect in English loanwords by prefixation,¹¹ as is done with native words, is a part of secondary adaptation and is classified as a secondary change.

3.4.3 On the semantic level this phenomenon is even more frequent, appearing during adaptation of the meaning of a loanword.¹² The first semantic change,¹³ be it zero adaptation, restriction in number or in field, or expansion in number or in field, belongs to primary adaptation; we therefore call them primary changes. Some loanwords pass through secondary adaptation. This can be either restriction or expansion¹⁴ of a type different from that of primary adaptation or pejoration. A small number of loanwords show two qualitative changes during secondary adaptation.¹⁵

⁸ Filipović, Rudolf (1958), "The Phonetic Compromise", *SRAZ*, no. 5, Zagreb, p. 86.

(1959), "Consonantal Innovations in the Phonological System...", *SRAZ*, no. 7, Zagreb, p. 44.

(1960), *The Phonemic Analysis of English Loan-Words in Croatian*, Zagreb, p. 55.

⁹ E *hands* > SC *henc* = primary adaptation

SC *henc* > SC *henac* = secondary adaptation

¹⁰ Filipović, Rudolf (1961), "The Morphological Adaptation of English Loan-Words in Serbo-Croat", *SRAZ*, no. 11, Zagreb, pp. 100–103.

¹¹ E *box* > SC *boksati* > SC *izboksati* = secondary adaptation.

¹² Filipović, Rudolf (1968), "Semantic Extension Changes in Adaptation of English Loan-Words in Serbo-Croatian" *SRAZ*, nos., 25–26, Zagreb, pp. 109–119.

¹³ Restriction (primary) e.g.

E *corner* (in SOD nine senses) — SC *korner* (one sense)

¹⁴ Expansion (secondary) e.g.

prim. ad. SC *korner* (one sense) > sec. ad. SC *korner* (its meaning expanded within the same field)

¹⁵ E *nylon* > SC *najlon* in primary adaptation shows zero semantic adaptation and in secondary it shows an expansion in number and pejoration.

4.0 *Substitution* is the more important of two concepts that directly influence the formation of the form of a loanword on the phonological and morphological levels. On the phonological level the form of a replica is determined by the replacement of phonemes of the lending language by phonemes of the borrowing language. We call this *transphonemization*.¹⁶ On the morphological level the replacement process is the same: a morpheme of the lending language is replaced by a morpheme of the borrowing language; this we call *transmorphemization*.¹⁷ Transmorphemization refers to bound morphemes only, because free morphemes are in general borrowed after transphonemization and without any change on the morphological level.

4.1 *Transphonemization* can have three degrees depending on the degree of similarity in the description of phonemes in the lending language and those in the borrowing language. If we compare the phonological systems of two languages in contact according to the similarities of their elements, we get a division into three groups.¹⁸

4.1.1 The first group contains those phonemes of the lending language, English, which correspond completely or almost completely to phonemes of the borrowing language. For example:

- E. /i:/ — SC. *i*,
E. /f/ — SC. *f*, etc.¹⁹

¹⁶ I used this term for the first time as early as 1960 in *The Phonemic Analysis of English Loan-Words in Croatian*, with the meaning of narrow substitution (substitution of phonemes within the same manner of articulation). Now I have extended it to all three stages.

¹⁷ This is a new term which I have just formed on the pattern of *transphonemization*.

¹⁸ Here is a matrix of English phonemes made on the basis of this principle.

English Phonemes

	Group 1.	Group 2.	Group 3.
<i>Vowels</i>	/i:/, /e/, /æ/, /ɔ:/, /u:/	/i/, /æ/, /a:/, /ɔ/, /u/	/ə:/, /ə/
<i>Diphthongs</i>			/ei/, /ai/, /ɔi/, /au/, /əu/, /iə/, /eə/, /uə/
<i>Consonants</i>	/b/, /g/, /m/, /n/, /k/, /v/, /l/, /h/, /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/, /j/	/p/, /t/, /d/, /k/, /r/	/θ/, /ð/, /v/, /w/

¹⁹ E *jeep* /dʒi:p/ > SC *džip*
E *film* /film/ > SC *film*

4.1.2 The second group contains those phonemes of the lending language, English, which only partially correspond to phonemes of the borrowing language. These are phonemes which differ from those of the borrowing language in degree of opening (for vowels), or in place of articulation (for consonants) although they have the same manner of articulation, e.g.:

- E. /i/ — SC. *i*;
- E. /t/ — SC. *t*, etc.²⁰

4.1.3 The third group contains those phonemes of the lending language, English, which do not have articulatory equivalents in the borrowing language. Substitution of these phonemes is most frequently done on the basis of orthography or extra-linguistic factors. Examples are:

- E. /ə/ — SC. *er*,
- E. /eə/ — SC. *er*,
- E. /ŋ/ — SC. *ng*,
- E. /θ/ — SC. *t*, etc.²¹

4.1.4 The replacement of phonemes carried out within the framework of the first group described above belongs to *substitution of the first degree = complete transphonemization*. Replacement of the second type belongs to *substitution of the second degree = partial transphonemization*. That of the third type belongs to *substitution of the third degree = free transphonemization*. This division has great applicability in analyzing the adaptation of a model and in classifying substitution and changes which take place during it.

4.2 *Transmorphemization* of bound morphemes is a somewhat less complex process than is transphonemization. We can distinguish three degrees among nouns: a) *zero or first-degree transmorphemization* occurs when the base form is borrowed without a bound morpheme,²² b) *second-degree transmorphemization* takes place when an English ending is maintained, although it doesn't belong to the borrowing language's system,²³ c) *third-degree transmorphemization* occurs when an English ending is replaced by a native ending,²⁴ or a

²⁰ E *lift* /lift/ > SC *lift*; E *test* /test/ > SC *test*

²¹ E *farmer* /fɑ:mə/ > SC *farmer*; E *fair* /feə/ > SC *fer*; E *parking* /pa:kiŋ/ > SC *parking*; E *Commonwealth* /kɒmənwèlθ/ > SC *komonvelt*

²² E *whiskey* > SC *viski*

²³ E *sprint-er* > SC *sprint-er*

²⁴ E *box-er* > SC *boks-ač*

new ending is given to the English word in order to denote one or more categories of the loanword.²⁵

5.0 *Importation* is the second, less important and rarer, phenomenon which can affect the process of a model becoming a replica. It can be analyzed on three levels:

1) on the phonological level, in three forms: (a) in the inventory phonemes, (b) in the distribution of phonemes, (c) in the composition of accent; 2) on the morphological level in the importation of morphemes; 3) on the semantic level in borrowing the meaning (without the form of a loanword).

5.1 My research into importation on the phonological level²⁶ has shown that new phonemes can appear in the borrowing language, but that this is not a free introduction of new elements into the system. The first thing that we found out is that the introduction of new phonemes is closely connected to the phonological system of the borrowing language and that it is strictly conditioned.

5.2 All examples of so-called *phonemic importation* that we have studied in numerous European languages²⁷ can be classified into two groups. These groups are defined in the following way.

5.2.1 A foreign phoneme is the result of *phonologization*, i.e. the change of an allophone into a phoneme. E.g.:

SC. *dž* < T, H, E. /dʒ/,
F. *ɲ* < E. /ŋ/.

In Serbo-Croatian the allophone *dž* appeared in the development of nouns from verbal bases: *svjedoč-i-ti* — *svjedodž-ba*. The existence of this allophone *dž* in Serbo-Croatian made possible the development of a phoneme *dž* through phonologization in loanwords from Turkish, Hungarian and English²⁸ in Serbo-Croatian. The same is true for French, where the phoneme /ɲ/ has appeared in the phonetic context of *langues modernes* /lā:ɲ modern/ which conditions the development of

²⁵ E *farm* > SC *farm-a*

²⁶ Filipović, Rudolf (1960), "Phonemic Importation", *SRAZ*, no. 9-10, Zagreb, pp. 177—189.

²⁷ See note 4. for the list of languages.

²⁸ Turkish: *džamija, hodža, dželat, hadžija*

Italian: *dženerao, madž*

Hungarian: *Madžar, Madžarska*

English: *džem, džungla, pidžama, bridž*

the phoneme /ŋ/ by phonologization in English loanwords ending in *-ing*.²⁹

5.2.2 The foreign phoneme represents an active, latent phoneme of the borrowing language, which is confirmed by an empty slot in the system which the foreign phoneme fills. Examples:

SC. *f*³⁰ < E., G, L /f/

I. *ʒ*³¹ < F. *ʒ*

The above examples are examples of *zero importation*, the form of importation which is realized within a system and which does not lead to the introduction of new elements.

5.3 Besides this form of importation we find another type which leads to *innovation* in the system of the borrowing language. Einar Haugen in "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing"³² has already noted that one of the structural effects of linguistic borrowing in phonology is to be found in changes called *phonemic redistribution*.³³ In testing this phenomenon quite frequently in numerous European languages, I ascertained that it appears in two forms: 1) redistribution which is found in a compromise replica but which is not maintained in a replica when it is integrated into the borrowing language system,³⁴ 2) redistribution which is kept in a replica although it conflicts with the distribution of consonants in the phonological system of the borrowing language.³⁵ Then it represents a consonantal innovation in the phonological system as a consequence of linguistic borrowing. This type of importation is called *full importation* because it contributes to changes in the borrowing language system.

6.0 Through research on changes on the *semantic level* and through the application of my principle for distinguishing *primary* adaptation and changes from *secondary* adaptation and changes, I have developed further the first element of a five-member scheme of semantic adaptation of changes in se-

²⁹ E *meeting* /mi:tiŋ/ > F *meeting*

E *parking* /pa:kiŋ/ > F *parking*

³⁰ E *finish* > SC *finiš*

G *Flasche* > SC *flaša*

L *Stephanus* > SC *Stefan*

³¹ F *garage* > It *il garage* /ga'raz/

F *reportage* > It *il reportage* /repor'taz/

³² Haugen, Einar (1950), "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing", *Language*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 201—231.

³³ Filipović, Rudolf (1959), "Consonantal Innovations in the Phonological System as a Consequence of Linguistic Borrowing", *SRAZ*, no. 7, Zagreb, pp. 39—62.

³⁴ E *hands* > SC Compromise replica: *henc* > SC Replica: *hen-a-c*

³⁵ E *lift* > SC Compromise replica: *lift* > SC Replica: *lift*

semantic extension which Hope³⁶ divides into a) zero semantic extension, b) restriction of meaning, and c) expansion of meaning. I noticed that the second and third types of changes in semantic extension appear in some cases in two varieties. A change may be in the number of meanings or it can be realized within the domain of one meaning (in the area).

6.1 In this way I extended Hope's divisions from (a), (b), (c) above to (a), (b 1), (b 2), (c 1), (c 2). This means that I examined semantic changes according to a new table:³⁷

- a) zero semantic extension
- b) 1 restriction in the number of meanings
- b) 2 restriction within the area of one meaning
- c) 1 expansion in the number of meanings
- c) 2 expansion of meaning within the area.

6.2 It is not necessary to emphasize that such a widened approach to the semantic adaptation of loanwords in the borrowing language represents a much more precise and useable model for analyzing semantic changes. This is especially true for those instances when changes in meaning pass through primary and secondary and even tertiary adaptation (*pejoration*).³⁸

7 Finally I would like to say a few words about the sequence of stages of the analysis. After I ascertained that it is important to observe the difference between cultural and intimate borrowing and introduced chronologically and qualitatively different stages of adaptation, primary and secondary, the application of the principles of languages in contact showed that it is most appropriate for changes on the phonological level to be analyzed first, followed by changes on the morphological level, while always bearing in mind that substitution and importation on the phonological level are preconditions for substitution and importation on the morphological level. Semantic adaptation is, to be sure, independent of phonological and morphological adaptation, but it logically follows after these two because after the integration of a loanword into the borrowing language system has been carried out, we can with certainty state how and to what degree it has been adapted, i.e. changed.

³⁶ Hope, Thomas E. (1960), "The Analysis of Semantic Borrowing" *Essays Presented to C. M. Girdlestone*, New Castle, pp. 125—141.

³⁷ Filipović, Rudolf (1977), "English Words in European Mouths and Minds", forthcoming in: *Folia Linguistica*, Tomus XI, 1/2.

³⁸ E nylon — SC najlon > najlon-hotel (ill-reputed)
najlon-mentalitet (primitive character)
najlon-mozak (feeble mind)