

Geissler (163, 24ff.) distinguishes between orderly (*geordnet*) bilingualism, in which each language is assigned to its sphere of persons, and disorderly (*ungeordnet*) bilingualism, in which specialization is blurred. This, in turn, can pass into contrary (*entgegengesetzt*) bilingualism, in which the domains are not separated.⁴⁵ Michel (359) designates the two kinds of bilingualism as *in sensu distincto* and *in sensu composito*. Barker (20, 201) speaks of the "systematic patterning" of some bilinguals' language usage; the converse would be "unpatterned" usage.

These generalizations may prove of value in correlating "inorganic," "disorderly," "unpatterned" bilingualism with greater and lesser, or different types of, interference; the problem, however, stands.

3.43 Emotional Stress

The relation of the amount or type of interference with varying degrees of emotional stress under which the speaker acts is a psycholinguistic problem of some complexity and can only be mentioned here. The existence of the relation is suggested by the relatively frequent transfer of so-called "affective" grammatical categories and words;⁴⁶ even though satisfactory frequency tabulations are not yet available, it is significant that in many lists of loanwords, after the transfer of all possible items has been accounted for by reasons of structure, cultural innovation, and the like, a residue of words remains which is termed "affective borrowing."⁴⁷ Here, too, is an important task for interdisciplinary investigation.

⁴⁵ Cf. p. 35, footnote 21.

⁴⁶ Cf. p. 34.

⁴⁷ Out of many possible examples, Łukasik's analysis of Polish-Rumanian borrowing (327) and Scheludko's study of Rumanian loanwords in Ukrainian (483) may be cited. Both reveal, besides the alpine-pastoral "culture" designations, practically only "affective" words.

4 The Socio-Cultural Setting of Language Contact

4.1 The Role of the Socio-Cultural Setting

The bilinguality of some individuals is, no doubt, a socially isolated phenomenon. A lone missionary with an African tribe or an accidental Basque immigrant in an American town form practically unique points of language contact. Any of their language-usage habits which are of interest to students of interference must be described separately for each case. But when a group of some size brings two languages into contact, idiosyncrasies in linguistic behavior tend to cancel each other, while socially determined speech habits and processes characteristic of the group as a whole become significant. To delineate such patterns of language usage as characterize large groups—not to erect a futile dichotomy between individual and group—is the purpose of the present chapter.

It is clear that of the factors which make a language dominant for a bilingual (see §3.3), the usefulness of a language, its role in social advance, and its literary-cultural value are given to the individual by his surroundings; the relative status of the languages is therefore likely to be the same for most bilinguals in an undifferentiated environment. But even the order in which, and the age at which, the languages are learned, the extent of written usage, the relative proficiency, and the emotional involvement with the languages are frequently laid down for the language users by their society. Furthermore, the environment may make certain types of speech situation more prevalent than others. Thus, American immigrants, in their specific conditions of life, have occasion to speak a great deal with bilingual interlocutors; this cannot be without consequences for interference in their speech (cf. §3.41). One may go a step further and say that a person's predisposition to submit to or resist interference also has an environmental determinant, even if proneness to excessive "switching" is an individual personality trait. "A culture, as a preference for certain modes of behavior, involves a preference for certain personality structures rather than others; the kind of person favored in one group may be condemned in another."¹ Switching and speech mixture thus may come to be condemned by a society like any other undesirable trait.²

When a language-contact situation is examined in detail, the interrelation of socio-cultural conditions and linguistic phenomena is apparent. As an illustration, the case of Romansh-German bilingualism in Switzerland can be cited.³

¹ Morris (377), 209. Cf. the preference of certain types of speech behavior in Mohave culture described by Devereux (118), 268.

² Thus, the Mohaves, according to Devereux (118, 270), "show a singular reluctance to speak English unless they speak English well." If excessive switching should be demonstrated to be the result of too early and unspecialized use of two languages (§3.21), the possibility of social causation is all the more far-reaching.

³ Studied by this author in 1949/50 (624, 268-436).

The Raetoroman language community is rapidly approaching a state of total bilinguality. In the present territory of Romansh, which is the remnant of a much larger Romance area subjected to continuous Germanization from two directions for over a millennium, the practical need to know German extends to almost all speakers. Familiarity with the Schwyzertütsch vernacular, in addition to the traditionally taught Standard German, is also on the increase. In one section of this area, the so-called Sutselva (Central Grisons), consisting of the Domleschg and Schams valleys (Romansh: Tumleastga, Schons), the exposure of the Romansh-language population to contact with German is particularly intense. Even within the family—as a result both of intermarriage and of the progressing language shift—the functions of German and Romansh often overlap. Children of Romansh mother-tongue consequently become bilingual very early. If it is true that children learn languages more easily and correctly than adults (cf. §3.33), a degree of purity of speech may be expected among the Raetoromans which cannot be sought, say, in an adult immigrant group coming to a new country and picking up the new language rapidly but poorly.

There are no clearcut language borders or mutually exclusive language territories in this contact situation. The Raetoromans in particular realize that they have no solidly unilingual hinterland and no city to serve as a cultural center.

As a result of the functional overlapping of the languages in everyday usage, many children learn both languages from the same persons, namely, their parents. It has been alleged that this fact in itself inhibits satisfactory language learning (cf. §3.22). What is certain is that if the parents are their children's teachers of both languages, then their own errors in both languages are transmitted to the next generation. This is in marked contrast, for example, to certain situations of French-German contact in western Switzerland, where bilingualism is also widespread but children as a rule learn each language from native, if not unilingual, speakers.

The overlapping of functions of the languages in the Romansh Sutselva leads to the use of both languages between the same interlocutors. This, added to the fact that both languages are learned so early, virtually blurs the distinction between mother-tongue and second language.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to suppose that in a bilingual community the general level of language cultivation (*Sprachkultur*), which is independent of the extent of bilingualism, accounts for the predominant types of speakers in the population. Since this is largely a peasant population with little schooling and a loose social hierarchy, one is led to expect that the type of bilingual who mixes both languages indiscriminately will be relatively frequent.

The population of the Sutselva is undergoing a language shift in favor of German. This fact of prime importance is deducible not only from the comparison of the data of the decennial censuses, but also from a synchronic analysis of figures regarding knowledge of each language among various age groups. It is a corollary of the shift that most bilingual speakers are of Romansh mother-tongue, for it is not often, in the Sutselva at least, that native German speakers learn Romansh subsequently, in opposition to the "trend of the times." There

is thus a core of German unilinguals but practically no Romansh unilinguals in the population. The significance of this would in itself perhaps be ambiguous. On the one hand, the unilingual speakers of German form a nucleus of resistance against interference in German; on the other hand, German rather than Romansh is the second language to many speakers, and since the most natural direction of influence is generally thought to be from the mother-tongue upon the other tongue, the greatest potential influence might be expected from Romansh upon German.

However, the likelihood of this influence is counteracted by the fact that the social control of speech mixture affects the two languages quite unequally. While German elements in Romansh speech are tolerated practically without any limit, the reverse trend—Romansh influence in German speech—is kept within bounds. The knowledge of German is treated as an essential of acculturation, and is a prerequisite to social advance (urbanization); hence, the premium on good German is extremely high. When speaking German, the bilingual must guard himself against Romansh borrowings not only for fear of being misunderstood by the unilingual German speaker, but also because, in the area under discussion, slips may give away his Romansh origin at an inopportune moment or be taken as indices of his incomplete acculturation. In Romansh speech, on the contrary, there are no such regulative socio-cultural factors. Generally, no value is locally attached to purity in Romansh. Moreover, the Romansh listener is bilingual as a matter of certainty and will understand a borrowed German form. Nor is any loss of status possible through admixture of German forms or Romansh replica forms on German models. Thus, while potentially the major amount of influence could occur in German speech, actually, considering the effects of social control, most of the interference must be expected to take place in Romansh speech.

Until the Romansh revival movement of the past decade or two, there was practically no control opposing the habitualization of the results of German interference. The Sutselvan Romansh community is, to a degree, isolated linguistically as well as geographically from the speakers of other Romansh dialects; the cohesive forces within the community are few; no unilingual hinterland supports it or demands from it a "correct," uninfluenced language. If isolated cries for purity are voiced occasionally, they cannot be backed up by tangible cultural or social sanctions. Furthermore, institutional means for perpetuating a conservative language are almost lacking for Romansh. There has been little or no Romansh instruction in the schools of most villages of the area in over a century. The use of Romansh in such prestige-endowing functions as sermons has also been declining, especially in Protestant churches (for various complicated reasons). All instances of interference in speech are therefore candidates for becoming elements of Sutselvan Romansh—provided this dialect continues to be spoken, and unless the endeavors of the Romansh League to establish Romansh schools are successful.

Quite the contrary, of course, is true of German. There is a tendency for borrowings to become habitual, insofar as Romansh bilingual parents are also the German teachers of their children; but this is corrected by the rising volume

of contact with non-Romansh, unilingual German speakers. To be sure, in the spoken form of German, i.e. the Chur dialect of Schwyzertütsch (to define it simply), there is no standardizing tendency and there is room for new borrowings from Romansh. But the unilingual bulk of the speakers of this dialect, bolstered by the urban center of Chur, is an important countervailing factor.

This socio-cultural setting of language contact and its linguistic-effects are radically different from French-German contact in western Switzerland. There it is widely felt that French is a standardized language with zealously guarded norms propagated by the schools. If there is any habitualized interference, it is therefore in the direction of French on Schwyzertütsch.

The likelihood of errors checked by the tolerance of interference in speech among native speakers of Romansh in the area discussed might be summarized as giving the following possibilities of linguistic influence:

	IN ROMANSH SPEECH	IN SCHWYZERTÜTSCH SPEECH
Likelihood of errors.....	small	considerable
	↓ ↓	↓ ↓ ↓ ↓
Tolerance of incidental interference in speech.....	unlimited	small
	↓ ↓	↓
Possibilities of habitualized language influence.....	unlimited	small

The fullest freedom of integration of such borrowing as does occur can be expected in Romansh. In Schwyzertütsch a conflict exists between the inclination to borrow and regulative control of borrowing.

It should be evident even from an informal analysis like the preceding one that socio-cultural factors which can determine personality traits, preferred language habits, and typical speech situations are relevant to the control of interference. To ascertain how the various factors may best be grouped and studied is a formidable sociolinguistic research problem in itself. Programmatic works by German scholars like Kuhn (290) or Pritzwald (422), although prepared with somewhat different applications in mind, contain many useful ideas on this point. The following treatment is necessarily tentative and is designed primarily to stress the variety of factors that need to be considered. First, the functions of languages in a bilingual group are discussed (§4.2); then other group divisions paralleling the language division (§4.3) and the development and operation of language loyalty (§4.4) are taken up. Finally, some problems of the crystallization of new languages in contact situations and of language shifts are dealt with (§§4.6, 4.7).

One important limitation has to be pointed out. To predict typical forms of interference from the sociolinguistic description of a bilingual community and a structural description of its languages is the ultimate goal of interference studies. Unfortunately this aim cannot be attained till the missing link—the correlations between characteristics of individual bilinguals and interference in their speech—is supplied. In the ideal case of the future, the argument may run something like this. We are told that in a certain contact situation there is

much intermarriage between the groups in contact. We infer from this that many children grow up in bilingual families, learning both languages simultaneously. Consequently (and this is the link which so far is only hypothetical) the children can be expected to have difficulties, say, with the grammar of both languages. A direct connection between intermarriage and proneness to grammatical interference—other things being equal—could then be postulated. To supply the missing middle of the argument, the psychological factors in interference, which were outlined in chap. 3, must be explored. But one can anticipate some of the aspects of the socio-cultural setting of language contact which are likely to be pinned down eventually as the ultimate extra-linguistic stimuli and resistance factors of interference.

4.2 Language Functions in Bilingual Groups

4.21 Classifying and Weighting the Functions

The functions of the languages in a bilingual community can be analyzed and classified in more than one way. Schmidt-Rohr, for example (488, 183), distinguishes nine "domains of language use," to wit, the family, the playground, the school (with subdivisions), the church, literature, the press, the army, the courts, the administration. This scheme may be adequate for some situations, but a domain like "The Family" is hardly differentiated enough. As one critic puts it, "often the parents are of different stocks and insist on initiating their children from the beginning in the native tongue of the father as well as of the mother. Sometimes parents entrust children from a very early age to governesses or tutors who speak different languages with a view to inculcating in them several tongues simultaneously or successively. Finally, families which have immigrated to foreign countries often speak their native language at home while the children use the language of the adopted country in their relations with domestic servants and the native population."⁴ Mak (334) has used a more detailed schedule of functions, while Barker (20, 195), on the contrary, divides the social functions of language simply into familial, or intimate; informal; formal; and inter-group. This scheme, too, seems insufficiently articulated for many bilingual communities. A general survey of language functions in the bilingual communities of the world is not yet available.

From the special point of view of interference, the various functions of languages can be significantly graded according to the conservatory effect which they produce on speech behavior. In some functions, obviously, language usage is more subject than in others to corrective forces that counteract the habitualization of interference phenomena. In the kind of everyday discourse which aims at intelligibility only, careful diction is overlooked; there, interference may be rife. On other levels, however, conservative, "standardizing" forces may be operative at the same time. The school, for instance, in most literate societies checks people's freedom of speech behavior and acts as a deterrent to the "free"

⁴ Braunshausen (78).

development of the language. In the unilingual situation it helps maintain a conservative, standardized language; in the bilingual situation it supports, in addition, the norms of the language against unchecked foreign borrowings. For the purpose of understanding and predicting language influences, the fact that one of the languages is used in the educational system (if any) is therefore of great importance. What the school achieves as a conservatory agency in language development is, however, not accidental, but part of a broader cultural setting with its specific prevailing attitudes on language purity. For example, if there is a strong and living literary culture transmitted through the schools, an attitude of caution against borrowing may be effectively communicated to the younger generations. The use of a language for literary functions is thus a hint that the conservative language forces symbolized by literature may be at work.

The realization that one's mother-tongue is not a standardized language applicable in all types of formalized communication (governmental activities, literature, radio, schools, etc.) often makes people indifferent to interference in it. In Switzerland, the functional "inferiority" of Schwyzertütsch (predominantly a spoken language) as against French—a language of unrestricted functions—is so deeply felt by many bilinguals of both mother-tongues that the flow of borrowings from French to Schwyzertütsch in border areas is considered as natural as the inhospitality of French to loanwords from Schwyzertütsch. Dialectal diversity, too, is often seized on as a token of the "unstandardized" state of a language and its functional inferiority, with a resulting indifference to interference in it. The Swiss Raetoromans of the Sutselva area, for example, are distinctly aware of the dialectal variations in local Romansh. Can it be a real language, many local inhabitants ask, if bread is called [paŋ] in one village, [pawŋ] in another, and [pœwŋ] in a third? This variation contributes to the contempt in which the language is held, a contempt so great that the mere suggestion of purism appears ridiculous to most of its speakers. Thus the loanwords from Schwyzertütsch stream in *en masse*. That Schwyzertütsch, which is here the "superior" language, is itself dialectally diverse elsewhere, is immaterial, since practically every Romansh community is in contact with only one variety of it.

From a sociolinguistic evaluation of the conservatory effect which standardized uniformity and a variety of functions produces, a scale could be derived for weighting the several functions in which one or the other language predominates in a contact situation.

4.22 Functions of a Language According to Mother-Tongue Groups

It is a conclusion of common experience, if not yet a finding of psycholinguistic research, that the language which has been learned first, or the mother-tongue,⁵ is in a privileged position to resist interference. The importance of priority in learning is likely to be so great in comparison with other psychological factors governing interference that the description of functions in bilingual situations ought to be refined to take the factor of mother-tongue into account from the start.

⁵ Notwithstanding the reservations about the term "mother-tongue" when applied vaguely (§3.32), the expression can be utilized in the present technical sense as 'the language learned first.'

To do this, one might define as a MOTHER-TONGUE GROUP the class of all those people involved in a language-contact situation who learned one of the languages first. In a bilingual group, one would accordingly expect to find two mother-tongue groups, and perhaps an intermediate set of persons who actually learned both languages simultaneously.

The characteristic use of languages in various functions should preferably be described separately for each mother-tongue group, not merely for the bilingual community as a whole. This additional breakdown might show, for example, that the burden of bilingualism is borne entirely by one of the mother-tongue groups, while the other group expects to be addressed in its own language in all cases of intergroup communication. Thus in a French-Schwyzertütsch bilingual village like Meyriez (near Murten, Switzerland), the bilinguals belong predominantly to the Schwyzertütsch mother-tongue group; few native French speakers learn Schwyzertütsch at all. It may furthermore appear from this additional analysis that though a community is bilingual, it contains only one mother-tongue group; the other language may not be spoken natively by anyone. The functional division between the languages is then uniform for the entire bilingual community.⁶ Such is the case in German Switzerland, where the population is generally bilingual (Schwyzertütsch and Standard German), but the mother-tongue is exclusively Schwyzertütsch. Standard German is functionally restricted to written usage, to formal (monologic) discourse, and to subject matter technical in nature (cf. p. 81). The absence of a significant Standard German mother-tongue group deprives the language of that resistance to interference with which a group of native speakers would endow it. Ashkenazic Hebrew, which in its millenarian contact with Yiddish was largely limited in function to liturgical use and rabbinical literature and correspondence, was not represented by a mother-tongue group, either, and experienced profound interference as a consequence, splitting up dialectally in its phonology as Yiddish did: Just as the word for 'year' appears in some Yiddish dialects as *yor* and as *jur* in others, Hebrew 'blessed art Thou' corresponds to *borux ato* or *burax atu*, according to the area.

The psychological importance of priority of learning thus has a concomitant on the sociolinguistic plane. It is the importance of being represented by a sizable mother-tongue group in a contact situation.

4.3 Congruence of Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Divisions

In any concrete contact situation, the division between mother-tongue groups is usually congruent with one or more other divisions of a non-linguistic nature. Some of these are outlined in the present section, with the stress on such factors as may be relevant to the stimulation or inhibition of interference.

4.31 Types of Congruence

(1) GEOGRAPHIC AREAS. Among the most common parallels to the division between mother-tongue groups is a geographic line. Unless it coincides with high

⁶ Grootaers (182) terms this "stylistic bilingualism," as distinct from "social bilingualism," where two mother-tongue groups are involved.

mountains, seas, or other physical obstacles, there is likely to be contact between the mother-tongue groups across the line, and hence bilingualism.⁷ Language contact along many European language borders has been described in great detail, and data are available on the extent of bilingualism for every community in those areas.⁸ It appears that if the geographic division is clearcut, especially in rural surroundings, the language contact tends to be rather restricted. The purpose of intergroup communication in such cases is mainly trade,⁹ whether the geographic line is a county boundary or an ocean. For example, the German-language part of the Sarine valley, canton of Fribourg (Switzerland), "is oriented predominantly westward [because] economic and social intercourse with the [French-language] Pays d'Enhaut, . . . the Ormont Valley, and its market center, Aigle, is more important than that with the [German-language] Simmental."¹⁰ Consequently, the relations between mother-tongue groups are fluid and limited in scope. There is a great turnover of interlocutors; the means used to communicate are frequently improvised. Although interference in speech is likely to be quite heavy, it is not apt to be habitualized. On the other hand, since language contact congruent with area contact involves travel into a strange environment, new things are likely to be encountered and their names adopted. Sporadic lexical borrowing is therefore to be expected.

In one type of congruent language-and-area division, the intergroup contact is more developed: in isolated enclaves, such as the so-called language "islands" (*Sprachinseln*) of pre-war Europe or the rural immigrant settlements of the Americas. There the population is dependent on the surrounding area in proportion to its isolation from its own hinterland or homeland, and interference can accordingly be expected to be more profound. In the study of German-language enclaves in Eastern Europe, the precise nature of the relations with the new environment as a determinant or interference has been carefully considered.¹¹

The congruence of language and area may be disturbed even in rural communities, especially if located precisely on a language border;¹² in city surround-

⁷ The role of physical obstacles in the cultural and linguistic isolation of German ethnic enclaves in Slovakia has been graphically portrayed by Kuhn (291).

⁸ Cf. Draye (127), Dhondt (120), and Valkhoff (588) on the French-Flemish border in Belgium, Lévy (310) on Alsace-Lorraine, Zimmerli (657) on the German-French border in Switzerland, Waltershausen (606) on the German-Romansh line, Bock (58) on German and Danish in Central Schleswig, Kloss (276) on a section of the German-Dutch language border.

⁹ In Switzerland, the population of a village sometimes also crosses the language border to a neighboring community to attend church services, e.g. the German-speaking Catholics of the village of La Scheulte; cf. Wartburg (607), 158.

¹⁰ Steiner (546), 31, footnote 13.

¹¹ See Kuhn (290); also Pritzwald (422), Mackensen (331).

¹² For example, Wallenried near Murten, Switzerland, described by Weinreich (624), 233-5. Concerning the cartographic problems created by blurred language borders, cf. Pfandler (403), Sieger (518), and Sidaritsch (517), as well as the Styrian map by Schmidt and Neumann (487), where the new principles are utilized; cf. also Weinreich (624), 52f., 100, 103.

ings, an unblurred language border is quite unusual. In the bilingual (French and German) Swiss city of Biel, for example, no topographical language border appears to exist.¹³ But of course there are exceptions. A city like Fribourg (Switzerland) is divided: In the lowest quarter (German *Au*, French *Auge*), inhabited mostly by German speakers, the signs are in German, the police officials and the salespeople are all conversant with German. While the entire upper portion of the city is French, the lower city enjoys a certain amount of linguistic (German) autarky. It is hardly surprising, then, that such widespread interference of French and German as is reported from Biel¹⁴ is not typical of Fribourg.

There remains a need for precise sociolinguistic studies of bilingual urban communities,¹⁵ since it is evident that linguistically unnuccleated cities are foci of the most extensive and intimate interlingual contacts, both in the Old World and the New.

(2) INDIGENOUSNESS. The geographic separation of two mother-tongue groups may be canceled by migration, but a movement of one of the two groups seems frequently to result in a new characteristic socio-cultural division not without typical linguistic effects of its own. The immigrant language, rather than the indigenous one, appears to be the more exposed to interference for at least the following reasons: (a) The novelty of the habitat creates a need among the immigrants for adequate new vocabulary (cf. §2.43, p. 59); (b) The social and cultural disorientation of the immigrants undermines their inertial resistance to excessive borrowing into their language;¹⁶ (c) Since many immigrant groups have a significantly low proportion of women among them, the necessity for intermarriage leads to a discontinuity of linguistic tradition. Bilingual Arizona, where there are both fresh Spanish-speaking immigrants and indigenous Spanish-speaking "Old Families," represents a curious test case for these hypotheses. And indeed, while the "Old Families" maintain their Spanish—with a preference for Standard Spanish—in the face of the ascendancy of English, the immigrants and their children, anxious to speak English, are generally negligent about their native Spanish.¹⁷ Spanish as an immigrant language thus suffers considerably greater interference from English than Spanish as a coterritorial, indigenous tongue.

(3) CULTURAL OR ETHNIC GROUPS. In a great majority of contacts between groups speaking different mother-tongues, the groups constitute, at the same time, distinct ethnic or cultural communities.¹⁸ Such contact entails biculturalism (participation in two cultures) as well as bilingualism, diffusion of cultural traits as well as of linguistic elements.¹⁹

¹³ Detailed house-to-house inquiries might, however, reveal varying concentrations of mother-tongue groups.

¹⁴ Kuenzi (289).

¹⁵ Cf. the correlated studies of urban social structure and acculturation outlined by Caplow (95).

¹⁶ See Willems (642), 463; (640), 320 on German immigrants in Brazil.

¹⁷ Barker (18), 169f.

¹⁸ Some exceptions are discussed in §4.32.

¹⁹ See Barker (18) on the biculturality of children growing up in Tucson, Arizona.

Situations of congruent culture-and-language contact seem to invite interference of a lexical-cultural type (cf. pp. 56f.). The relationship of the cultures to one another in a particular geographic habitat determines what one group learns from the other and defines such gaps in the vocabulary of each group as may need filling by borrowing. Even for extensive word transferring, large numbers of bilingual speakers need not be involved and the relative size of the groups is not necessarily a factor; after all, "there is no intrinsic reason [to assume] that, when a large and a small group are brought into contact, the small group will borrow more extensively than the large one. . . . A hundred individuals can learn a new thing as readily as one."²⁰

Culture contact naturally produces the diffusion of non-material as well as of material culture elements. The non-material side of culture is particularly significant in explaining not only the borrowing of abstract vocabulary, but the principles of selectivity and rejection of vocabulary. Cultural resistance long delayed the adoption by Islam of gambling, insurance, or printing.²¹ Resistance of a similar type apparently led the Ashkenazic Jews to avoid the adoption from medieval German of the word for 'Saturday'²² (even though the names for the other six days of the week were borrowed), and also to leave out from the large German vocabulary they did accept such words as *tugent* 'virtue', *laster* 'vice', *buoze* 'penance', and others with specifically Christian connotations.²³

(4) RELIGION. One kind of cultural difference, namely a religious one, quite often coincides—alone or in combination with others—with a mother-tongue division. In many Ukrainian towns before World War I, for example, the mother-tongue division between Ukrainian, Polish, and Yiddish coincided with the religious division between Uniates, Catholics, and Jews. Similarly, for the Germans in the ethnic enclaves of Eastern Europe, the German mother-tongue and the Lutheran religion "were the same thing."²⁴ In Switzerland, the author had occasion to observe bilingual communities in which the mother-tongue division coincides with no other cultural difference except the denominational one. Several villages around Murten, for instance, have German and French mother-tongue groups which are exclusively Protestant and Catholic, respectively. The religious division acts as an even greater barrier to the integration of the communes than the linguistic one, so that in the bilingual but unreligious communes the contact of the two mother-tongue groups is considerably more intimate. A villager as a rule is more conscious of his neighbor's denomination than of his mother-tongue. Not only is intermarriage quite rare, but everyday activities, too, are separated according to denominations. Thus, in the village of

²⁰ Linton (312), 499.

²¹ Kroeber (287), 417f.

²² German *Samstag* or *Sonnabend*, Yiddish *šabes*.

²³ Cf. M. Weinreich (619).

²⁴ Karasek-Lück (258), describing the Germans of Volhynia. In Catholic Brazil, according to Willems (642, 460), Protestant families are emotionally more attached to their German mother-tongue than Catholic German immigrants. See the special study on religion and mother-tongue by Grentrup (180).

Courtaman there are two inns: a Protestant and a Catholic one. A surprising amount of linguistic self-sufficiency and unilingualism is possible in a denominationally divided bilingual village like Wallenried (pop. 265; 51% of French mother-tongue). Some children there grow up without having to learn the other language; as many as 41% of the native Schwyzertütsch speakers and 79% of the native French speakers were found to be unilingual in this village. While there are mixed play groups of pre-school age (the common language is French), the Protestants and Catholics have separate schools.²⁵ The contacts even within the village are thus quite restricted. The use of each language is rather specialized according to interlocutors, and in intergroup contact it is most restricted topically, but each language is used in all functions within the mother-tongue group. This considerably limits the possibilities of interference. The division of schools on linguistic-denominational lines exposes most children of both mother-tongues to the standardizing, conservatory influences on their language that emanate from the school as well as from the church. The results of any interference that does take place are thus additionally checked and eliminated.

The restricting effect on language contact and interference exercised by religious differences, especially in rural areas, should never be lost sight of. Some of the language borders in Europe which are more recent than religious borders represent lines where a language shift came to a standstill at a religious divide.²⁶ This phenomenon, too, can be observed in Switzerland at present. The Germanization of Romansh villages along the Rhine above Chur, originating from largely Protestant areas, has skipped the solidly Catholic Domat/Ems and Rhäzüns, but is engulfing such Protestant points as Trins, Flims, or Rothenbrunnen. On the contrary, the Protestantism of the Müstair Valley helps to protect it from the threat of Germanization proceeding from the neighboring Catholic valley of the Lower Engadine.²⁷ The denominational border is in both instances a barrier to the progress of the language shift.²⁸

(5) RACE. The congruence of race and mother-tongue differences seems significant only to the extent that in some situations the racial division reinforces the bars to intermarriage and thus to the earliest and most intimate kind of home bilingualism. In Brazil, for example, the recognizable racial difference has prevented Brazilian-Japanese intermarriage much more effectively than Brazilian-German mixed marriages.²⁹

(6) SEX. While certain differences in language style according to the sex of the speaker are not uncommon,³⁰ major language divisions coinciding with the sex difference are rare. The most famous case is probably the remnant of such a division in the Antilles which originated from the capture of Arawak-speaking

²⁵ Details in Weinreich (624), 233-5.

²⁶ See the special study by Cornish (107).

²⁷ Weinreich (624), 277; Gadola (155), 147; Waltershausen (606).

²⁸ The separatistic effect of religious differences is sometimes great enough to support the crystallization of new languages in contact situations; cf. §4.6.

²⁹ Willems (641), 105; (640), 451-61.

³⁰ Cf. Tagliavini (562); Jespersen (250), 237ff.

women by a predatory Carib-speaking tribe.³¹ The contact between the sex groups is of course so extensive that no such major difference can be long maintained. On the other hand, the tagging of selected speech features as feminine or masculine makes them, in some cultures, highly immune to transfer to the speech of the other sex.³²

Occasionally one of the sexes may be more exposed to contact with a second language. In Macedonia, for example, Aromunian women are reported to be largely unilingual, while their husbands are bi- and multi-lingual.³³

(7) AGE. A congruence between mother-tongue groups and age groups is the synchronic manifestation of what is, diachronically seen, a language shift (see also §4.7).³⁴

A language shift is hardly ever so abrupt as to sever communication between age groups. What appears like a discrete generational difference in mother-tongues within a single family is a projection of a more gradual age-and-language transition in the community.³⁵ It can be assumed that the same reasons that lead an age group to shift to a new language usually compel its elders at least to learn that language. Thus language shifts are almost invariably preceded by widespread bilingualism. Whether they are also followed by bilingualism, i.e. a lingering knowledge of the obsolescent language, seems to differ from case to case. Unfortunately census evidence is usually only inferential. It is known, for example, that among the descendants of German immigrants, the percentage of American-born persons of American parentage who gave German as a mother-tongue was 18.7% according to the 1940 census (587); among Swedish immigrants the corresponding figure was only 4.1%. If there is a positive correlation between the proportion of an ethnic group which passes on its language to its children as a mother-tongue, and the total proportion which teaches its children the language, then the knowledge of the obsolescent old-country language can be assumed to have been about 4½ times as widespread in the German group as among the Swedish.

Whether the burden of bilingualism is borne by the group as a whole or to a greater degree by one part of it seems to depend both on the suddenness of the shift and the point to which it has progressed. In American immigrant families, for example, the children usually learn English most rapidly and in the early period it is they who switch back to the old-country tongue in communication with their elders. A generation later the grandchildren are often unilingual

³¹ Müller (379), II, 322-49; Jespersen (250), 237ff.

³² See Jespersen, *ibid.*; Avanesov (13), 238; cf. also Capidan (90, 127-32) on the Rumanians of Albania, whose unilingual women had somewhat different phonetics from those of the plurilingual men; and Lévy (308) on certain lexical differences between men's and women's speech in Yiddish.

³³ See Récatas (431).

³⁴ In the Swiss area of a Romansh-to-German shift, this author was able to establish statistically the decreasing percentage of persons of Romansh mother-tongue in progressively lower age groups (624, 344-7).

³⁵ Selk (513) utilized the different language-usage habits of generations to measure the process of Danish-to-German shift in Schleswig.

English and it is the parents and grandparents who must switch languages in deference to their interlocutors.

An obsolescent language seems destined to acquire peculiar connotations and to be applied in special functions even after it has lost its main communicative role. Under a rapidly progressing language shift it acquires a certain esoteric value.³⁶ On the other hand, the first generation to undergo the shift tends to learn enough of the obsolescent language to destroy this value; thus, many children of American immigrants "know" just enough of the old folks' language to understand what the parents mean to conceal. Obsolescent languages also easily develop comic associations. Patois columns in French Swiss newspapers or Pennsylvania-German sections in certain Pennsylvania journals are mainly restricted to humorous material. Among children of American immigrants, the mere utterance of a word in their parents' language easily evokes laughter.³⁷

The stylistic specialization of an obsolescent language and the association of it with intimate childhood experiences is conducive to the borrowing of its lexical elements into the younger people's speech, especially in discourse that is informal and uninhibited by pretensions of high social status. Particularly apt to be transferred are colorful idiomatic expressions, difficult to translate, with strong affective overtones, whether endearing, pejorative, or mildly obscene.³⁸

Correspondingly, the "new" language is likely to be viewed by members of the older age group as the epitome of fashion. This may lead, in turn, to heavy borrowing in the opposite direction designed to make utterances sound more youthful, modern, or elegant. In Brazil, for example, highly mixed speech has been found to be a phase in the transition of Germans from their native language to Portuguese.³⁹ It would be a worthwhile problem in sociolinguistics to determine the correlation between obsolescence of a language and the extent of interference in it.

(8) SOCIAL STATUS. While a difference in social status is often a concomitant of other group divisions (cultural, religious, indigenous vs. immigrant), situations of stable language contact in which the mother-tongue difference corresponds to a difference in the social status of two autochthonous groups, and to nothing else, are easier to imagine than to discover. One such case is reported from Java, where the nobility speaks Noko natively, while the commoners' mother-tongue is Kromo.⁴⁰ In Ireland, according to one opinion, Gaelic long

³⁶ A Swiss woman in an area that had shifted to French, when asked by an investigator to speak patois, said: "Why? Are there too many ears hearing us?" Cf. Gauchat (159), 25. See also Seliščev (509, 37) on the esoteric functions of Chuvash and Cheremis in areas where they are becoming obsolete.

³⁷ Related to this is the fact observed by Swadesh (558, 234) that "once the new language is widely adopted, there are certain groups and personalities that persist especially in retaining the old language."

³⁸ For Amer. Yiddish examples, see p. 35, footnote 21.

³⁹ Willems (640), 315. Rosenquist (453) notes similarly how Swedish in the United States, before being replaced, is influenced by English.

⁴⁰ Pieris (406), 330.

survived among the lower strata without appearing in the historical records produced by representatives of the autochthonous upper classes.⁴¹

In conditions of a language shift, however, some socially distinct groups often lead the rest of the population, so that a congruence between mother-tongue and social status can be traced, even if it is only transitional. Thus in many German cities and English rural areas all but the lowest stratum have shifted from the local dialects to the standard language.⁴² Similarly, the shift to Portuguese among German immigrants in Brazil has been more rapid among the middle and upper classes than among the lowest.⁴³ Whether the determinant here is the greater cultural conservatism or the more limited social goals of some strata, a differentiated reaction to a new language is produced. As for socially differentiated resistance to a shift, cf. §4.42.

What the foreseeable linguistic effects of a stable status-and-language division are is difficult to say because of the scarcity of pertinent evidence, although it is to be expected that the familiar diffusion from the upper to the lower stratum accompanied by a trickling of slang expressions upward, which is characteristic of all linguistic innovations, will ensue. In situations of language shift, heavy interference as a forerunner of the shift is apparently so general (see p. 95) that it is hardly dependent on social differentiation. To subject a slow language shift, preferably in socially differentiated urban surroundings, to close sociolinguistic study seems a prerequisite to the elucidation of the phenomena involved.

(9) OCCUPATION. Occasionally special occupational groups have languages of their own, e.g. the tailors of Saracatsana in Macedonia⁴⁴ or the Jewish cattle merchants of Alsace.⁴⁵ These are borderline cases, of course; it is not even always clear whether the special languages differ from the general language in more than certain sections of the vocabulary. Yet, because of the esoteric function of the special occupational languages, their value depends on the restriction of the group of initiates. Here, then, is a rare situation in which there is resistance to interference on the part of the speakers of the source language, a reluctance to "lend" rather than to borrow.⁴⁶ Only occasionally do individual words penetrate into general slang.

(10) RURAL VS. URBAN POPULATION. Among the non-linguistic groupings which sometimes coincide with mother-tongue differences in language contact situations, the urban-rural distinction perhaps deserves mention as a unique combination of social, occupational, and topographic differences. The linguistic diffusion proceeding from urban centers to the surrounding countryside has been

⁴¹ Pokorny (412).

⁴² Henzen (213), 182-6; Bloomfield (55), 51.

⁴³ Willems (642), 452f. See also Heberle (207).

⁴⁴ Capidan (91); Suli (555); Georgacas (165). Similar linguistic formations have been found by Keller (263a) in Ticino, Switzerland.

⁴⁵ Their cryptic language, an outgrowth of Western Yiddish, is called by them Lošlekoudeš. It will be described by this author in a forthcoming paper.

⁴⁶ In the field of acculturation, reluctance to "lend" due to the nature of the cultural item is illustrated by such phenomena as monopolies, patents, secret diplomacy; cf. Devereux and Loeb (119), 134f.

repeatedly demonstrated by dialectologists, especially the Marburg school of Wrede's (651) and by Frings (9). This diffusion would seem likely to take place not only when sporadic innovations are spread to similar dialects, but even when the city has shifted to a new language.

Rural populations sometimes develop a hostile attitude (or at least an ambivalent one) toward their urban centers; the effect of this on language shifts is mentioned in §4.71. Whether anti-urban attitudes can prevent the diffusion of linguistic interference phenomena short of a shift remains to be determined by empiric sociolinguistic investigation.

4.32 Lack of Congruent Non-Linguistic Divisions

There are some instances of language contact in which the language division does not correspond to any congruent non-linguistic divisions. A number of them are observable in Switzerland. After various culture patterns in their geographic distribution had been subjected to intensive study, little connection was found there between language and patterns of dress, food, games, or customs. On close scrutiny, such differences as exist, for example, between the spinning and weaving methods of the German and French Valais turn out not to be strictly congruent with the language frontier.⁴⁷ Switzerland generally has been discovered to be culturally divided not at the French-German language border, but by a line running further east through German-language territory, along the mountains Brünig and Napf and the rivers Reuss and Aare. While "it cannot be denied that individual, literary culture is associated for the most part with the geographic domains of the respective written languages . . . , folk culture often follows other divides—older ones, perhaps—than the ones between contemporary 'national' languages."⁴⁸ A preliminary examination by this author of unpublished materials of the Atlas of Swiss Folk Culture (160) failed to reveal any consistent cultural difference which could be connected geographically with the division between German and French or Romansh.

Again, in studying the status of the bilingual Swiss Raetoromans (i.e. Romansh speakers), this author tried to evaluate the content of the Raetoromans' group consciousness. It turned out that "ethnic" interpretations of the group's identity were secondary to linguistic considerations, if they entered the picture at all. A Raetoroman of German mother-tongue is impossible by definition. The Romansh as well as the Schwyzertütsch speakers consider themselves members of the Swiss nation (*Volk* or *Nation*; *pievel*, *naziun*), and more immediately of the Grison people (*Bündnervolk*, *pievel grischun*) and its culture. Only a few informants thought in terms of a Raetoroman *Volk*. In the struggle to resist the language shift, Raetoroman leadership hardly makes use of even the few existing differences in folkways, folk art, or folklore that could be emphasized to raise the Raetoromans' group solidarity. The competition between the languages has no overtones of an ethnic or social conflict.

A similar linguistically mixed area in Southern Hungary where the ethnic

⁴⁷ Bodmer (60), 96ff.

⁴⁸ Weiss (630), 154.

division between Germans, Hungarians, and Slovenes had become quite blurred was described by Werner (633). Other groups that have been characterized as ethnically indifferent are the inhabitants of Polesie, who called themselves neither Poles nor Russians, but merely *tutejsi* 'local people', and the "Blakkede" people in the German-Danish borderlands.⁴⁹

The absence of socio-cultural divisions to reinforce the difference in mother-tongues is not only a factor facilitating language shifts but it probably also deters the development of resistance to linguistic interference, and is thus conducive to interlingual influence.

4.33 Conclusion

In the analysis of what makes one of two languages dominant for a bilingual individual, the multiplicity of contributing elements was pointed out (§3.38). The discussion of congruent linguistic and socio-cultural divisions in the preceding section of the present chapter underscores the difficulty of determining in some cases which language is "upper" or "dominant" in the bilingual community. The very breakdown of communities into mother-tongue groups gives rise to the question: Dominant for whom? Clearly each mother-tongue group can rate the two languages independently and with different results. It is doubtful altogether whether it is worth tagging two languages in contact as respectively "upper" and "lower" at any cost, since from the point of view of interference studies, various relations between mother-tongue groups are likely to have different characteristic effects on the languages in contact.

The difficulty of ranking two mother-tongue groups in hierarchical order is aggravated by the need to rank functions of the languages as well. It is therefore expedient, perhaps, to restrict the term DOMINANT to languages in contact situations where the difference in mother-tongues is coupled with a significant difference in social status (§4.36).⁵⁰ But this should not imply, of course, that even there the direction of interference is exclusively from the dominant language to the non-dominant one. In Southern Welsh dialects, for example, two phonemes, /w/ and /i/, have been progressively merged (a case of underdifferentiation in the terminology of §2.21) despite the fact that the variety of the language which maintained the distinction was of "higher prestige."⁵¹ Similarly, Baltic German, as noted in §2.21, was influenced by the socially lower Lettish and Estonian. In many contact situations the languages would have to be called neutral with respect to dominance or non-dominance.

⁴⁹ Selk (513). Cf. also Beck (35).

⁵⁰ The term would then be the counterpart to "prestige," i.e. the value of a language as a means of social advance (cf. p. 79, footnote 34). This terminology would accord with Bloomfield's distinction (55, 461) between "the UPPER or DOMINANT language, spoken by the conquering or otherwise more privileged group, and the LOWER language, spoken by the subject people, or, as in the United States, by humble immigrants." Needless to say, the implications drawn by Bloomfield from this distinction would be qualified by a more refined sociolinguistic analysis.

⁵¹ Sommerfelt (533), 96.

The social functions of languages (§4.2) and the congruence of mother-tongue with non-linguistic group differences (§4.3) are worth describing not because they permit a simple ranking of the languages, but rather because the various *modi vivendi* create typical patterns of linguistic behavior and interference or resistance to interference.

4.4 The Standardized Language as a Symbol

4.41 Sources of Language Loyalty

The sociolinguistic study of language contact needs a term to describe a phenomenon which corresponds to language approximately as nationalism corresponds to nationality. The term LANGUAGE LOYALTY has been proposed for this purpose. A language, like a nationality, may be thought of as a set of behavior norms; language loyalty, like nationalism, would designate the state of mind in which the language (like the nationality), as an intact entity, and in contrast to other languages, assumes a high position in a scale of values, a position in need of being "defended." Language loyalty, like nationalism, can be "an *idée-force* which fills man's brain and heart with new thoughts and sentiments and drives him to translate his consciousness into deeds of organized action."⁵² In response to an impending language shift, it produces an attempt at preserving the threatened language (cf. §4.7);⁵³ as a reaction to interference, it makes the standardized version of the language a symbol and a cause. Language loyalty might be defined, then, as a principle—its specific content varies from case to case—in the name of which people will rally themselves and their fellow speakers consciously and explicitly to resist changes in either the functions of their language (as a result of a language shift) or in the structure or vocabulary (as a consequence of interference). Thus in the field of sociolinguistics purism, standardization, language loyalty, and related defensive mechanisms are phenomena of major importance requiring systematic treatment, even if, for understandable reasons, they are considered irrelevant in descriptive structural linguistics.

What are the roots of language loyalty? One would suspect that a rudiment of this feeling is natural in every user of language, because the inescapable emo-

⁵² Kohn (282), 19, in a reference to nationalism.

⁵³ Occasionally language loyalty can even be made subservient to aggressive purposes. Recent European history abounds in attempts to impose languages on populations by force. But there have also been grotesque attempts to modify languages (without displacing them) by ukase. The Russians have toyed with the idea of changing certain forms of Slavic languages in Soviet-occupied countries. For example, after invading Poland in 1939 they found the fact that 'Jew' was called in Polish *Żyd* distasteful, since *żid* in Russian is a term of contempt. Consequently, they ordered Polish newspapers to write *Jewrej*, coined on the model of the non-pejorative Russian *jevrej*. After World War II, the Russian occupation authorities in Poland again felt misgivings about the use of *pan* as a pronoun of polite address, since *pan* also means (in Russian as well as in Polish) 'squire', and was found to be an inappropriate remnant of feudalism in a People's Democracy; see Klemensiewicz (274).

tional involvement with one's mother-tongue as one learned it in childhood (§3.35) makes any deviation seem repugnant.⁵⁴ Differences in temperament may cause people to respond differently to this natural inertia. Beyond that, however, the extent of loyalty that is displayed varies with other socio-cultural factors from one contact situation to the next.

While the fact that languages can function as symbols of groups has been repeatedly noted in the literature,⁵⁵ little of a social-science nature has been done to analyze the symbolic association of a language as a standardized system with the group's integrity. The group involved is, of course, primarily the mother-tongue community, but frequently also some other congruent grouping; the nationality is a favorite. The correlation of language loyalty and nationalism is a significant sociological problem.⁵⁶ To be sure, "before the age of nationalism, . . . the spoken language . . . was in no way regarded as a political or cultural factor, still less as an object of political or cultural struggle."⁵⁷ But even in this age of nationalism, a group's language loyalty and nationalistic aspirations do not necessarily have parallel goals. As mentioned in §4.31, the Raetoromans, like the Italian Swiss, cultivate the fullest possible loyalty to their language without aspiring to such nationalistic goals as political independence. The "Yiddishist" movement in Eastern Europe before and after World War I similarly concentrated on a language program rather than on political organization. The connection is thus at least flexible and cannot be taken entirely for granted. Relations between language loyalty and group élans other than nationalistic also need to be investigated.

It is in a situation of language contact that people most easily become aware of the peculiarities of their language as against others, and it is there that the pure or standardized language most easily becomes the symbol of group integrity. Language loyalty breeds in contact situations just as nationalism breeds on ethnic borders.⁵⁸

Even if not restricted to immediate situations of contact, loyalty sentiments probably bear some proportion to an actual or imagined threat to the language. As a reaction to a threat, manifestations of language loyalty might perhaps be viewed in a similar conceptual framework as those which anthropologists em-

⁵⁴ Similar statements can be made regarding non-linguistic aspects of culture. As Kroeber writes (287, 437), "people in growing up do get attached to the ways of their culture. . . . By the time they begin to age, their memories of the culture have got tinged with pleasurable nostalgic sentiments and assume a symbolic value."

⁵⁵ Cf. for example Sapir (471), 29.

⁵⁶ See Boehm (62), 235 f.; cf. also Vossler's eloquent, if uncritical, essay (603).

⁵⁷ Kohn (282), 6.

⁵⁸ As Boehm puts it (62, 234), "the national frontier . . . is the symbol of the territorial contiguity of nations and thus a particularly vital factor in modern nationalism. . . . Border populations are usually imbued with particularly militant nationalism, for here the contrast to an alien people and an alien culture is more generally apparent. . . . This 'pathos of the borderland' is the connecting link between the border regions and the capital city of a country . . . , the focal point for all the vital energies of a people. . . ." Pousland (418) notes a greater loyalty to pure French in Salem, Mass., and Canada than in France itself.

ploy in the study of nativism.⁵⁹ Linton, in his analysis of nativistic movements (313), classifies cultural groups in contact as objectively dominant or dominated and subjectively inferior or superior. It might be said accordingly that if a group considers itself superior but in practice has to yield to the other group in some of the functions of its language, or has to fill vocabulary gaps by borrowing from the other language, a resentful feeling of loyalty may be fostered. Thus language loyalty, like a nativistic movement, is "unlikely to arise in situations where both societies are satisfied with their current relationship."⁶⁰ It is rather frustrated superiority feelings that cause language loyalty to develop.⁶¹

The more "realistic" members of an objectively dominated group may attempt to better their lot by associating themselves with the dominant group. The sight of such "betrayals" invariably causes resentment among the more steadfast members of the dominated group, a resentment which brings with it unswerving language loyalty. Divergent reactions and the consequent resentful loyalty can be found in almost any type of group contact congruent with a mother-tongue division: ethnic and cultural contact, immigrant and indigenous populations, lower and higher social strata, rural and urban sections, old and young age groups. The way in which the dominated group splits can sometimes be explained by its internal makeup. As Linton puts it (313, 239), ". . . nativistic tendencies will be strongest in those classes of individuals who occupy a favored position and who feel this position threatened by culture change. This factor may produce a split in the society, the favored individuals or groups indulging in a rational nativism, . . . while those in less favored positions are eager for assimilation. This condition can be observed in many immigrant groups in America where individuals who enjoyed high status in the old European society attempt to perpetuate the patterns of that society, while those who were of a low status do their best to become Americanized." While there is reason to doubt the universal applicability of this scheme, and while difference between individuals must be allowed for, one can say nevertheless that corresponding divergences in attitudes toward a language, and toward language norms as a group symbol, lend themselves to analysis according to similar criteria.

It is also pertinent to note that social action in the field of language has sometimes been based on a manipulation of language loyalty. Ordinarily, it is true, when a mother-tongue community exposed to contact splits on the point of loyalty to its language, the more loyal sector will resort to self-pity and exhortation of the less loyal. But occasionally leaders with more than usual insight will attempt to enhance the language loyalty of their fellow speakers by methodic,

⁵⁹ Kroeber defines nativism (287, 437) thus: "After two societies have come into sufficiently close contact for one to feel the other as definitely more populous, stronger, or better equipped, so that its own culture is in process of being supplanted by the other, a conscious preservation effort or defense is often produced. Such reactions have been called nativistic endeavors or revivals." The best survey of the problem seems to be Linton's (313).

⁶⁰ Linton (313), 234.

⁶¹ Roberts (450) uses the term "counterprestige" for a reaction to prestige. Since "prestige" has been more narrowly defined in the present work, to adopt "counterprestige" in Roberts' sense would be misleading.

organized means. The reasoning behind such programs, their successes and failures, also need to be studied for a fuller understanding of the interplay of structural and socio-cultural factors in language development. One attempt to create language loyalty was observed by this author in a Romansh section of Switzerland.⁶² A great deal of material concerning the more and less successful revivals of half-"dead" languages (Hebrew, Irish), though easily available, has not yet been utilized for sociolinguistic analysis. The creation of new standard languages in the past century and a half is, by and large, also the record of the organized buildup of language loyalty.⁶³

4.22 Effectiveness of Standardization

In response to interference, language loyalty ordinarily concentrates on the standardization of the language.⁶⁴

Devotion to a standardized language is often thought to be an intellectualistic affliction. In the speech of German immigrants to Brazil, for example, it has been noted that Portuguese interference is most limited where there has been "an influence of intellectuals from Germany."⁶⁵ Conversely, anti-purism sometimes accompanies generally anti-intellectual, "slangy" behavior; "there are . . . areas in our large cities where the young people deliberately refrain from speaking an 'unmixed' English lest their 'crowd' accuse them of being 'highhat.'"⁶⁶

It is doubtful, nevertheless, whether intellectualistic motivations are the ultimate determinant of a preoccupation with standardization. The Athabaskan languages of America have displayed a marked resistance to loanwords, despite varied cultural contacts,⁶⁷ apparently without the involvement of intellectualistic motivations of an Occidental sort. This author has also observed Raetoroman peasants artlessly attempting to speak a purer type of Romansh by avoiding German loanwords. To be sure, the intellectual subgroup of a mother-tongue group may have cause to be the most loyal to its language out of such considerations as Linton indicates (cf. p. 101); moreover, purism requires a degree of concentration and self-consciousness which is best attainable in intellectual discourse (spoken and written). It would stand to reason, however, that the conscious resistance to interference on the principle of loyalty requires no greater effort than the frequently observed conscious submission to interference which

⁶² Weinreich (624, 360-405; also 621).

⁶³ See, for example, Kloss' sketchy but excellent review (275) of the development of a dozen new Germanic standard languages.

⁶⁴ One type of reaction is PURISM, i.e. self-conscious resistance to all interference in the name of a principle. But language loyalty is not necessarily puristic. In Hitlerite Germany, where the symbolic values of the German language were so fully played upon, the purists had to struggle for their cause as in the pre-Hitler years. In the Soviet Union, too, the glorification of the "great and mighty" Russian language drowns out the occasional puristic pronouncements.

⁶⁵ Willems (640), 305.

⁶⁶ Bossard (71), 701. Cf. also the heavy mixture in the slangy English-Spanish Pachuco argot of the American Southwest, described by Barker (19), and the high percentage of unetymologizable words in slangs generally.

⁶⁷ Sapir (472), 209.

takes place when the source language symbolizes high status. Whether this is actually so is a problem to be investigated.

For many decades now, dialectological as well as descriptive interests have made many linguists averse to problems of language standardization and have kept a damper on the potential development of sociolinguistic studies of the processes involved. However, if the social sciences were to be called upon to contribute more amply to the study of languages, the research problems concerning resistance to interference on the grounds of language loyalty could be formulated without much difficulty. They turned up in many spots in chap. 2 of the present study, and were summarized in the table on pp. 64f. It should be investigated what domains of language have been stressed in standardization programs (vocabulary, syntax, phonics), and the effectiveness of standardization in the various domains and under different historical conditions should be critically evaluated. Information is needed on how much socio-culturally induced resistance is needed to counteract structurally stimulated interference phenomena of various types. While there is little chance that such studies will reveal purism to have been a major factor even in the recent history of some languages, the net effect of standardizing tendencies might be assessed more correctly than heretofore. In such languages as Czech or Rumanian, for example, they did attain signal successes. A detailed sociolinguistic analysis of even the failures of standardization would shed light on the interplay of structural and non-structural factors that are involved in the regulation of interference.

4.5 Duration of Contact

The synchronic slant has been so dominant in descriptive linguistics that students of interference have generally overlooked the possibility of studying contact-induced progressive changes in a language against the time dimension.⁶⁸ Yet an attractive opportunity for short-term diachronic observation is offered by languages freshly brought into contact, as through migration.

The time factor in interference can be analyzed in two significant ways: first, through the relative chronology of the habitualization or elimination of interference features; and secondly, through the absolute time elapsed before this or that phenomenon of interference is habitualized or eliminated.

Some of the statements concerning the relative amounts of interference in various domains of language (phonetics, vocabulary, etc.; see §2.53) lend themselves to a chronological interpretation. Dauzat's assertion (113, 49-55), for example, that morphology is affected least implies that it is affected last; interference in vocabulary is asserted to be greatest, and, by implication, also takes

⁶⁸ In acculturation research, too, the time element has been widely neglected. Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (432) did include "the factor of TIME elapsed since [the] acceptance [of a trait]" in their Memorandum, but Beals (33) notes that "field studies of acculturation frequently are essentially descriptive; we are given the results of acculturation rather than an attempt to discover its dynamics [p. 628]. . . . Dynamic situations, as the physicists have long recognized, require the use of time as a dimension. New techniques and standards are called for" (p. 638).

place first. But aside from the fact that such statements are theoretically untenable on the synchronic level (see p. 67), their validity as diachronic "laws" remains to be demonstrated. What is necessary is the close observation of a contact situation from its inception over a period of time, with the usual scientific controls, before anything factual can be said regarding either relative or absolute chronology.

The only real-life study of interference in time which this author is aware of is the dissertation by Sadlo (459), who actually retested the phonetics of the same subjects' speech after an interval. Among a group of children of emigrant Polish miners in France, Sadlo found that three years were sufficient to produce in their native Polish a merger of the palatal and hushing sibilants and affricates ($\acute{s} > \acute{\zeta}$, $\acute{z} > \acute{\zeta}$, $\acute{c} > \acute{\zeta}$). Other available evidence consists of educational progress measurements in second-language study. Although those are based on "artificial" classroom experience, they too may contain information relevant to the theory of interference. But such information still remains to be extracted.

Short-term empiric diachronic investigation may make it possible to clarify basic problems involving longer time spans as well. For example, according to an opinion current in Europe (the evidence remains to be presented in linguistically valid terms), immigrants acquire an American "accent" in their first-learned language after a few years' residence in the United States;⁶⁹ this would seem to show that mother-tongue phonetics are easily affected by bilingualism. On the other hand, it has been shown that phonic features of extinct languages can survive for many generations;⁷⁰ this has been cited as proof that a native phonetic system is, at bottom, extremely durable. Similar contradictory observations have been made on syntax. Detailed research must unravel these paradoxes. Perhaps the facts can be explained by the early establishment, and delayed persistence, of unified phonic or syntactic systems (cf. pp. 8f. above); other solutions, based on differences of socio-cultural setting and a neat distinction between phonemic and subphonemic features, or between relevant and redundant syntactic relations, ought not to be neglected either. The field is large and intriguing, and its implications for the understanding of "substratum" phenomena are obvious.

4.6 Crystallization of New Languages

Some situations of language contact have been productive of new, third languages, while others have not.⁷¹ Some criteria for deciding whether or not a new

⁶⁹ Kock (281) states this about Swedish, Pap (395, 83) about Portuguese, Senn (514) about Lithuanian, Wechsler (609, 446) about other languages.

⁷⁰ Cf. Kessler (266) on remnants of Romaniish sounds in one variety of Schwyzertütsch or Rosenquist (453) on the persistence of a Swedish "accent" in American English for generations (to quote but two of innumerable examples).

⁷¹ The problem has been discussed in some detail by Loewe (318). Again, students of acculturation have had similar observations to make. In some situations of culture shift, it was noted, new marginal cultures have developed, but not in others. Thus, Willems reports (640, 186) that among some German immigrants in Brazil, the feelings of inferiority in rela-

language has developed out of the crossing of two others were discussed in §2.55. On that basis, trade languages like the Chinook Jargon, the creoles and pidgins, all undoubtedly deserve the appellations of new languages. On the other hand, such speech forms as often arise between dialects and their corresponding standard languages, e.g. the Greek *mikti*,⁷² similar vernacular idioms in Upper Germany,⁷³ the "Halbdeutsch" of the Baltic countries,⁷⁴ the Hawaiian dialect of English,⁷⁵ or the Anglicized Italian of the United States⁷⁶ do not seem to have attained the stability of form, the breadth of function, or the distance from the stock languages, nor have they generated sufficiently separatistic subjective attitudes among their speakers, to be styled new languages in a valid sense of the term.

The nature of linguistic interference, it will be granted, is the same whether the interfered-with speech does crystallize into a new language or not. What are the factors, then, that do contribute to the development of a new language? The question can be examined according to the criteria outlined on p. 69.

(1) DEGREE OF DIFFERENCE. It takes the contact of two rather different languages to crystallize a new idiom sufficiently different from either of them to rate classification as a new language. On this point, therefore, the question of whether a third language does or does not emerge has a linguistic determinant, too. For example, the fact that Lower Germany has what is practically an intermediate language between the dialect and Standard German (the so-called *Missingsch*⁷⁷), while Upper Germany does not, may, in part at least, be due to the fact that the dialect is considerably more unlike the standard language in Lower than in Upper Germany.

(2) STABILITY OF FORM. How firmly the patterns of interference become habitualized is already a matter beyond strictly linguistic causation. The relative stability of affected speech forms reflects rather the manner in which the two languages are learned by the bilinguals and the relative ineffectiveness of influences tending toward the elimination of interference (see pp. 87f.). It is significant that many of the new languages which have achieved some stability of form arose far from the centers of social control, "on very pronounced frontiers of culture. . . . Those [new languages] now extant are almost all closely connected with the great migrations of European peoples during the past four hundred

tion to both the German stock culture and the Luso-Brazilian culture are connected with the existence of a marginal, or intermediate, "Teuto-Brazilian" culture, which is a source of psychological compensations for the inferiority feelings (see also pp. 245-72, esp. 265ff.). Here Willems leans on the marginal culture theory, developed by Goldberg (171) as an antithesis to the marginal man theory. On the other hand, the Quechuan village of Nayón, Ecuador, is in the course of acculturation almost completely bypassing the intermediate stage of mestizo culture developed in other sections of the country; see Beals (34), 73.

⁷² Intermediate between the *dimotiki* and the "pure" *katharevousa*; cf. Steinmetz (547).

⁷³ See Loewe (318).

⁷⁴ See Mitzka (370) on Latvia, Stammler (542) on Estonia.

⁷⁵ Described by Reinecke and Tokimasa (442); cf. also Reinecke (441), 118.

⁷⁶ Menarini (354), 159.

⁷⁷ Described in some detail by Borchling (69).

years."⁷⁸ They were crystallized, one might say, in conditions of "anti-prestige,"⁷⁹ or lack of sufficient "prestige" on the part of either language to promote it to the status of a norm.

(3) BREADTH OF FUNCTION. The crucial function which a regularly interfered-with type of speech must acquire in order to develop into full-fledged language is, it seems, use in the family. The socio-cultural settings in which a hybridized language can become the mother-tongue of a generation of children have been studied by Reinecke (441). "Very seldom," he found (p. 112), "does a trade language spontaneously become the mother-tongue of a group. Perhaps the only example in the literature is that of the Chinook Jargon, which is said to have been for a time the sole language of a few children of French Canadian *voyageurs* and squaws in Oregon Territory." Accordingly, Reinecke distinguishes trade jargons, which remain supplementary (i.e. the "other tongue" to all its speakers) from creole jargons, which develop into full-fledged mother-tongues.

The functions of a new language can be broadened by administrative fiat or other conscious efforts to include education, religion, and the like. In some cases, e.g. that of Papiamentu in Curaçao or Haitian Creole, the new languages have been used in written form in the press and in literature, although long after contact with the African stock languages had been severed.⁸⁰ Such functional expansion naturally increases, in turn, both the stability of form and the subjective experience of the idiom as a separate language.

(4) SPEAKERS' OWN RATING. The development of an attitude among bilingual speakers in which their speech, a result of interference between two languages, is regarded as a new single language, again depends on various socio-cultural factors, such as the isolation of the group in contact from its unilingual hinterland, separatist tendencies of an ethnic or political content, and so forth. The manner in which loyalty to a hybridized form of speech is generated and develops is an interesting sociolinguistic problem. In clarifying it, it may be useful to contrast the history of Yiddish with that of other Jewish languages. All of them represent unique fusions of various dialects of the stock languages (German, Spanish, Arabic, Persian, etc., as the case may be) with outside admixtures (Hebrew-Aramaic and Slavic, Turkish, etc., again as the case may be); but the language loyalty of the Yiddish-speaking community has not been equaled among the speakers of Dzhudezmo ("Judeo-Spanish") or other Jewish languages.

4.7 Language Shifts

4.71 Sociological Aspects

A language shift was defined (p. 68) as the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another. Whereas interference, even in its socio-cultural setting, is a problem in which considerations of linguistic structure enter, the

⁷⁸ Reinecke (441), 109. See also Schultze (499), whose study is superseded by the former.

⁷⁹ A term proposed by M. H. Roberts (450).

⁸⁰ Reinecke (441), 112, 117.

matter of language shifts is entirely extra-structural, since it can be taken for granted that the respective structures of two languages in contact never determine which language is to yield its functions to the other. Because there are no strictly linguistic motivations in language shifts, the matter need not be dealt with at length in the present study. But it may be useful to show at least how the framework established in §§4.2-4 for the sociolinguistic study of interference can be utilized to good advantage for the study of language shifts, too, if common oversimplifications are to be avoided.

First, language shifts should be analyzed in terms of the functions of the languages in the contact situation (cf. §4.2), since a mother-tongue group may switch to a new language in certain functions but not in others. For example, under a foreign occupation, or in migrating to a new country, the adult members of a mother-tongue group may come to use a new language in its dealings with governmental authorities, while the children use it in school; at the same time, the old language may live on in the homes and at informal gatherings of the group. In such a case we might speak of a PARTIAL rather than a TOTAL shift. While language shifts among urban immigrants in America are usually rapid and total, the language shifts among rural immigrant communities are often rather of a partial type for two or three generations, at least.⁸¹

It is a worthwhile further problem to investigate in what order languages are shifted in their several functions, and to what degree a shift in one function, e.g. in politics and education, necessarily brings about a shift in others. It would be interesting to study, too, whether standardized languages, applicable in all types of formalized communication (cf. p. 88), have a greater potential for displacing other idioms in a language shift than unstandardized languages. While this has often been supposed to be the case,⁸² actual situations seem to vary. In East Prussia before World War I, many Lithuanians were highly conversant with Standard German, but it was only the Low German dialect, the knowledge of which spread rapidly among the postwar generation, that was able to displace Lithuanian.⁸³ In Switzerland, several generations of Raetoromans have known Standard German, but again it is the knowledge of unstandardized Schwyzertütsch which poses the threat of a substantial shift in some areas.⁸⁴ It would appear, then, that an unstandardized vernacular is sometimes more apt to be adopted than a standardized language whose functions do not include everyday speech.

Secondly, the nature of shifts should be studied in contact situations where the mother-tongue division is congruent with various other, non-linguistic divisions, in order to allow for a differentiated response to the new language among various subgroups. For instance, research on the shift to Portuguese among German

⁸¹ See American Council of Learned Societies (3), no. 34, *passim*; cf. also Pihlblad (407) on conditions among the Swedes of Kansas.

⁸² Cf. Hirt (220a), 252. Hall also writes (189, 19): "It is hard to think of any modern instance in which an entire speech community is under pressure to learn a substandard variety of a second language."

⁸³ Gerullis (167), 61f.

⁸⁴ Details described by Weinreich (624), 284-6.

immigrants in Brazil has shown various significant correlations.⁸⁵ The shift is a concomitant of the urbanization of the colonists; it progresses faster among the lowest social strata, but more rapidly among Catholics than among Protestants and faster among the better than the less well educated. It is most rapid in trilingual areas, where Portuguese makes headway as the common medium of communication.⁸⁶ The shift is also favored where non-linguistic forms of German culture are being abandoned simultaneously. In a Lithuanian village in East Prussia, it was observed that workers and artisans experienced considerably less embarrassment at shifting to German than did the more conservative farmers, hostile to urban innovations.⁸⁷ In the Hebrides, it is similarly reported, the Gaelic language survives in the countryside as a symptom of rural hostility to the Anglicized towns.⁸⁸

Obviously, such differentiated situations cannot be subsumed under a simple statement as to which language has higher "prestige" or "social value." A study of one multilingual area in central Schleswig showed that Standard German—which many would readily call the socially "higher" idiom—displaced the Danish dialect totally, in all functions, but the Low German dialect only partially.⁸⁹ The configuration of dominance can be complicated, and oversimplifications must be guarded against no less than in considering the setting of interference (p. 98).

In general, the possible effects of language loyalty (cf. §4.4) in counteracting language shifts should be carefully sifted. Many languages with low "prestige" have been able to hold their own against threatening shifts for long periods. A peculiarly favorable socio-cultural setting, for instance, has enabled Schwyzertütsch to maintain itself against the onslaught of Standard German. Many "obsolescent" languages have received new leases on life through a rejuvenated language loyalty among their speakers⁹⁰ and have made the prediction of the death of languages a hazardous business.

Finally, language shifts, like interference, can and ought to be studied carefully against time. An outstanding research job on the "dynamics" of a language shift from Danish to Standard German in Schleswig has been contributed by

⁸⁵ Willems (642), 462ff.

⁸⁶ The effect of trilingualism is also discussed by Reinecke, who reports (441, 112): "Naturally, the more polyglot an area, the better the chance has a pidgin [or any other new language] to spread. . . . No jargon was able to gain more than a temporary foothold in Polynesia, the dialects of which are mutually intelligible or nearly so. But in Melanesia and the Papuan-speaking regions, where every village may speak a distinct language, Beach-la-mar English ran like wildfire. . . ."

⁸⁷ Gerullis (167), 64.

⁸⁸ C. A. Smith (526).

⁸⁹ See Selk (512) and Hahn's review (188).

⁹⁰ See Kloss' surveys of the Germanic field (275, 277), in which he also includes Yiddish. On Lallans (Scottish), see also Ziekursch (656) and Wagner (605). An excellent sociolinguistic analysis of the rise and decline of a Frisian-Dutch dialect is given by Hellinga (209). For Celtic parallels, see Rees (439), and also Weinreich (622) on Welsh. Details on Romansch are presented by Weinreich (624), 171-7, 363-83.

P. Selk (513). However, rather than examine the shift function by function, Selk concentrated on the family level and consequently reported only the total shift. In another time study of a total shift, Arsenian (6, 69), by correlating length of residence of parents in the United States with the bilinguality of their children, was able to measure quantitatively the progress of the language shift among Italian and Jewish immigrants.

4.72 Linguistic Implications

If the processes of interference and language shift are interconnected, the available evidence regarding one of them can be utilized in understanding the other. It has been suggested, for instance, that language shifts are characterized by word transfers, while loan translations are the typical mark of stable bilingualism without a shift.⁹¹ Another hypothetical connection is that in a slow shift, the surviving language suffers less habitualized interference than in a rapid one.⁹² Other correlates also have been proposed.

The crucial problems are these: Do the language shift and the processes of language influence take place in the same direction? Are their respective tempos correlated? Does a standstill in the language shift imply a standstill in interference, or, on the contrary, the crystallization of a new language?

That a language shift does not exclude linguistic influence in the opposite direction, i.e. interference in the "winning" language, is obvious from the survival of words from extinct languages in living ones; the way American English borrows words from receding immigrant languages is a case in point. But the conditions under which winning languages adopt more than loose lexical elements are still obscure.

Obviously it is a matter of socio-cultural conditions whether the speakers of the "losing" language learn the new language so well as to leave no trace on it, or whether they learn it in an imperfect manner, bequeathing the phonetic and grammatical peculiarities of their speech to future generations in the form of a substratum. Hence, in a language shift, the scholar must look not only for the pressures that determine the choice of language but also for those which decide the thoroughness with which the new language is learned and the flow of leveling, equalizing forces from the unilingual bulk which tend to eliminate traces of the old languages. The educational system, geographical accessibility, the rural or urban character of the shifting population are essential factors for the understanding of how substrata are formed. "It is generally believed," says Schuchardt (498, 528f.), "that the original language always 'protrudes' through the newly acquired one; but which of its sides, which part of it? We have to know the history of the people to decide whether *AI* is to be interpreted as *A'* or *I^a*."

It has long been customary to use the evidence of cultural loanwords to reconstruct social, cultural, and political conditions under which the borrowings

⁹¹ Willems notes, for example (640, 279), that in the German of Brazilian immigrants, loan translations are extremely rare.

⁹² Seliščev (509), 38.

were made.⁹³ If the study of actual cases of language contact should show that certain types of interference are habitualized under specific socio-cultural conditions, but not under others, then it may be possible to buttress the reconstruction of social situations of the past with the help of linguistic evidence other than cultural loanwords alone.

⁹³ Cf. Windisch (645) on the theoretical principles, and Mackenzie's coordination of linguistics with history in Anglo-French relations (333). Seiler's 8-volume study of loanwords in German (507) is one of the crowning achievements of this approach.

5 Research Methods and Opportunities

5.1 Need for a Broad Approach

From the analysis of the mechanisms of linguistic interference, its structural causes, and its psychological and socio-cultural co-determinants, these basic problems emerge:

In a given case of language contact, which of the languages will be the source of what forms of interference? How thoroughly will the effects of interference be incorporated in the recipient language? How far in space will they be diffused?

Ever since the late nineteenth century there have been linguists interested in the concrete effects of language contact who endeavored to account for them by reference to the socio-cultural setting of the contact. After it had been demonstrated how the transfer of lexical material could be ascribed to cultural conditions,¹ it was attempted to apply similar methods to interference in the more highly structured parts of languages—sound systems and grammar. The classic paper by Hempl (210), for example, written in 1898, divided language contacts according to the demographic and cultural characteristics of the communities in which they occurred, showing that the stabilization or elimination of effects of interference varied with many external circumstances. Thinking along these lines would hardly meet with any opposition today. But arguments such as Hempl's, while they offered a partial explanation of the direction of interference and perhaps its depth of penetration, did little to account for the principles of selectivity according to which this or that concrete instance of interference was established or eliminated in the recipient language. It is surprising that social scientists concerned with language have done so little to apply the findings and methods in their general field of work to the problems that have been discussed here.

A radically different approach to these problems was offered by twentieth-century descriptive linguistics when the Prague phonologists, in the late twenties and early thirties, tackled the matter of interference from the structural side. They held the view that the spread of linguistic features from one language to another was but an extension of linguistic change in general, since, as Jakobson (241, 193) put it, "differences of language are no hindrance to the diffusion of phonemic or grammatical devices."² The selection of new traits for adoption by another language, as they saw it, is governed by the structure of the recipient language, just as diffusion within a single language is governed by its structure. What is amenable to the recipient structure is taken over from the modified

¹ Cf. the essay by E. Windisch (645), published in 1897, and frequently quoted, and the paper by Wackernagel (604). Schuchardt, of course, anticipated these by his unexcelled *Slavo-deutsches und Slavo-italienisches* (496) of 1884.

² See also the subsequent statement of this theory by Martinet (344), 24ff.