interference as those that govern connected speech in a secondary language (§2.21–3). But a bilingual's connected utterance in language S, even if imperfect, must nevertheless approximate the phonemics of S sufficiently to be intelligible to its unilingual hearers. On the contrary, the use of a word borrowed from S in a P-utterance is not inhibited by the need to conform to an extraneous phonemic norm; the mechanisms of interference therefore affect individual loanwords with particular force. If the speaker's intent is to integrate the loanword, the same mechanisms dictate a sweeping substitution of phonemes. Thus, Spanish *yegua* 'mare' becomes, in Taos, /ˌjawoˈʔonɑ/;[37] Italians in the United States adopt *Brooklyn* as /brokoˈlino/, *husband* as /ˈosbiru/, *box* as /ˈbokisɑ/;[38] Hawaiian borrows *George* as /keoki/, *rice* as /lɑiki/, *brush* as /pɑlɑki/.[39] In addition to the simple substitution of phonemes, various analogy patterns become operative: Danes adopt German *Maschine* as *maskine* on the analogy of such cognates as *Schuh* ~ *sko*. Some Yiddish speakers modify *painter* to /pejntner/ and *coat* to /kojt/.[40] Longer words, undergoing folk etymology, are reinterpreted as meaningful compounds and their phonemic shape is adjusted accordingly (e.g. the famous *asparagus* > *sparrowgrass*),[41] or, by metanalysis, parts of words are productivized for compounding (e.g. *hamburg-er* > *ham-burger* > *burger, beef-burger*).

Since words can also be borrowed from a language in its written form, phonic integration sometimes starts with the spelled form of a word. Because of the transcription *tsar*, this Russian loanword is pronounced with /ts-/ in Amer. English, while German *Zwieback* has been adopted as /ˈzwijbak/, even though in the source languages both words have the same initial sound.[42] English loanwords have been treated differently in Hawaiian spoken Japanese, which received many of them by the "ear route," and in standard Japanese, which (until 1945, at least) received its English material from the printed page. Thus standard Japanese borrowed *gasoline* in its spelled form and obtained *gasoriñ*; colloquial Japanese in Hawaii has /gʹɑsɯriñ/, since the Japanese hear the initial English consonant as a palatal and the [ə] as most nearly [ɯ].[43]

The phonic integration of a corpus of loanwords has been satisfactorily described for many languages;[44] but a systematic survey of all possible processes and mechanisms, in the light of both structural and cultural considerations, remains to be made.

[37] Trager (576), 146.
[38] Menarini (353).
[39] Carr (96), 18.
[40] This adaptation must have originated with speakers of Yiddish dialects which have no /oˑ/ or /ow/, but who feel—as a result of their contact with central ("Polish") Yiddish—that /ow, oˑ/ corresponds to their own /oj/; therefore, /kojt/ is to /kowt/ as northeastern ("Lithuanian") Yiddish /hojz, bojx/ is to central Yiddish /hoˑz, boˑx/ 'house, belly'. On a parallel dialect problem in Amer. Norwegian, see Haugen (203), 222f.
[41] Cf. Lommel (321).
[42] Cf. Bloomfield (55, 448) for this and other examples. See also Haugen (203, 223) on Amer. Norwegian, and Møller (374, 10–2) on Danish.
[43] Carr (96).
[44] See, for example, Frey's study (153) of English loanwords in Pennsylvania German or Lytkin's analysis (330) of Russian loanwords in Komi.

2.3 Grammatical Interference

2.31 Plan of Analysis

The problem of grammatical interference—currently among the most debated questions of general linguistics[1]—is one of considerable complexity. Many linguists of repute have questioned the possibility of grammatical, at least morphological, influence altogether. "The grammatical systems of two languages . . . are impenetrable to each other," said Meillet (350, I, 82), and he was echoed by Sapir: "Nowhere do we find any but superficial morphological interinfluencings" (472, 217). With equal vigor, the opposite view has been defended by Schuchardt (497, 195): "Even closely knit structures [*dichte Zusammenschlüsse*], like inflectional endings, are not secure against invasion by foreign material." According to a contemporary restatement, "there is no limit in principle to the influence which one morphological system may have upon another."[2]

That entirely contradictory views could be held by such responsible scholars is apparently due to the lack of agreement between them on fundamental terms and concepts. To this day, there is little uniformity in the drawing of lines between morphology and syntax, grammar and lexicon.[3] But this need not be an obstacle to a systematic analysis of grammatical interference. The main requirement is that in a given contact situation, both languages be described in the same terms. Beyond that, it is possible to steer clear of the fluid and controversial borders between words and non-words, syntax and morphology, and so forth, by treating these distinctions, for comparative purposes, as matters of degree. Thus, while morphemes that are words (free) and those that are not (bound) may be distinguished absolutely in some languages or language types, in a general synopsis the "degree of boundness" of morphemes is easily handled as a variable; correspondingly, a commitment as to the absolute limits between morphology, word-formation, syntax, and phraseology can be avoided.

The analysis attempted here skirts the treacherous classificatory problems of general grammar by recourse to one absolute and two relative distinctions:

a. MORPHEMES (segments of utterances, including prosodic features which differentiate simple morphemes) are distinguished from GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS, including: (1) order; (2) agreement, dependence, and similar relations between grammatical units; and (3) modulations of stress and pitch. This distinction is of significance here because grammatical functions which are performed in one language by morphemes may be identified by bilinguals with relations of another language. For example, a Russian-English bilingual may

[1] The question figured on the agenda of the International Congresses of Linguists in 1939 (Brussels), 1948 (Paris), and 1952 (London); see bibliography (230–232).
[2] Bazell (32), 303. Rosetti (454, 73) uses the interpenetration of two morphologies as the criterion for defining a *langue mixte*, which he contrasts with a *langue mélangée*, containing but isolated borrowings.
[3] Cf. Vogt (599), 33.

identify the order relation between *loves* and *Mary* in *John loves Mary* with the morpheme *-u* in the Russian sentence *Ivan Mari-u ljubit*, where it expresses the accusative and thus makes *Maria* the direct object.

b. More or less OBLIGATORY categories. In a language, the expression of some categories is obviously more obligatory than that of others. Whenever an action is described by a finite verb in English, for example, its time in relation to the speech event must be expressed by a tense. This category is therefore more obligatory than, say, the sex of animate objects, whose specification is optional even with nouns capable of gender differentiation (*teacher—woman teacher, friend—boy friend, poet—poetess, wolf—she-wolf*, etc.). In the more obligatory distinctions, a zero morpheme can signify one member of the opposition. Thus the absence of *-s* in (*he*) *put* signifies past tense, while the absence of *she-* in *wolf* does not necessarily signify masculinity. Relations, too, can be more and less obligatory. For instance, word order patterns covering subject and verb are less obligatory in German than in English, and in Russian they are more optional than in either of the former.

c. Greater or lesser syntagmatic BOUNDNESS of morphemes used to express categories. For example, *-t* in Latin *amaui-t* is more bound (i.e. less separable) than *il* in French /il-emɛ/ (*il aimait*). The English morpheme *he* in *he loved*, is, in turn, less bound than the French *il*, since it is even more separable and is used in other functions.

This scheme, it is hoped, will make possible an examination of the evidence without the bias reflected in strongly worded, and possibly premature, declarations like Meillet's (quoted on p. 29 above). But two additional premises underlying the analysis must be stated. First, morphemes and grammatical relations belonging to one language can occur in the speech of another language as "borrowings." Secondly, morphemes and grammatical relations, as well as morpheme classes, are subject to interlingual identifications in the sense defined in §2.11.

In these terms, given the contact of two languages, *A* and *B*, the following types of grammatical interference of *A* with *B* (or vice versa) are to be expected:

(1) The use of *A*-morphemes in speaking (or writing) language *B*. Example: Amer. Yiddish /nit er bʌt ix/ 'not he but I'. It is to be investigated whether forms belonging to some classes are more subject to transfer than others (§2.32); also, how the transferred morphemes are integrated with the recipient grammar (§2.37).

(2) The application of a grammatical relation of language *A* to *B*-morphemes in *B*-speech, or the neglect of a relation of *B* which has no prototype in *A* (§2.53). Example: *he comes tomorrow home*, with the German word order pattern (cf. *er kommt morgen nach Hause*) applied to English morphemes.

(3) Through the identification of a specific *B*-morpheme with a specific *A*-morpheme, a change (extension, reduction) in the functions of the *B*-morpheme on the model of the grammar of language *A* (§2.34). Example: The identification by bilinguals of Yiddish *ver* with English *who*, and the resulting use of *ver* in the capacity of a relative pronoun (*der mentš ver iz do* instead of *der mentš vos iz do* on the model of *the man who is here*). On the model of language *A*, a

set of existing categories of language *B* may come to be expressed by new morphemes, or entirely new obligatory categories may even be established; also, existing categories may be eliminated on the model of another language (§2.35).

For interference of type (1), where a transfer of morphemes is involved, it is convenient to speak of the source language and the recipient language. For types (2) and (3), where no morphemes are transferred, we may speak rather of the model language and the replica language.

2.32 Grammatical Function of Morphemes and Likelihood of Transfer

The outright transfer of morphemes from one language into speech in another, viewed as a means of correcting the inadequacies of a lexicon, is considered in §2.4. In this section, the transferability of morphemes is considered as a correlate of their grammatical function in the source language and the resistance of the recipient language.

The transfer of morphemes which are as strongly bound as inflectional endings in many European languages seems to be extremely rare. The study of the phenomenon is unfortunately encumbered by the often unsatisfactory description of its few known instances.

What appears at first blush to be a transfer of highly bound morphemes often turns out, upon a fuller analysis, to be something else.[4] It sometimes happens that free forms are transferred into a language in pairs, with and without an affix. The presence of the pair in the recipient language enables even its unilingual user to analyze the two-morpheme compound into a base and affix, and to extend the affix to other, indigenous bases. Thus the plural ending *-im* in Yiddish *pójerim* 'peasants,' *doktójrim* 'doctors' is only ultimately, but not directly, of Hebrew origin; it is rather an analogical extension of the *-im*-plural from such Yiddish couples as *min—mínim* 'sort,' *giber—gibójrim* 'strong man', etc., etc.—free morphemes borrowed in pairs from Hebrew. The English diminutive *-ette* in words like *kitchenette* represents a productive device introduced in such word pairs as *statue—statuette* or *cigar—cigarette*, rather than a direct transfer of a bound morpheme from French.[5]

After such items are discounted,[6] however, there remains a residue of cases

---

[4] This point was raised by Schuchardt (**496**), 9f.

[5] Cf. also the rare examples of the penetration of a Latvian prefix into Livonian and of a German prefix into Old Prussian, cited, alongside of the well known Slavic prefixes in Rumanian, by Kiparsky (**272**, 501–3). It is interesting that such affixes are frequently utilized for facetious purposes, e.g. *-ilät, -ibus* in German (*Grobität, Gründibus*) or *-ition* in Rumanian (e.g. *furculition* for *furculiţă* 'fork'); see Graur (**175**). Cf. also the humorous phrase of Yiddish slang, /far'štande-vu/ 'do you understand?' after French *comprenez-vous*.

[6] Many alleged instances of bound-morpheme borrowing are not described in sufficient detail to permit a judgment as to whether analogical extension of the above type is involved or not; thus Schuchardt's reference to an Armenian *-kʰ* plural of Caucasian origin (**497**, 193) is all too curt; his view on the Latin origin of Basque plural *-eta* (*ibid.*) is doubted by Lafon (**292**, 507). In Zvegincev's assertion (**658**, 331) that modern Persian borrowed new plural suffixes, *-at* and *-džat*, not even the source of these loans is indicated. The Greek agentive suffix *-ci*, transferred into Turkish, according to Spitzer (**537**), is almost certainly

which can be explained in no other way than by the outright transfer of a highly bound morpheme. One such ascertained instance is the transfer of Bulgarian verb endings for the first and second persons singular into Meglenite Rumanian.[7] Thanks to the rigorous description by T. Capidan (**93**, 159 f.),[8] the facts and circumstances of the case are known. In that Rumanian dialect, the endings -*um* (-*ăm*) and -*iš*, of Bulgarian origin, occur in place of the older -*u*, -*i*: *aflum*, *afliš* 'I, you find' for *aflu*, *afli*. It is significant that in the surrounding Bulgarian dialect, the conjugation in -*am*, -*iš* is the most productive of several types. Some Bulgarian verbs formerly of the -*à* conjugation have adopted the -*am* paradigm (*pletà* > *pletam* 'I twist, knit', *rastà* > *rastam* 'I grow,' etc.). It is as if the analogical expansion of the -*am* verb class overflowed the boundaries of the Bulgarian language into the Rumanian dialect. Of course, the category of first person singular, present indicative, already existed in Rumanian when the new morpheme to express it was introduced. A rather special condition is therefore involved here, namely the congruence in structure of the Rumanian and Bulgarian conjugations prior to the transfer. The case plainly resembles the spread of inflectional morphemes among closely related dialects of one language,[9] where two prerequisites are satisfied: congruent grammatical structures and *apriori* similar vocabularies.[10] Almost equally favorable conditions characterize the Romansh-Schwyzertütsch contact, where a case bordering on bound-morpheme transfer has occurred. Bilingual children have been replacing the Romansh feminine indefinite article *in*, an alternant of *ina* used before vowels, by *ina-n* (*ina-n-ura* 'an hour' for *in' ura*) on the model of Schwyzertütsch, where, just as in English, the article *a* has an extended alternant, *an*, before vowels (*a p'luag* 'a plough', *an ap'al* 'an apple'). In Welsh, where an English -*s* is sometimes used to reinforce the plurality of a collective noun (e.g. *sɛren* 'star', *sēr* 'stars, collectively', *sɛrs* 'stars, plurally'),[11] there was also a preëxisting plural category.

---

an analogical extension. Jaberg's curious case (**237**, 65) of the adoption of -*en* from (standard?) German into the Romance dialect of a Swiss Grison valley to differentiate the plural (*la vacchen*) from the formerly identical singular (*la vacca*) also possibly has to be discounted on the grounds of analogy; his data are inconclusive. Incomplete, too, is the assertion by Hardie (**194**, 122) that French -*amant* was transferred as an adverb-forming suffix into Breton. Schuchardt's example (**496**, 8, 10) of the transfer of English possessive -'*s* into insular Portuguese (*gobernadors casa*) has been used as a stock illustration by Meillet (**350**, I, 87), Vendryes (**594**, 343–4), and many others who were unaware that Schuchardt himself retracted it (**498**, 524, footnote 1), reanalyzing the phrase as *gobernador su casa* ('the governor his house'). On the other hand, Spanish-English bilingual children in Tampa, Florida, have been overheard saying *Juan's padre vive aquí* 'Juan's father lives here'; cf. Ortoz (**390**).

[7] A dialect spoken north of Salonica.

[8] Summarized by himself (**91**), 91.

[9] E.g. the spread in Schwyzertütsch of the first and second plural ending -*nt* (replacing zero, -*t*) from Uri into Urseren, described by Bangerter (**15**, 11). Even Meillet (**350**, I, 87) admitted the possibility of this type of morpheme transfer.

[10] The similarity of vocabulary, cognate and borrowed, in Bulgarian and Meglenite Rumanian may have been a facilitating factor even in the morpheme transfer discussed here.

[11] Sommerfelt (**534**), 8.

Indeed, it stands very much to reason that the transfer of morphemes is facilitated between highly congruent structures;[12] for a highly bound morpheme is so dependent on its grammatical function (as opposed to its designative value) that it is useless in an alien system unless there is a ready function for it.

One reason why bound-morpheme transfers have so rarely been detected[13] is that observers have sought them predominantly in fixed languages, rather than in the flowing speech of bilinguals.[14] There is little doubt that careful listening to speech, particularly in circumstances where interference is little inhibited (cf. §3.4), would reveal many interesting transfers of even the most strongly bound morphemes.[15]

That such transfers are ephemeral and are rarely established in the recipient language is a different matter and deserves separate study. Cultural reasons (cf. §42) may be at play, but structural factors, too, may be involved. Significantly, the transferred morphemes in several of the cited examples are introduced to replace zeros or phonemically less bulky forms: -*en* replacing zero for the plural in a Swiss Italian dialect, -*o* replacing zero for the vocative in Rumanian, *ge*- replacing zero for the passive participle and -*ke* for the feminine in Yiddish-affected English; -*um*, -*iš* taking the place of the shorter -*u*, -*i* in Meglenite Rumanian, or -*nt* replacing mere -*t* (or zero) in Urseren Schwyzertütsch. The bilingual speaker apparently feels a need to express some categories of one system no less strongly than in the other, and transfers morphemes accordingly for purposes of reinforcement. The unilingual speaker of the recipient language, on the other hand, uncontaminated by another system, may not share the need for reinforcement. Moreover, because of their frequent inconspicuousness, the transferred bound morphemes occurring in the foreigner's speech easily escape his notice. Unaware of their presence, ignorant as to their function, he is not likely to adopt them. Caribbean Creole, for example, reflects a state of one-time

---

[12] This has been asserted in much more general form by Bartoli (**22a**, 90) in 1927 and by the Prague Linguistic Circle (**420**, 305) in 1948. While Vogt's remark (**599**, 38) on the unsuitability of the Indo-European field for grammatical interference study is valid with reference to replica functions (see p. 37, footnote 30), the exact opposite would seem to be true as far as the transfer of bound morphemes is concerned, since the condition of *apriori* congruent structure is so fully developed in the Indo-European family.

[13] Some other instances of bound-morpheme borrowing are the Rumanian feminine vocative ending -*o*, of Slavic origin, reported by Rosetti (**454**, 73); the Georgian instrumental in -*iw* of Armenian origin, mentioned by Schuchardt (**497**, 193); and a few scattered others.

[14] On differentiating language and speech, see §2.14.

[15] Thus Schuchardt (**496**, 101) heard, in the German speech of Czechs, forms like *sie geht-e* 'she goes' (present tense!), with a transfer of Czech -*e*; he also heard Slovaks saying, in German, *in Pressburg-u*, with a Czech locative suffix (*ibid.*, 85). Cf. Kober's phrases, allegedly reproducing the English speech of native Yiddish speakers (**279**, 36): *now is gebusted the cup* 'now the cup is "busted"', or *like a ... can from sardines was gepacked the train* 'the train was packed like a can of sardines' (**280**, 25), where the morpheme *ge*- is transferred into English; *Miss Fortune-Tellerke* (*ibid.*), where the Yiddish formant -*ke* is added to reinforce the feminity of *Miss Fortune-Teller*. Cf. also the Polish-German forms cited by Mak (**334**, 49), e.g. *to mi przyszło komisch vor* (<*das kam mir komisch vor*) 'this seemed funny to me'.

bilingualism when the functions of the strongly bound and alternating morpheme which differentiates French masculine /plē/ from feminine /plèn/ 'full' were overlooked. Instead, these compound forms were borrowed as simple, semantically different words: plē 'full', plen 'pregnant (of animals and women); full (of moon)'; similarly for fē 'fine (delicate)', fin 'thin', etc.[16]

As a mechanism for the reinforcement of expression, the transfer of morphemes naturally flourishes where affective categories are concerned. Schuchardt (496, 86f.), in his still indispensable early study, noted the transferability of diminutive and endearing affixes. Diminutives of Polish origin have been shown to abound in Silesian German,[17] while in modern Hebrew endearing forms in -le, derived from Yiddish, have been regularly established.[18] A favorite Yiddish morphological device for the expression of disparagement, consisting in the repetition of a word with substitution of /šm-/ for the initial consonant (e.g. libe-šmibe 'love—what's love?'), has been applied by Yiddish speakers to many other languages; in Amer. English, as Spitzer has shown (537), the money-shmoney pattern seems to be catching on among non-bilinguals, too.

According to the conception of the relative boundness of morphemes (p. 30), it is now possible to pass from the unequivocally bound forms to freer ones and inquire whether some parts of speech, or form classes, are more amenable to transfer than others. It would be interesting, for example, to test the proposition that the transferability of a class of morphemes is a function of both systems in contact, not just of one. In other words, it might be possible to show, perhaps, that a relatively unbound morpheme is most likely to replace its counterpart in another language if the latter is more bound and is involved in a greater variation of alternants in fulfilling corresponding functions. Thus, Ukrainian and Rumanian both have adjective comparisons, but while in Ukrainian the comparative is expressed by an unstressed bound suffix (involving frequent root modifications), the Rumanian system is quite clearcut: To form the comparative, the detachable form mai is placed before the adjective, which is itself unaffected. A bilingual in this contact situation is reported to have reinforced her comparatives in Ukrainian by introducing mai from Rumanian (obtaining something like the redundant more older).[19]

Would the same speaker have introduced mai into French, where plus is just as unbound and invariant? The answer must remain speculative because, unfortunately, evidence of this type is still extremely scarce.

Other things being equal, and cultural considerations apart, morphemes with complex grammatical functions seem to be less likely to be transferred by the bilingual than those with simpler functions. For example, a preposition which determines one of several cases is less likely to be transferred than a freely occurring noun;[20] an auxiliary verb, governed by conjunctions or governing moods

[16] Taylor (565), 43, footnote 2.
[17] Pritzwald (422).
[18] Rubin (457), 308.
[19] Racoviță (424).
[20] Schuchardt already noted (496, 9, 85) that "in regard to their independence, preposi-

of the main verb, is perhaps less transferable than a full-fledged verb. On the contrary, such unintegrated morphemes as sentence-words and interjections would appear to be transferable almost at will.[21] Of course, the structure of the recipient language is also involved. If it contains cases which the bilingual can identify with the case system of the other language in contact, the transfer of a preposition may be facilitated.

It may be possible to range the morpheme classes of a language in a continuous series from the most structurally and syntagmatically integrated inflectional ending, through such "grammatical words" as prepositions, articles, or auxiliary verbs, to full-fledged words like nouns, verbs, and adjectives, and on to independent adverbs and completely unintegrated interjections. Then this hypothesis might be set up: The fuller the integration of the morpheme, the less likelihood of its transfer.[22] A scale of this type was envisaged by Whitney in 1881 (637) and by many linguists since. Haugen (203, 224) discusses it as the "scale of adoptability," without, perhaps, sufficiently emphasizing its still hypothetical nature as far as bilinguals' speech is concerned. It should be clear how much painstaking observation and analysis is necessary before this hypothesis can be put to the test.[23]

While the flowing speech of bilinguals has been neglected, statistical analyses

tions differ little from suffixes." He quotes an Italian who said, in German, er wohnt nella Heinrichstrasse 'he lives on Heinrich Street'. Here the place name, which in this community was as much Italian as German, was transferred into German speech along with its invariant preposition, much as the French statuette was transferred into English with its formative suffix. The same speaker, Schuchardt writes, would not have used nella in a free construction like *er ist nella Küche.
[21] Some bilinguals appear to transfer these unintegrated words in both directions, until they form a single, merged lexical subsystem used in speaking either language; in Roberts' terminology (450, 34), there takes place lexical "interfusion," i.e. reciprocal borrowing. The native-language speech of American immigrants swarms with English interjections. But while words like sure, never mind, well, and O.K. are freely used, say, in immigrant Yiddish, the uninhibited English speech of the same speakers, and even that of their children, is full of táke 'indeed', kejnenhóre 'not bad!', nébex 'poor thing', and similar grammatically unintegrated adverbs of which Yiddish has so many. As Sjœstedt points out (521, 100), "such little words . . . are the forerunners of the invasion of a vocabulary by a foreign one"; but after the language shift has taken place, such words of the receding language "are often the last ones to survive and to attest the existence of the extinct language."
[22] The confirmation of this hypothesis would be fully in keeping with the decisive role assigned to grammatical criteria, as the most conservative, in establishing genetic relationships among languages; cf. Meillet (350), I, 84.
[23] Students of acculturation face a similar problem—almost equally unexplored—of rating culture elements according to their transferability. "It seems," says Linton in a tentative remark (312, 485), "that, other things [e.g. prestige associations] being equal, certain sorts of culture elements are more easily transferable than others. Tangible objects such as tools, utensils, or ornaments are taken over with great ease, in fact they are usually the first things transferred in contact situations. . . . The transfer of elements which lack the concreteness and ready observability of objects is the most difficult of all. . . . In general, the more abstract the element, the more difficult the transfer."

In the future it may be feasible to formulate a theory of transferability as a function of structure comprehensive enough to cover both linguistic items and extralinguistic elements of culture.

have been made of the form classes contained in lists of loanwords. In a count of this type, Haugen (203, 224) computed the proportion of each part of speech in several lists of English loanwords in Amer. Norwegian and Amer. Swedish. The result was in conflict even with Haugen's own concept of transferability; in one list, there were 75% nouns but only 1.4% interjections (though the latter would be expected to be at least as transferable as nouns in view of their structural independence). Perhaps the statistical procedure could be refined a bit. In the first place, the text frequency of the classes of loanwords would have to be determined. Interjections, for instance, might be only one in a hundred different loanwords, but might be twenty or thirty of every hundred loanwords as they occur in speech. In the second place, the ratio of form classes among the loanwords should be compared with the ratio of these classes in the total vocabulary of the recipient and source languages (in terms of both text occurence and dictionary listings). It might turn out then that, say, only one out of thirty occurring nouns is a loanword, but as many as one out of every three interjections is transferred.

If one could somehow measure the frequency of particular words in the speech of various members of a language community, it might be possible to show the diminishing frequency of certain transferred forms as one moves from the highly bilingual speakers—the agents of the transfer—to the more unilingual bulk of the group.[24] It might be feasible to prove or disprove then what so far has had to be asserted only hypothetically—that the reception of transferred forms, especially by unilinguals, is subject to a selective resistance inherent in the recipient grammar.

It has been suggested, for example, that the inflected[25] verb systems of the Indo-European and Semitic languages are recalcitrant at the introduction of new stems, while their noun classes are more open. Indeed, a language like Hebrew cannot use a verb of more than four stem consonants;[26] but other languages, whose stems are also inflected but not limited in length, have means to handle new additions. When it comes to mobilizing verbs, *-ieren* can be suffixed to a new stem in German, *-irovat'* in Russian, *-adzi* in modern Greek,[27] *-i* or *-ari* in Amer. Sicilian;[28] Yiddish has a special periphrastic conjugation for the use of

most verbs of Hebrew origin (e.g. *mekane zajn, ix bin mekane* 'to envy, I envy' < *mᵉqanê⁷* < *q-n-⁷*); Amer. Portuguese can not only inflect English verb stems directly, but also resorts to periphrasis: *fazer o boda* 'to bother', and even *fazer o find-out*.[29] Similar devices can be named for other morpheme classes in these inflected languages.

Why is it, then, that in the usual lists of loanwords, nouns figure so predominantly? The reason is probably of a lexical-semantic, rather than a grammatical and structural nature. In the languages in which borrowing has been studied, and under the type of language and culture contact that has existed, the items for which new designations were needed (cf. §2.44) have been, to an overwhelming degree, such as are indicated by nouns. Under different structural or cultural contact conditions, the ratio might be different.[30] For example, in the contact of a European language, where many concrete "things" are generally indicated by nouns, with a language in which verbs fulfill some of the same functions (e.g. Nootka), the ratio of nouns among the loanwords would probably be lower than usual. Further, in a cultural setting where the emphasis in borrowing is on things spiritual and abstract, loanwords other than nouns may again occupy a larger place, even in a European language. In this way one may account, for example, for the relatively large proportion of such classes as verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions among the loanwords from Hebrew into Yiddish (although here, too, nouns predominate).

In themselves, the existence of an inflection or the restrictions on the phonemic make-up of stems (e.g. their length) are hardly an obstacle to borrowing. Where there are inflections, there are usually also base-extending affixes to adapt new stems; where the stem must have a prescribed phonemic form, it can be forced into that form (see §2.37). Some morpheme classes of a language (like inflectional endings or pronouns) do indeed seem less hospitable to newcomers than others, but only insofar as those classes are more self-sufficient in the face of cultural innovation, at least of a concrete, material kind.

2.33 Interference in Grammatical Relations

The sentence *he comes tomorrow home* was cited on p. 30 as an example of the application of a grammatical relation of word order from one language (German) to morphemes of another (English). Such interference in the domain of grammatical relations is extremely common in the speech of bilinguals.

Interference of relations can be of several types. (1) The replica of the relation of another language explicitly conveys an unintended meaning. Example: A German speaker says in English *this woman loves the man* on the model of German *diese Frau liebt der Mann*, intending to communicate the message 'the man loves this woman', but producing the opposite effect. (2) The replica of the relation of another language violates an existing relation pattern, producing

---

[24] In Switzerland, it has been proposed to study this aspect of language contact in a spatial projection. Jaberg (238, 55ff.), commenting on Tappolet's collection of Schwyzertütsch loanwords in Swiss French patois (563), showed that if the occurrence of loanwords were indicated by dots on a map, the contact areas on the language border would be darkest. Cf. also Steiner (546, 31) on the "density of borrowing" of French words in Schwyzertütsch. Unfortunately this line of research was never pursued, and no information on form classes has been produced.

[25] I.e. those utilizing highly bound morphemes with many alternants in their paradigms, and not excluding inflectional changes in stems.

[26] Even so, *t-l-g-r-f* 'to telegraph' does function as a five-consonant verb; cf. Weiman (615), 66.

[27] Graur (174).

[28] Menarini (353), 156f. Unless otherwise indicated, examples of interference cited from Amer. Italian, Amer. German, Amer. Norwegian, Amer. Yiddish, and other immigrant languages belong to substandard usage and are not admitted to the cultivated forms of these languages even in the United States.

[29] Pap (395), 100, 105. In Amer. Lithuanian, according to Senn (514, 47ff.), English adjectives are most difficult to accept; verbs are easiest. Nevertheless, adjectives, too, are transferred: *dòrtinas < dirty, jòniškas < funny*.

[30] Here, Vogt's recommendation that other than Indo-European languages be examined (599, 38) is fully to the point (cf. p. 33, footnote 12).

nonsense or a statement which is understandable by implication. Example: A German speaker says in English *yesterday came he* on the model of German *gestern kam er*, meaning 'he came yesterday'. A third type, which constitutes interference only theoretically, consists in the unnecessary imposition of a relation to a language where no obligatory relations exist in the equivalent domain. For example, if a native English speaker were to maintain the English-type word order of SUBJECT + VERB + OBJECT in his Russian speech, this would be superfluously monotonous, but would not violate Russian grammar.[31]

All types of interference can affect every type of relation: order, modulation, agreement and dependence.

a. ORDER. Examples of interference in word order are plentiful. Swiss bilingual children have been recorded saying, in Romansh, /ˈɪɲa ˈkotʃna tʃaˈpɛtʃa/, instead of /ˈɪɲa tʃaˈpɛtʃa ˈkotʃna/ 'a red hat', on the model of the Schwyzertütsch order pattern ARTICLE + ADJECTIVE + NOUN; also, /ɛl a la tʃaˈpɛtʃa aɲ/ for /ɛl a aɲ la tʃaˈpɛtʃa/ 'he has his hat on', on the Schwyzertütsch pattern in which adverbal complements come last in the main clause. In idiomatic Yaqui, words like *betčiʔibo* 'for' generally follow the noun: *ʔin-áčai betčiʔibo* 'my-father for', i.e. 'for my father'; but on the pattern of Spanish PREpositions, the word order is being shifted to make the relational word precede the noun: *bétčiʔibo ʔin-áčai*.[32] In Amer. Portuguese, nouns are compounded in an Anglicized order: *Português Recreativo Club* for *Club Recreativo Português*.[33]

b. MODULATIONS. The systematic description of modulation patterns available in a language is still in its infancy; it is too early, therefore, to expect exact statements of the impact of one language on another in this domain.[34] Let two examples suffice.

(1) Yiddish has an intonation pattern which designates a yes-or-no question with an expected negative reply. It consists in a rise, as if for a normal yes-or-no question, which turns into a fall after the high pitch level is reached.[35] Thus, *du vilst smétene* (with final contour ‾–_) 'you want sour cream' is distinguished from the same sentence with final contour _–‾ ('do you want sour cream?') and from the same sentence with the final contour ‾‾\ ('you don't want sour cream, do you?'). Some native speakers of Yiddish may be heard to apply this special contour to sentences in other languages, e.g. *you're going home* (‾‾\), intended to mean: 'you aren't going home, are you?'.

(2) The rules of Yiddish noun compounding require a distinctly stronger stress on the first element: /ˈkix-meser/ 'kitchen knife', /ˈbixer-ˌojsʃtelung/

---

[31] While comparisons between phonemic and grammatical processes have their dangers, it may be safe to point out the parallelism of the first type of interference of grammatical relations with phonemic under-differentiation, the second type with phone subsitution, and the third type with phonemic over-differentiation.

[32] Johnson (**252**).

[33] Pap (**395**), 85.

[34] Dreher's study (**129**) deals with a related problem but does not fit into the framework of the present discussion.

[35] In the notation of Trager and Smith (**577**), this would correspond approximately to [. . .² ⁺ ‾] or /. . .² ‖ ⫲/.

'book exhibition'. Under English influence, this relation is sometimes neglected in Amer. Yiddish; one hears forms like /ˌarbeter-ˈring/ 'Workmen's Circle' (properly /ˈarbeter-ˌring/), /ˈperets-ˈmitlʃul/ 'Peretz High School' (properly /ˈperets-ˌmitlʃul/), and the like.

c. AGREEMENT AND DEPENDENCE. Interference among relations of this type is easily observed. Bilingual children in Switzerland say, in Romansh, /la tʃa-ˈpetʃa ɛ ˈkotʃan/ 'the hat is red', failing to select for the predicate adjective the same gender (feminine) as for the subject (i.e. /. . ɛ ˈkotʃna/), on the model of neighboring Schwyzertütsch, where the pattern of agreement does not exist. The Italian model leads Slovenian bilinguals to neglect the selection of the accusative in the direct object in Slovene.[36] Chuvash speakers fail to make the past-tense verb in Russian agree in gender with the subject, on the Chuvash model: *syn ne pila čaj* for *. . . ne pil . . .* 'the son did not drink tea'.[37] On the other hand, a possessive relationship is sometimes superfluously distinguished in Amer. Yiddish on the English model: *er šnajtst zajn noz* 'he blows his nose' for the more idiomatic *er šnajtst di noz* '. . . the nose'.

Examples of all kinds could be cited without limit, for the misapplication and neglect of grammatical relations is well attested. This type of interference is so very common probably because grammatical relations, not being segments of utterances, are least noticed by naïve speakers.[38] If the available evidence contains mostly cases of the type where the intended meaning is understandable at least by implication (cf. p. 37), it is clearly because the pressure against relational interference resulting in unintended meanings is considerably stronger.

Interference may also affect functions performed in one language by morphemes but rendered in another by grammatical relations. For example, the function of the German morpheme *dieser*, as distinct from *die*, is often performed in Yiddish by stress: *af der ˈgas* = *auf der Strasse* 'in the street'; *af ˈder ˌgas* = *auf dieser Strasse* 'in this street'. This difference leads German-Yiddish bilinguals either to transfer the German morpheme or to utilize—often superfluously—Yiddish patterns of emphasis by morphemes: *af ot der gas, af der dóziker gas*, etc.

2.34 Replica Functions for Equivalent Morphemes

If the bilingual identifies a morpheme or grammatical category of language *A* with one in language *B*, he may apply the *B* form in grammatical functions which he derives from the system of *A*.

What leads the bilingual to establish the interlingual equivalence of the morphemes or categories is either their FORMAL SIMILARITY or a SIMILARITY IN PREËXISTING FUNCTIONS. Formal similarity enables Amer. Yiddish speakers to

---

[36] Vendryes (**594**), 341. Actually, a pattern of order is substituted for the requirement of the accusative in the direct object.

[37] Seliščev (**509**). Many similar instances of interference of Estonian and Chuvash with Russian are cited by Raun (**427**), 9f.

[38] Language teachers instructing relatively young children feel it necessary to make their pupils aware of the subtle relations of their native grammar before exposing them to the new system; cf. Nikol'skij's experiences (**386**) in teaching Russian to Tatar children.

identify *op* 'off, down' with English *up*, leading to such innovations as *op-rufn* (after *to call up*). The Hungarian deverbal adjectives in *-andó/-endö* have been given gerundival functions by identification, on formal grounds, with Latin *-andus/-endus*.[39]

Similarity in function, on the other hand, causes Uzbeks to equate the Russian construction *iz* + genitive with their native partitive and to use it even where idiomatic Russian requires other prepositions (*ot*, *u*, etc.).[40] On the same basis— through a process identical with loan translation in the lexical domain (cf. §2.41) —the Balkan languages have each developed a set of two specialized conjunctions to introduce complementary clauses, one (e.g. Rumanian *ca*) after 'to say, to think, to believe', the other (e.g. Rumanian *să*) after 'to want, to demand', etc., all corresponding to the Middle Greek distinction between ὅτι and νά.[41] In Hungarian, the conjunction *akár* 'or' has been identified with Slavic equivalents (e.g. Serbocroatian *volja*), yielding, on that model, an extended construction *akár . . . akár* 'either . . . or' (Serbocroatian *volja . . . volja*).[42] The Finnish form *epä*, originally the present participle of the verb of negation, has been mobilized in compounds as a prefix meaning 'non-', after the fashion of Swedish *om-*, *on-*.[43] In many European languages, a full system of adverbal complements has been reproduced from another language: Romansh after German,[44] Welsh after English,[45] Hungarian (to some extent) after German,[46] Yiddish after Slavic.[47] In Yiddish, for example, the adverbal complements of Germanic origin *far-*, *tse-*, *on*, *der-* have aspective functions closely resembling Polish *za-*, *roz-*, *na-*, *do-*, respectively.[48] Sometimes entire grammatical categories of two languages are identified because of a partial similarity in function. For example, Amer. German speakers, identifying the English with the German present tense, may say *how long are you here?* for *how long have you been here?*. In Silesia, the identification of the third person plural of the local Polish dialect ("Wasserpolnisch") with the equivalent category in German has led to the unexpected use, completely unknown in Polish, of the third person plural for polite address (e.g. *dokąd idą? = wohin gehen Sie?*).[49]

Taking its cue from the speech of bilinguals, a language community can, by systematically extending the functions of morphemes in its language, not only change the use of individual forms, but also develop a full new paradigm of ob-

[39] Sauvageot (474). On identification by form in lexical interference, see below, pp. 48, 50f.
[40] Xajrulla (654).
[41] Sandfeld (468).
[42] Simonyi (519).
[43] Sauvageot (474), 498.
[44] Jaberg (236; 238, 287f.).
[45] E.g. Vendryes (594), 343.
[46] Sauvageot (474), 498.
[47] Landau (294).
[48] Cf. Yiddish *šrajbn* with Polish *pisać* 'to write (*imperfective*)' and *on-šrajbn* with *na-pisać* 'to write (*perfective*)'.
[49] Müller (380). The same phenomenon occurs in Italian speech influenced by Slovene; cf. Schuchardt (496), 99.

ligatory categories on the model of another language. Such is the origin of grammatical calques like the new Breton perfect with *am euz* based on the French indefinite past with *avoir*;[50] the postposited definite article in Rumanian, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Modern Greek;[51] the disappearance of the infinitive and the differentiation between two conjunctions in the Balkan languages under Middle Greek influence;[52] the differentiation between the purely grammatical copula and the verb 'to be' in Tigre and Tigrinya on the pattern of Cushitic languages in Ethiopia;[53] the future tense in Romansh and Schwyzertütsch formed with /vɛɲ/ and /kʰun/ ('come'), respectively, as auxiliaries;[54] the passive voice in Estonian, Sorbian,[55] and Slovene[56] based on German; the partial aspective system of Yiddish based on Slavic;[57] the partial aspective system in Irish based on English.[58] In Silesia, the German verbal construction *haben* + past participle has been reproduced in Polish to function as a past tense: *ja to mam sprzedane* 'I have sold it', after *ich habe es verkauft*[59]—much like the new preterite in late Latin, *habeō scriptum*, which is said to be a replica of the Greek γεγραμμένον ἔχω,[60] or like the new Hungarian pluperfect formed with *volt* 'to have' following the past form of the verb, on the pattern of the German pluperfect;[61] and so on and on.

Significantly, in the interference of two grammatical patterns it is ordinarily the one which uses relatively free and invariant morphemes in its paradigm— one might say, the more explicit pattern—which serves as the model for imitation.[62] This seems to be true not only in the creation of new categories, as in the above examples, but also in those changes due to language contact where a new set of formants is developed to fulfill a preëxisting grammatical function. Estonian, for example, has developed a system for denoting possession by the genitive of the personal pronoun (a free form), in the German fashion, to replace the personal suffix (bound form), a pattern which still survives in Finnish. It thus has *minu kodu*, *sinu kodu* 'my house, your house' where Finnish (and

[50] Hardie (194), 103.
[51] Sandfeld (467), 165–73; despite overall similarities, the functions of the article do differ in the four languages; cf. Michov (360). Caution against simplifications is also urged by Iorga (233).
[52] Sandfeld (468); cf. p. 40 above.
[53] Leslau (306), 72.
[54] Szadrowsky (561), 9.
[55] Sandfeld (466), 60. While Estonian uses an equivalent auxiliary, Sorbian has transferred the German *werden* bodily.
[56] Vendryes (594), 343.
[57] On the aspective system of Yiddish, see Schächter (481, 482) and Weinreich (625).
[58] Sjœstedt (521), 112ff.
[59] Vendryes (594), 343.
[60] Bonfante (68), 304.
[61] Sauvageot (474), 498.
[62] A case in which the expression of a category was made more explicit by the TRANSFER of a morpheme was described on p. 34. Incidentally, the psychological reasons for which the more explicit, the more consciously experienced pattern is easier to imitate should not be difficult to formulate. Note that the transfer of morphemes also seems to be favored by relatively greater (i.e. more explicit) phonemic bulk; cf. p. 33.

presumably older Estonian) has *koti-ni, koti-si*.[63] Similarly, in Amharic there has developed, beside the possessive-suffix pattern *bet-kä* 'your house', a more explicit pronoun construction (*yaantä bet < yä-antä bet* 'of-you house') after the Cushitic pattern.[64] In much the same way, the possessive suffixes are falling into disuse in colloquial Israeli Hebrew (*bet-xa* 'house-your' is much less common than *ha-bait šel-xa* 'the-house of-you') under the pressure of the more explicit pattern of Yiddish and other European mother-tongues of so many Israelis.[65] Language contact can result in such far reaching changes that the affected language assumes a different structural type.[66]

The reverse type of influence—the change of a grammatical system toward a less explicit form—is generally recognized to be quite rare,[67] but some instances have nevertheless been attested. Thus, in the dialect of Tadzhik spoken in the north of the Tadzhik S.S.R. (around Khodzhent and Samarkand), where the contact with Uzbek is particularly strong, the Tadzhik conjugation has been evolving from an isolating toward a more agglutinative form, with the auxiliary verbs becoming affixes, i.e. growing more bound, on the Uzbek model. In standard Tadzhik, for example, there is a present progressive form of the type *man xurda istoda-am* 'I eating am-I', i.e. 'I am eating'. In the Uzbek-influenced dialect, a new pattern has been developing: *man xur(d)-sod-am*, where the auxiliary *istoda-* has been reduced to a suffix of the main verb (*>-sod-*), the personal ending now being added to the main verb. The Uzbek prototype is *kel-vat-man* 'coming-am-I', where the suffix *-vat-*, indicating the progressive aspect, has, incidentally, also evolved from a free auxiliary verb. Many other Tadzhik verbal forms have developed likewise.[68] In Serbocroatian, a productive pattern of forming absolute superlatives by means of bound morphemes has developed as a replica of the Turkish model (*beli* 'truly'—*bezbeli* 'quite truly'); for example, *go* 'nude'—*gozgo* 'quite naked'; *ravno* 'even'—*ravravno* 'entirely horizontal', etc.[69] But despite the unusual trend toward more strongly bound forms demonstrated in the above cases, the model patterns have nevertheless been explicit enough. The formant morphemes in the model were easily recognizable, the occurrence of alternants was regular.

2.35 Abandonment of Obligatory Distinctions

Finally the type of grammatical interference resulting in the disappearance of grammatical categories should be referred to. One need only think of a foreign-language classroom where English-speaking students fail to distinguish cases, genders, or aspects in a foreign language. In situations of natural language contact, the same process occurs. In Gurage (Southern Ethiopia), for example, the

[63] Sauvageot (474), 498.
[64] Leslau (306), 71.
[65] Weiman (615), 7.
[66] Belić (38), 304. The partial "Indo-Europeanization" of modern Hebrew, a secondary language for many European bilinguals, could probably be demonstrated; cf. Weiman (615), *passim*; Larish (295); Rubin (457).
[67] E.g. by Vogt (599), 39.
[68] Stavrulli (543), 40f.
[69] Skok (522).

gender of adjectives, under the influence of Sidamo, is no longer expressed consistently;[70] that is, as a result of language contact the expression of the category has become less obligatory in the sense defined on p. 30. Similarly, German speakers in Texas, under the influence of English, neglect the distinction between dative and accusative in certain constructions.[71] In Yaqui verbs, the obligatory indication of incorporated direct object, transitiveness (with regard to an indirect object), and person is being eliminated under the impact of Spanish; the pattern *ʔinepo ʔenči-ʔa-mák-ria-ne* 'I you-it-give-*trans.*-I' is replaced by the rudimentary *ʔinepo ʔen-máka* 'I you-give', i.e. 'I give (it to) you'.[72] In Udi, a North Caucasian language, the ergative construction has given way to a nominative under Armenian and Tatar influence.[73] But while the violation of such highly obligatory categories is quite conspicuous, astute observation reveals the desuetude of more optional types as well. In Ireland, for example, "there is no doubt that a speaker who knows some English often tends to prefer the Irish construction which least shocks the English language habits [i.e. the grammatical system serving as a model], unless he is reacting consciously, in which case the reverse effect will be produced. . . . Even where the details of the process escape observation, the total result is considerable, as shown by the growing banalization of Irish in areas where it is spoken concurrently with English."[74]

In the highly hybridized makeshift trade languages, most obligatory categories expressed by bound morphemes are well known to be abandoned.[75] These tongues have by and large been formed from structurally very different languages; the failure to perceive non-explicit grammatical categories has therefore been widespread on both sides. Also, considering that trade tongues begin with a very sketchy learning of both second languages, and that only the bare essentials of existence are given expression in the hybrid form, the necessity for observing grammatical distinctions is so reduced that free and non-obligatory forms suffice as means of expressing them.

2.36 Role of Extra-Structural Factors

It follows from the preceding discussion that a simple statement of the form "Morphologies can(not) be mixed" is premature at the present state of our knowledge. The transfer of a full grammatical paradigm, with its formant mor-

[70] Leslau (306), 69.
[71] Eikel (133), 279.
[72] Johnson (252).
[73] Dirr (122), 306.
[74] Sjœstedt (521), 121. Cf. also Heberle (207), 31.
[75] Cf. Broch's description of Russenorsk (81). On the other hand, the more stable Creole languages have developed articulate grammatical systems, including obligatory categories, based on free forms; cf. Taylor's analysis of the Caribbean Creole conjugation (565, 84), in which *mwĕ tan* 'I hear', *mwĕ te tan* 'I heard', *mwĕ ke tan* 'I will hear', etc., represent a perfect tense paradigm. Silesian bilingual Poles who, according to Hoffman (223, 276), say in German *ich bekommen täglich 3 Mark Lohn* 'I receive 3 marks a day in wages', seem to depend on the free and explicit pronoun *ich* to denote the first person, not troubling with the proper inflection of the verb itself (which should, of course, be *bekomme*). Hjelmslev has shown (221) that Creole languages have a theoretical optimum, rather than a minimum, of grammar.

phemes, from one language into another has apparently never been recorded. But the transfer of individual morphemes of all types is definitely possible under certain favorable structural conditions, such as a preëxisting similarity in patterns or the relatively unbound and invariant form of the morpheme. Furthermore, obligatory categories have become optional or abandoned and replica patterns established on the model of another language, again favored by such factors as relative explicitness of the model categories.

And yet, not every conjuncture of favorable structural conditions results in permanent grammatical interference of the type one might predict. Clearly, fewer phenomena of interference are incorporated in the language as a code than occur in the speech of bilinguals. There is a selection of phenomena, and a complex resistance to interference. The conventional evidence does not enable us to analyze the components of such resistance—purely structural considerations (incompatibility of new forms with existing ones), psychological reasons (e.g. unwillingness to adopt for ordinary usage material transferred in affective speech), and socio-cultural factors (favorable or unfavorable prestige associations of the transferred or reproduced forms, etc.).

For an analysis that can do justice to the complexity of linguistic facts, the data must be obtained, first and foremost, from the flowing speech of bilinguals in the natural setting of language contact; the usual sort of evidence, taken from relatively well established languages, cannot be a substitute.[76]

2.37 Grammatical Integration of Transferred Words

A word which has been transferred from one language into another is itself subject to the interference of the grammatical, as well as the phonic, system of the recipient language, especially at the hands of its unilingual speakers. As in the case of phonic treatment (cf. §2.25), a scale of effects ranging from complete non-adaptation to full grammatical integration of a word can be formulated.

By far the most usual procedure is the grammatical adaptation of loanwords.[77] Amer. Polish, receiving *bootlegger* from English, declines it: *jeden z butlegerów*, 'one of the bootleggers', and forms new words on native derivation patterns: *rokińczer-ować* 'to rock in a rocking chair'.[78] Amer. Greek adds inflectional endings: *bossis* 'boss', *bommis* 'bum', *grihonnis* 'greenhorn', and also forms new derivatives: *sain-atiko* '(shoe) shine parlor'.[79] Amer. Lithuanian classifies nouns: *týčeris* 'teacher', *drèsè* 'dress', *grýnorius* 'greenhorn'.[80] Amer. Yiddish conjugates: *badern* 'to bother', *er hot gebadert* 'he bothered', and derives: *holdópnik* 'gangster who performs a holdup', *olrájtnik* (<*allright*) 'self-satisfied parvenu'. Some of these American innovations have even found their way into the corresponding languages of the Old World.

---

[76] Little has been done in grammar that would correspond, for example, to studies of foreign "accents" in the phonic domain.

[77] Bloomfield (55), 453ff.; see also Migliorini's study (361) of the problem.

[78] Doroszewski (125).

[79] Lontos (323).

[80] Senn (514), 50.

Particularly interesting is the grammatical integration of loanwords where several classes are potentially open for them in the recipient language. Thus, English verbs borrowed into Amer. Portuguese are, if they are conjugated at all, generally placed in the first conjugation (*chinjar* 'to change', *jampar* 'to jump', etc.); only rarely do they join the *-ear* class (*faitear* 'to fight').[81]

In the assignment of borrowed nouns to grammatical genders, various criteria are at play. Generally, it appears, nouns denoting animate beings receive genders according to their sex; thus, *a norsa* (<*nurse*) in Amer. Portuguese, *di noj(r)s* in Amer. Yiddish are feminine, *o boquipa* (<*bookkeeper*) and *der bukkiper* are masculine in each language.[82] With inanimate nouns, the form of the word may be paramount: *cracker*, becoming *craca* in Amer. Portuguese, is feminine by virtue of its *-a* and *krèkė* in Amer. Lithuanian is feminine for its *-ė*;[83] in Amer. Yiddish, the ending of *kreker* classifies it as masculine. Some nouns seem to bequeath their gender to the loanwords by which they are replaced: in Pennsylvania German, *bailer* 'boiler' is masculine because it replaced *kesel* (*m.*), while *pigder* 'picture' is neuter because it replaced *bild* (*n.*). The word *sing* has split: it is *der sing* in the sense of 'kitchen sink' (substituting for *der waseršang*), but *di· sing* in the sense of 'laundry sink' (for *di· wešbang*).[84] In Amer. Norwegian, *inč* is masculine because it replaces *tomme*, while *jågg* 'yoke' is explained to be feminine because of *krukka*.[85] In other cases, however, the basis of classification must be assumed to be the greater productiveness of one of the genders in the recipient language: masculine in Amer. Norwegian,[86] Amer. Lithuanian,[87] and Amer. Portuguese;[88] feminine in Amer. German[89] and, to a lesser extent, in Amer. Yiddish[90] (e.g. *train* > Amer. Port. *o treno*, Amer. Yiddish *di trejn*). In still others, the classification is unexplained; why, for example, does Amer. Italian have *lo storo*<*store*, but *la yarda*<*yard*?[91] It would be most desirable to have a comparative study of the reactions of all American immigrant languages to English loanwords in the way of gender and other categories;[92] the fact that the source of the loanwords is the same—a common denominator in the comparison—would bring to the fore the structural criteria which are at play in the grammatical integration of loanwords.

---

[81] Pap (395), 100. Why some verbs do join the *-ear* conjugation is not made clear.

[82] In Amer. Yiddish, a 'lady bookkeeper' would be *bukkiperke*. The source for the Portuguese examples is Pap (395), 100–4.

[83] Senn (514), 50.

[84] Reed (436).

[85] Flom (152).

[86] *Ibid.*, 28, 31.

[87] Senn (514), 48ff.

[88] Pap (395), 102.

[89] Aron (5).

[90] Neumann (383), 418.

[91] Vaughan (591). As Pap (395, 104) and Neumann (383, 417) point out, the borrowed vocabulary is still in a "transitional" stage and there is a considerable amount of fluctuation in the assignment of genders. The problem is also discussed by Møller (374), 45ff.

[92] Pennsylvania German, for example, uses not only the plural in *-e*, but also vowel alternation: *di· gaund* 'ladies' dress' (< *gown*), plural: *di· gaind*; cf. Reed (435). Similarly, in Amer. Yiddish: *der šap* 'workshop', plural: *di šeper*.

In all the cited examples, the transferred word was, for better or for worse, integrated with the recipient grammar. Under certain circumstances, bilingual speakers display an indifference as to the grammatical treatment of transferred material. Entire sentences may even be transferred in unanalyzed form, as in Amer. Italian *azzoraiti* 'that's all right', *variuvanni* 'what do you want', *goraelli* 'go to hell'.[93] The special speech situation necessary for such grammatical indifference is discussed in §3.43.

In still other circumstances, a conscious effort is made to retain the morphology of the source language for transferred words, as in the use of the Latin-type plurals *minim-a*, *foc-i*, *formula-e* instead of the English-type *minimums*, *focuses*, *formulas*; the use of the Russian-type plural in *Bolsheviki* in a variety of English; the declension of Latin loanwords in an antiquated, learned type of German (*unter den Verbis* 'among the verbs'), etc.[94] In all these instances, a desire to display the learning associated with the knowledge of the source language, or the prestige of the source language itself, underlies the practice. An important cultural factor is manifested here.

Thus, a choice is often made by the speaker between integrating and not integrating the transferred words—a choice which seems even more clearcut in the matter of grammar than in sounds (cf. §2.25). The choice itself would appear to depend not on the structures of the languages in contact, but rather on individual psychological and socio-cultural factors prevailing in the contact situation. These must be analyzed independently (see chaps. 3, 4).

[93] Menarini (353).

[94] Even the indeclinability of loanwords like those in *-o*, *-um* in standard Polish (e.g.: *radio*: *bez radio* 'without a radio', but *okno*: *bez okna* 'without a window') reflect an unwillingness to tamper with a foreign morpheme.

2.4 Lexical Interference

2.41 Mechanisms of Lexical Interference

The ways in which one vocabulary can interfere with another are various. Given two languages, A and B, morphemes may be transferred from A into B, or B morphemes may be used in new designative functions on the model of A-morphemes with whose content they are identified;[1] finally, in the case of compound lexical elements, both processes may be combined.

a. SIMPLE WORDS.

(1) In the case of simple (non-compound) lexical elements, the most common type of interference is the outright transfer of the phonemic sequence from one language to another. Examples of such loanwords are available from practically every language described.

"Simple" in this connection must be defined from the point of view of the bilinguals who perform the transfer, rather than that of the descriptive linguist. Accordingly, the category of "simple" words also includes compounds that are transferred in unanalyzed form. Many interjections belong in this class, e.g. Penna. German *holišmok* < *holy smoke(s)!*,[2] as well as whole interjectional sentences of the type of American Italian *azzoraiti* 'that's all right', *vazzumara* 'what's the matter?'.[3] There are also the nominalized interjections, like Acadian French *faire la didouce à* 'to say hello to' (<*how do you do*)[4] or *le donquia* 'carefree person' (<*don't care*),[5] and words of other classes: Amer. Italian *siriollo* 'city hall', *sanemagogna* 'son of a gun',[6] Amer. Norwegian *blakkvalnot* 'black walnut',[7] Amer. Portuguese *o fòdejulai(a)* 'Fourth of July',[8] Volga German *saditsen* 'to sit down' (<Russian *sadít'-sja*),[9] and so on and on. Italian *pizza* 'large, hot, open cheese pie (with various salty fillings)', which has been adopted in Amer. English and "reinforced" into *pizza pie*, has even been retransferred as an unanalyzed compound into Amer. Italian: *la pizza-paia*.[10]

[1] The parallelism with the formulation of grammatical interference (cf. §2.31, p. 30) is evident. Equivalence of designative function here corresponds to identity of grammatical function in the previous chapter. The separation of the grammatical and lexical aspects of interference presupposes, of course, that many morphemes do have a designative function distinct from their purely grammatical function. The author regrets that to those formalistically inclined readers who cannot conceive of linguistic meaning other than distribution and of linguistic semantics beyond context analysis, the material in this chapter will appear either repetitious or linguistically irrelevant.

[2] Werner (634).

[3] Menarini (353), 159.

[4] Poirier (411), 281.

[5] Smith and Phillips (527).

[6] Menarini (353), 159. 175ff.

[7] Haugen (203), 219.

[8] Pap (395), 98.

[9] Braun (77).

[10] Menarini (353), 163.