Borrowing

A 'borrowing' is a form that has spread from one linguistic variety (the 'source') into another variety (the 'target' or 'recipient'). In this sense it is nearly synonymous with 'loanword', but a borrowing is often more than a word (or even a word class) - it may be a phrase (larger than a word), and may be a phrase (larger than a word). Borrowing is also the term for the act of incorporation itself, and there is a certain semantic ambiguity between process and result in the usage of the term. Although the focus here is on language-to-language transfer, the concept may also be used when discussing the spread of a form among mutually intelligible dialects of a single language, or even among registers or idiolects.

The close analysis of borrowings involves many aspects of linguistic structure - particularly phonetics/phonology, morphology, and lexical semantics. The study of borrowings is of interest to general linguistics because the borrowing language may have several possible ways of incorporating the foreign form into its own phonological, morphological, and semantic systems, and the options implemented may reveal something about deep-seated developmental tendencies of the language that are not otherwise clearly evident. But the study of borrowings cannot rely entirely on considerations of pure linguistic structure, however 'deep'. Rather, borrowing patterns also reflect the social and historical context in which the language contact takes place. For this reason, borrowings play an important role in historical linguistics.

1. Basic Concepts and Terminology
1.1 Borrowing versus Code-switching

The term 'borrowing' is semantically misleading from the start, since it implies that the source language relinquishes a form in favor of its recipient without any implication that it is expected to return the form later (or without


Stearnmann R 1984 Franz Bopp and the vergleichende indoeuropäische Sprachwissenschaft. Inst. für Sprachwissenschaft, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck.


Borgstrom, Carl Bjorn

Borgstrom, Carl Bjorn was born in Oslo, the son of a composer. With his substantial studies on various dialects, Borgstrom was a pioneer within the field of Scottish Gaelic dialectology. Encouraged by his teacher Carl Marstrander (see Marstrander, Carl J. S.), he did for Scottish Gaelic dialects what Finck (see Finck, Franz Nikolai), Quiggin, and Sommerville (see Sommerville, A. J.) had done for Irish in the previous decades. His first extensive study was The Dialect of Barra in the Outer Hebrides—the thesis for his Master Arts in Celtic philology in Oslo, 1936; it was published the following year. Borgstrom was also the person who in 1940 opened up A Linguistic Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland with his study The Dialects of the Outer Hebrides, the first volume. Volume 2 of the Survey the following year, The Dialects of Kyle and Ross-shire, was also the work of Borgstrom. (The third and last volume was to wait 15 years, when another Gaelic scholar, O'Flatharta, produced a study of the Leurbost dialect from the island of Lewis.)

In 1932, Borgstrom arrived in Dublin to take up the post of lecturer in Comparative Philology at Trinity College upon a recommendation from Marstrander—a post he was to hold until 1935. Almost immediately, he set out for his teacher's favorite island, the Great Blasket, in Kerry, and acquired a command of the spoken tongue and the Blasket dialect. This is shown by a tale from Peig, the famous storyteller on the island, in the archives of the Department of Irish Folklore, University College Dublin, recorded by Borgstrom and dated 1932. Borgstrom's profound knowledge of the dialect is revealed by his cautious, but detailed review of the dialect's place in the general study of Celtic dialect history.

In 1936-37, he was a visiting professor in Sanskrit in Ankara. From 1938, he was a research scholar in Celtic linguistics in Oslo. During the war, he left for Sweden, and in 1945 he was a lecturer in linguistics in Lund. Finally, in 1947, he was appointed professor of Comparative Indo-European linguistics at the University of Oslo, from which he retired in 1976. In this capacity, he established a vital and prospering milieu and managed to inspire a whole generation of linguists, many of whom rank among the leading Norwegian scholars of the 1900s.

His major contributions to the field of Indo-European linguistics were published in the late 1940s and early 1950s, mainly concentrating on Indo-European vowel-grading, whereas the general linguist in him published continuously over the years. As a general linguist he was a committed structuralist, who combined the French and the American schools, with a preference for the latter. When the comparative and the general linguist united, fascinating results were yielded. Reading Borgstrom, one is still struck by his exceptional theoretical ability and cogency. This applies, indeed, to his introduction to linguistics of 1950, Ausführende i spridsugskap. It is tempting to say that this book crowns his scholarship, as it succeeds in making the insights he had gained from his various investigations available even for the beginner in a way rarely achieved by linguists.
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interest). It is a historical quirk that the term "borrowing" is now used to cover a wide range of processes, including assimilation, reanalysis, or, in the context of linguistics, the acquisition of entire linguistic systems. However, there is a more substantive terminological difficulty due to the sometimes fuzzy boundaries between code-switching and borrowing.

In extreme cases, the difference between borrowing and code-switching (see Code-switching and Mixing) is clear. For example, the Romance language is a borrowing from Latin, French, but few modern speakers of English would be aware of this fact as its origin. At the other extreme, a pair of bilingual speakers might converse for a whole in one language, English, then shift abruptly into French for a ten-minute stretch. Such a conversation is more appropriately described as a topic, because they do not want an eavesdropping English monolingual to overhear them, or for some other reason.

In other words, a borrowing is (ideally) a historically transformed form, usually a word (or lexical stem), that has settled comfortably into the target language, while code-switching is (ideally) a spontaneous, clearly bounded switch from sentences of one language to sentences of another, affecting all levels of linguistic structure simultaneously. However, if actual speech patterns in bilingual environments are observed, one finds that borrowing and code-switching are not always so clearly distinct. For one thing, many borrowings are only partially integrated into the target language, and even monolingual speakers may be conscious of the foreign status. Second, widely used (hence presumably borrowed) forms may have a degree of internal phrase structure that speakers are (to varying degrees) aware of, as opposed to code-switching, which is not. For example, the word that is used in English. Coming from the other direction, spontaneous mixing of material from two languages most often takes the form of metathesis or code-switching, such that only those portions of language are included from a foreign language into slots in a clearly primary base language, rather than abrupt shifts from entire sentences of one language to those of another. In other words, borrowings may resemble code-switches in retaining a foreign status and/or a discernible internal structure, while code-switches often resemble borrowings in brevity (words, short phrases) and in being fitted into another language's syntax.

To deal with these problems, some scholars have expanded the terminology by adding a third term such as 'code-mixing' to cover certain intermediate cases such as Braille French (a borrowing of the French alphabet). Other terms include 'linguistic restitution' for special cases, such as 'loanblend' for combinations of a borrowed and a native element, like the German altfälchen old fashion (converting German alt 'old' and fälchen 'flick' into a word that is used in English. Coming from the other direction, spontaneous mixing of material from two languages most often takes the form of metathesis or code-switching, such that only those portions of language are included from a foreign language into slots in a clearly primary base language, rather than abrupt shifts from entire sentences of one language to those of another. In other words, borrowings may resemble code-switches in retaining a foreign status and/or a discernible internal structure, while code-switches often resemble borrowings in brevity (words, short phrases) and in being fitted into another language's syntax.

To deal with these problems, some scholars have expanded the terminology by adding a third term such as 'code-mixing' to cover certain intermediate cases such as Braille French (a borrowing of the French alphabet). Other terms include 'linguistic restitution' for special cases, such as 'loanblend' for combinations of a borrowed and a native element, like the German altfälchen old fashion (converting German alt 'old' and fälchen 'flick' into a word that is used in English. Coming from the other direction, spontaneous mixing of material from two languages most often takes the form of metathesis or code-switching, such that only those portions of language are included from a foreign language into slots in a clearly primary base language, rather than abrupt shifts from entire sentences of one language to those of another. In other words, borrowings may resemble code-switches in retaining a foreign status and/or a discernible internal structure, while code-switches often resemble borrowings in brevity (words, short phrases) and in being fitted into another language's syntax.

To deal with these problems, some scholars have expanded the terminology by adding a third term such as 'code-mixing' to cover certain intermediate cases such as Braille French (a borrowing of the French alphabet). Other terms include 'linguistic restitution' for special cases, such as 'loanblend' for combinations of a borrowed and a native element, like the German altfälchen old fashion (converting German alt 'old' and fälchen 'flick' into a word that is used in English. Coming from the other direction, spontaneous mixing of material from two languages most often takes the form of metathesis or code-switching, such that only those portions of language are included from a foreign language into slots in a clearly primary base language, rather than abrupt shifts from entire sentences of one language to those of another. In other words, borrowings may resemble code-switches in retaining a foreign status and/or a discernible internal structure, while code-switches often resemble borrowings in brevity (words, short phrases) and in being fitted into another language's syntax.

To deal with these problems, some scholars have expanded the terminology by adding a third term such as 'code-mixing' to cover certain intermediate cases such as Braille French (a borrowing of the French alphabet). Other terms include 'linguistic restitution' for special cases, such as 'loanblend' for combinations of a borrowed and a native element, like the German altfälchen old fashion (converting German alt 'old' and fälchen 'flick' into a word that is used in English. Coming from the other direction, spontaneous mixing of material from two languages most often takes the form of metathesis or code-switching, such that only those portions of language are included from a foreign language into slots in a clearly primary base language, rather than abrupt shifts from entire sentences of one language to those of another. In other words, borrowings may resemble code-switches in retaining a foreign status and/or a discernible internal structure, while code-switches often resemble borrowings in brevity (words, short phrases) and in being fitted into another language's syntax.
2.2 Spelling Pronunciations

Because literacy, including multilingual literacy, is now so pervasive, it is almost impossible to understand the phonology of recent borrowings in some regions (notably Europe) without recognizing the mediating role of spelling. Of course, this can hardly be avoided in borrowings from defunct languages, such as newly coined Latinisms, but the issue is important also in connection with living languages. The most obvious demonstration of orthographic interference is the frequent pronunciation of ‘silent’ letters in borrowed forms, corresponding to zero in the actual source form. Thus, standard dialects of Spanish (both continental and Latin) long ago ceased to pronounce initial h, but it is often heard in borrowings into English such as acabando.

However, there are probably many other cases where a phonological adaptation, though of a type not incompatible with the transmission, may have been influenced by orthography. In the case of (d)ij/aji discussed above (Sect. 2.1), the consistent avoidance of front unrounded [i] in native zéj in nativized pronunciations may have been subtly favored by the orthography (as well as by other factors including the pre-existing English term dij).

Even when the source and target languages have entirely different scripts, the transcription of source forms in the written target language may result in pronunciation differing from what one would expect from oral transmission. For example, the transcription of swaiku/yakki in restaurant menus and signs in French has resulted in pronunciations of these loanwords that are very different from the original pronunciation (see Sect. 2.3). Of course, to the extent that the orthography (whether phonemic or phonetic transcription) mediates borrowing, the earlier comment about the relevance of source-language prosody must be reconsidered.

G hematoallow than 3 the 44 borro 3s that take place 3 different inter 3 44 simil 3s contexts, where literacy in the source language is low. In these cases, the source language is likely to be spoken in a way that is very different from its written form. For example, the French high front rounded [i] is often converted into [i] rather than [i]; French borrowings [b] for [b] are borrowed as [b].

2.3 Reinforcement and Hybrid Borrowings

If a word from one source language is largely replaced by vocabulary from a successor language, this happens in pidgins and creoles (see Sect. 2.2). If one or other of the languages involved in a lexicon in less dramatic circumstances. Examples are Third World countries that have under the successful political and cultural influence of different European powers in Morocco. Spanish was the first dominant European influence (on the coast), to be followed by a more thorough domination of Arabic, which has left an enduring imprint on Moroccan Arabic in an other relatively simple form and adding a native verb like ‘be’ or ‘do’ in auxiliary function, or adding a ‘thematizing determinative’ between the root and regular target-language affixes.

The auxiliary structure is typical of borrowings from Arabic into Turkish. For example, instead of attempting to find an inflected form of the Literary Arabic verb ‘to thank’ (perfective stem jahar with phonemically suffix, or imperfective jahar with phonemically prefix and suffix) that could be directly borrowed, Turkish took an Arabic verbal noun salakalar ‘thankung’, combined it with the native Turkish verb ezmek ‘do’ (used here as an auxiliary), and produced the verb phrase teşekkür etmek ‘to thank’.

An example of a thematicizing affix is German -ieren, which is used heavily in verb borrowings, particularly from Latin and French: finanziere, elektrizieren, etc. Similarly, Mexican (Nahuatl) has thematicizers such as -asi for borrowing Spanish verbs: costa-as ‘to cost’ (Spanish infinitive cueste). In a sense, such stratagems are a last resort, a kind of admission that direct borrowing of verb stems is beyond the target language’s capacity. But there are many cases where direct verb-to-verb borrowing has occurred, involving highly inflected source and target languages, and although this topic has been neglected it is of great theoretical interest. There would seem to be two basic ways in which it could be done. One is to establish a crosslinguistic identification between a particular inflected form in the source and a particular inflected form in the target. For example, either the infinitive or the third-person singular present tense form of the source language could be bor- rowed as the corresponding form of the target, with further inflected forms being generated analogically within the target language. The second possibility is that the stem could be analytically abstracted from the paradigm of affixed forms in the source language, and could then be borrowed as a correspondingly abstract stem into the target language, the actual forms taking target-language affixes. The two hypothetical models can be illustrated as follows (1):

For Moroccan Arabic, one can work out what happened in the case of the noun verb stem of words borrowed from French. In the Spanish case, the most productive pattern is for the source-language infinitive form to be dropped. Moroccan Arabic has borrowed the inflected stem, in which its simplest function forms either as the third-person singular perfective or as the singular present imperfective. Of the inflected stems, the Arabic verb frinu ‘he cracked; brake!’ from which other forms with nozoo affix can be generated: frinu-ya ‘they cracked; they brake!’ in Moroccan verb frinu ‘he cracked; brake!’ from which other forms with nozoo affix can be generated: frinu-ya ‘they cracked; they brake!’

French verb borrowings into Moroccan Arabic, which probably did not begin until the French Protectorate in 1912, are much more difficult to associate with a consistent source form. The productive pattern for the borrowed stem to end in the vowel i in the most basic form frinu ‘he fractured’ (the Arabic imperfective), as in -ànit ‘sing.’ The trouble is that most such verb borrowings involve the major French verb class (with infinitive -er), and, because Moroccan Arabic borrows French jey as i as the final i in the Moroccan imperfective could correspond to any of several specific French forms: changer (infinitive, change) (past participle, souv) changer (second-person polite present or imperative), or chanuts chanauts (chance past imperative). To determine which of these French forms is the real source of Moroccan borrowings, one has to look at borrowings from the minor French verb classes, though some such borrowings are only sporadically used. Moroccan riya ‘react’ is compatible with the past participle riyd ‘reacted’ (past perfect with the imperfective haiya), or the past imperfective reiat. However, the sporadic Moroccan borrowing bysi ‘drink’ is compatible with the French perfect participle buvat ‘drank’, but not with the past participle bu or with the infinitive borer. From these data, it appears that no single French grammatical category is the consistent source form borrowed into Moroccan; rather, bilingual Moroccans are able to identify, for each French paradigm, a cluster of forms—differing from one paradigm to another—ending in a Moroccan eur in a high front vowel, and to borrow this as the Moroccan third-person singular imperfective (and the singular imperative).

This suggests a reassessment of the previous conclusion that the Spanish and Arabic forms were based on the English infinitive directly on the Spanish infinitive. In fact, an important feature of Spanish inflections is that the ‘infinitive’ (fern to ‘to become’) is in fact the second of the two inflections, notably the future and conditional (fern ‘I will brake,’ ferni ‘I would brake’), based. The third-person singular present tense form (fern) is used like an infinitive in the -er conjugation, and, with [i] instead of [s], past participle ferned might also be mentioned. In the light of the later French-to-Moroccan borrowings, one might suggest that the form in -er (-er, -or) was the primary basis for Spanish-to-Moroccan borrowings not because the infinitive as such was used in the present tense, effectively because this form (seemed to) Moroccans to be the most recurrent stem-shape in the larger paradigm.

Phonetically, speakers of the local language, what is now known as Tagalog (Cebuano) also borrowed heavily from Spanish until the early twentieth century, and, although English is now the dominant nonnative language, large numbers of
Spanish loanwords continue in use. In Philippine languages, there is a basic, unmarked form of the verb (to which further affixes can be added as needed), and there are no unmarked verbs on the canonical shape of verb stems. It is therefore mechanically much easier than in the Moro- 
case for Spanish to form the PinoFilPino verbs. Several dictionaries and Cebeano dictionaries 
show that some Spanish grammatical categories have served 
as (a) the simple form ending in unstressed -es (-e), functioning in Spanish as third-person singular present tense (but also imperatives: 'sing'); (b) the infinitive in -ar (verbal, -er, -ir); as in cantar, 
the past participle in -ado (-ado), as in contado, and 
related nouns. In a Cebeano dictionary, examples are readily found like 
abandonar or (denominally) abandona 'to abandon,' añadir or añadir 'to add;' or 
aventurar 'to venture.' Spanish abandonar or abandono, 
abandonar or abandono, abandona 
pressured forms of verbs, and, cases affixes on nouns, but a number of cases 
have been known for some time and many others have 
been reported. In one Romanian dialect, certain pronominal 
endings on verbs have been altered by Russian influence: 
*afl and *afl 'and afl' became aflum, and *afl you 'and afl' became 
affl (the local Bulgarian endings are -afl, -afl). In 1933, 
Ursul Wittendon explains that Greek loan verbs (e.g., application of 
the regular Bulgarian paradigm, which helped it 
'to cross over' into Romanian, but also in terms of the 
pre-existing paradigms in that language. They have forms like 
au in the two languages. Later theory tends to emphasize two 
points: (a) the initial phonological similarity between 
Romanian a and Bulgarian b as a kind of phonological 
catalyst, and (b) the increased phonological distinctiveness 
of the resulting paradigmatic endings. While factor 
(a) helps make the cross-linguistic morpheme association 
possible, (b) is more teleological, suggesting 'formal renewal' 
of a categorical distinction (threatened with neutralization 
due to parallel processes in the two languages) 
and the increased phonological distinctiveness 
of the resulting paradigmatic endings. While factor 
(a) helps make the cross-linguistic morpheme association 
possible, (b) is more teleological, suggesting 'formal renewal' 
of a categorical distinction (threatened with neutralization 
due to parallel processes in the two languages) 
and the increased phonological distinctiveness 
of the resulting paradigmatic endings. While factor 
(a) helps make the cross-linguistic morpheme association 
possible, (b) is more teleological, suggesting 'formal renewal' 
of a categorical distinction (threatened with neutralization 
due to parallel processes in the two languages) 
and the increased phonological distinctiveness 
of the resulting paradigmatic endings. While factor 
(a) helps make the cross-linguistic morpheme association 
possible, (b) is more teleological, suggesting 'formal renewal' 
of a categorical distinction (threatened with neutralization 
due to parallel processes in the two languages) 
and the increased phonological distinctiveness 
of the resulting paradigmatic endings. While factor
Borrowing

out of step with broader phonological patterns in the lan-
guage. In other words, borrowings provide new raw ma-
terial for the development of the language, and may give
the first precise glimpses of incipient underlying trends
in the language, trends to have had much effect on the
bulk of the inherited lexicon.

5. Borrowing in Social and Historical Context

5.1 Official Languages

In the modern world, much borrowing into standard lan-
guages is part of what is called 'mutualism', and may be
currently fostered by international organizations, as
well as being controlled or monitored by official
organizations or committees. Scientific and other academic
terminology, for example, reflects the forms of neologisms
collected from Latin or Greek compounds. These terms pass
easily from English to French to Spanish, or vice versa in any
direction—the suffixes are adjusted to the local language by
the translator.

It is debatable whether these international words can even
be called borrowings—the original compounds may never
have existed in Classical Latin or Greek, and it is often
unclear whether one modern language X has borrowed
the terms from a particular other modern language or has
simultaneously created its own Latin-to-X routines.

The role of advertising and (other) propaganda also
deserves a mention. At the time of writing, the whole
domain of the advertising business was being
transformed by the use of advertising media in new forms and
in other languages—media in which, for example, the
USA have been leading the way in innovation and in
commercialization. Even the language of advertising in
these countries has been progressively transformed by
transmitting to it a new meaning and a new character
from other languages.

5.1.2 Colonial and Postcolonial Contexts

For the purposes of this article, the label 'colonial' is
applied to any system in which the majority of natives are
subjected to a foreign power, and/or culturally subordi-
nated to one of the world's hegemonic powers. This applies
also to so-called protectorates (e.g., Morocco), 'adminis-
ted territories' (e.g., Puerto Rico), 'zones of influence' (e.g.,
Palesine), and annexed lands treated as provinces (e.g.,
Algeria), as well as to nominal 'colonies.' Moreover,
many former dependent countries are included, as they
have usually become more dependent culturally on the
former colonial power than during the colonial period itself
because of the huge postcolonial expansion of foreign
education, literacy, and broadcast media.

The extent of borrowing from colonial to native lan-
guages (and vice versa) is not only involved in the extent of actual colonial penetration. Some expressions are imported to the colonial period by the attitudes of native speakers, not of the sociolinguists
who study the systems. To some extent, any language that
is spoken on the streets, is written, and is used in schools
and other formal contexts is characterized by some high-
level loanwords and loanphrases. This is most often applied
in cases like Arabic and (Modern) Greek, where the lan-
guage of writing (and of lectures and news broadcasts) is
quite different from the vernacular. Standard Literat-
ary Arabic, for example, is close to the language of the
Qu‘ran and does not vary from one Arab country to
another. Some of the mutually unintelligible vernaculars
have developed, from Timbuktu to Central Asia, in the
interwoven, 1,300 years. Until the Romance languages
took root in the various parts of the Mediterranean, in the
Roman empire, one could describe their relationship to Latin as diglossic;
though for the illiterate masses the matter was mostly
interpreted().' 

Dialglossic borrowing (from the H variety into the spoken
form) is rather similar to borrowing from a colonial lan-
guage. Again a local vernacular is up against a dominant
international or at least suprasegmental variety used in
schools, writing, and broadcast media, in a world with ever-
increasing literacy and exposure to media. Accordingly, the
type of vocabulary that is borrowed from the H to the L
variety tends to be of the same semantic types as in colonial
contexts. In Morocco, where the local Arabic dialects
borrow both from French and from Literary Arabic, these
languages are written in the same orthography. Although
there is a partial division of labor (Literary Arabic for
Islamic subjects, French for sports), this division is not
sharp and is being undermined by shifts in official language
usage (the gradual Arabization of the educational system
and the bureaucracy). Because the diglossic H form is not
completely isolated from L, the French loanwords often
are diglossic borrowings (as there are often with foreign ones).

Mechanically, diglossic borrowing is much more straight-
forward than borrowing from unrelated or distantly related
foreign languages. Since the vernacular already shares many
tongues with the H variety, phonological and mor-
phological correspondences are usually obvious, and new
borrowings can simply follow these correspondences. Some
diglossic borrowings may form an identifiable lexical stra-
atum by virtue of containing a sound or other feature not
characteristic of the L variety, like Moroccan sra‘ (tact). ('Stomach
(medical), get healthy) or in-I-ruma (that (quotative) and in-I-rumma (because) instead of older
dialect forms, a change with important syntactic
ramifications.

5.3 Diglossia

'Diglossia,' a term introduced by Charles Ferguson (see
Ferguson, Colloquial, 4), is the occurrence in a community of
sharply different H and L (high and low, i.e., official
versus vernacular) varieties of the same language. The
somewhat different terms 'bilingual' and 'multilingual'
reflect the attitudes of native speakers, not of the sociolinguists
who study the systems. To some extent, any language that
is spoken on the streets, is written, and is used in school

to function permanently as ethnic minorities. A consider-
able variety of language attitudes are found among
the indigenous population, depending on such factors as the size, degree
of intactness, and isolation of the minority groups, as well as
the relations between the ethnic group and external phenomena. Thus, in
the Americas, the number of speakers of Nahua and Quechua,
or even Navajo, has assured the vernacular viability of the
language. In some cases, and even Spanish; some much smaller groups in the pueblos
or cantons of Arizona and New Mexico have remained
relatively isolated, either due to cultural isolation, or
on account of dominant group in-

ation. On the other hand, many Native American
and Australian languages have already disappeared and others
are considered near-extinct.

As long as the minority language remains viable as a
vernacular, the type of borrowing observed is similar to
that found in ordinary colonial situations like Morocco, the
Philippines, and Indonesia. However, as minority languages
lose their viability and head toward eventual extinction,
more extreme phenomena connected with 'language death'
are observed. The native language, whose grammar is
subject to simplification and instability among marginal
speakers (e.g., when addressing monolingual grandparents),
keeps to the unquestioned base language for code-
switching and the target language for borrowing. Instead,
some form of the dominant majority language comes to
be used among younger members of the minority group. At
a certain point, the native language, along with other forms
of traditional behavior associated with aged persons, comes
to be viewed by the younger generation as a quaint anachro-
nism, leading to its eventual replacement by the
English-like form of the native language

In this historically advanced stage, one might still
be able to speak of a 'minority dialect' (e.g., Native American
English) of the majority language spoken among members
of the minority. In some cases, a pidgin or creole may have
developed among the natives, the lexicon coming mostly
from the majority language (see Pidgins and Creoles); later on
this will slowly decrease, producing a new lexical contin-

uum with the standard form of the majority language (an
eexample is Australian Aboriginal English). In less extreme
cases, the most consistent marker of the native dialect may
simply be a noticeable accent. However, even as the
minority dialect shows signs of merging completely with the
majority language, a number of highly visible and
symbolically important borrowings from the original native language are maintained or even accentuated.
Whether such forms should be considered as borrowings into the
majority language, or as innovations in the minority dialect, is
a continuous process of replacement by majority language
by majoritarian communities.

5.5 Immigrant Communities

Until the early-twentieth century, immigrants to the
Americas could, if they wished, obtain unoccupied farm-
land and recreate in the New World the towns they had
left behind. Since then, immigrants have formed ethnic
communities or small kin-based networks, usually in
large cities.

A wide variety of attitudes and behaviors toward lan-
guage are observed within immigrant families, whether the
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children came with the parents or were born in the host country. While the parents attempt to minimize the use of the ethnic language (and ethnic culture in general), an approach that may reflect the hope of returning to the mother tongue or parental tongue, the effects of bilingualism and parental control of children’s behavior. Alternatively, some parents make explicit decisions to shift to the new majority language. This process may take various paths, including the use of the ethnic language—crèole or other heritage language, to be consciously intended to improve the children’s educational and career prospects.

A third event, sociolinguistic forces within immigrant neighborhoods, often speakers of the ethnic language—creole or other heritage language, may also be relatively complex, as the choice of spoken language becomes a critically important, non-manipulable symbol of identity. Moreover, in such communities there is considerable asymmetry in degrees of mastery of the respective languages, not only across generations but also, say, between elder and junior siblings within a family. Unless the ethnic community is regularly replenished by new waves of immigrants, linguisitic assimilation is usually complete no later than the third generation (the second born in the new country). However, even at this stage, if ethnic identity has retained any significance in the host country, interesting ethnic variabilities (‘ethnolects’) of the majority language may persist, consisting of a slight accent along with a repertoire of lexical items borrowed (or retained) from the ethnic language. Some of these lexical items are not understood by non-members, so the variety can function as a litmus test for ethnicity and as a barrier. A third-generation immigrant who speaks at the quintessence of his/her grandparents and has no strong identification with the old country may nonetheless continue to function in using an ethnic variety, especially with peers, since it effectively expresses a special, inter-ethnic identity.

Under particular conditions, ethnic languages and dialects can endure over centuries. This happens when minority ethnic or religious groups coexist with majority populations over many generations but remain relatively isolated and socially segregated. Jews in Europe and in Arab countries, particularly before the Nazi genocides (1939-45) and the mass immigration to Israel (after 1945), furnish many examples. The boundaries between Jews and Gentiles in some regions were sufficiently sharp to permit long-term coexistence of mutually unintelligible languages (Yiddish and Ukrainian; Judeo-Spanish and Bulgarian; Judeo-Arabic, and Hebrew). In other cases, local populations of Jews and Gentiles spoke structurally quite distinct dialects of the same language (Yiddish and German, Judeo-Arabic and Arabic) and, under late-twentieth century conditions of the tensions in Europe and the USA, some by no means all Jews can still be readily identified by accent (especially in New York City and Philadelphia, where there are large Jewish concentrations). Some speakers can switch into an in-group, Jewish English ethnolect (often known as ‘Yinglish’ in a variable amount of Hebrew and Yiddish vocabulary in an English base.

5.6 Decolonization

A pidgin is at least relatively unstable variety developed in marketplaces, plantations, and similar environments for limited communication among native speakers of different languages; a creole is a pidgin that has become a native language for a new generation and has stabilized its grammatical and vocabulary systems. Most pidgins and creoles are lexically derived from a European language (English, French, Portuguese, etc.). Of interest here is the development of pidgins and creoles that begin as communicational and lexical change subsequent to their emergence.

In many cases, the creole continues to be in a diglossic relationship to its original language—creol or standard English in Jamaica, creole and standard French in Haiti, creole and standard Portuguese in the Cape Verde Islands (the Senegalese-Cape Verdean language), as described in Sect. 5.3 are applicable. The resulting con- vergence of the two creole lexicons is called ‘creolization’. In such contexts, there is a continuum of varieties ranging from the ‘acrolect’ (the standard European language) through the intermediate ‘mesolect’ to the ‘basilect’ (closest to the original creole), with the long-term tendency generally a contraction of the continuum around the acrolectal pole. However, the vicissitudes of politics may result in the superimposition of a distinct European language on the creole. Tok Pisin (spoken in Papua New Guinea; Tok Pisin and Papua New Guinea) is usually classified as an English-based creole, but it originated as a German-based creole (or pidgin) and was relexified when German power ended in the region. A major topic in creolistics is the difficult philological unraveling of similar replacements of lexifier languages in the early development of other pidgins and creoles, such as Papiamento (Guianas) and Hawaiian Pidgin (see Hawaiian). In any event, reflexes of such a language are a useful conversational creole or an ordinary language with a large stratum of borrowings (cf. Sect. 2.3) (see also: Pidgins and Creoles: Morphology, Pidgins, Creoles and Change).

5.7 Purism—The Target Language Fights Back

Even in unoffical contexts, borrowing (and code-switching) has powerful symbolic connotations. In many cases, borrowings are highly conspicuous, perhaps because of some telltale phonological or orthographic feature or just because most people know they are foreign. Borrowings are therefore a prime target of linguistic nationalists (and others, purists) who wish to purify their language. The formative period of Modern Turkish is an instructive example. Under the influence of a charismatic political leader, Atatürk, Turkey emerged as an independent country after World War I, and promptly set about refashioning its cultural and political allegiances, shifting away from the Arabo-Persian legacy and, more or less, from its script that had been used in Turkey under the Ottoman Empire was thrown out in favor of the Latin orthography still in use. Official committees sifted through the lexicon, throwing out hundreds of well-entrenched Arabic and Persian borrowings, and incorporating many new borrowings from European languages. In case this latter development was interpreted as a challenge to Turkish sovereignty, the ‘sun language’ theory was propounded, claiming that Turkish, or another language, was the original basis for all European languages, and there are hundreds of words from European languages that were long-lost brethren being belatedly reintegrated into the fold (see Turkish: Turkey).

Every modern standard language has passed through periods of birth and adolescence. Most such standardized dialects and in each case an elite group had to decide how to produce new vocabulary. The Romance languages, and to a large extent English (with its significant comparison of French borrowings dating to the Norman period), mined Latin and to some extent Greek for much of their vocabulary. The development of standard German took a mixed approach, accepting some of this Latinate vocabulary (along with many French borrowings), but also using Latin internally generated German compounds—often transparent calques like Fernsehen modeled on tele-vision (‘distance-seen’). When literature in the early Modern period was written internally generated academic vocabulary was the semantic model, but new vocabulary was generated from Arabic roots using various derivational mechanisms, rather than by direct borrowing from Greek, and written Arabic continues to avoid Euro- pean borrowings. Scholars engaged in the development of other standard languages (Basque, Swahili, Tok Pisin) continue to agonize over this perennial issue. In the case of standard French, the elite is less concerned with expanding an already impressive vocabulary than with stemming an unseemly flood of English borrowings (see French: Franglais).

5.8 Borrowings and Special Registers

While the conspicuousness of borrowings makes them anathema to puritans, it may also make them attractive in various special contexts. A sprinkling of foreign words gives sociolinguistic content to an ethnolect (Sect. 5.5), and a locally designed term (like English `bureaucrat’) is a utilitarian register. Urban street slang is a fertile ground for borrowings, at least in bilingual areas. Moroccan slang (from Fez) provides such examples as pony (crown pumpkin, hook (filed borrowing = (Spanish campo ‘field’), swadli ‘pal, brother’ (playful mixture of Moroccan as-su ‘brother’ and the Spanish sin’ (‘sin’)) and maffalat (‘gang of thieves’). Some notable examples include ‘tadema ’(Arabic ‘magistrates’ or ‘majesty’), and the English loan tr-tuana ‘get stoned’ (on drugs, etc.).

6. Borrowings and Historical Linguistics

6.1 Borrowings as Fossils

The philological study of archaic borrowings often provides important incidental evidence for historical linguistic research. As one example, the Basque word boko ‘peace’ is clearly a borrowing from Latin pacem, an accusative singular pacem. The borrowing must have taken place fairly early in the Roman occupation of this region in northern Spain and southwestern France. Not only does the Basque form preserve the Latin e (as in Italian pace, contrast Spanish paz, French pac, it also shows that Latin (orthographic) was still pronounced as a velar stop [k] at the time of the borrowing. This is significant since there is little other evidence (apart from Sardinian dialects) for the existence of this group. Indeed, there are hundreds of similar examples in historical linguistics where an otherwise unattested form survives only as a borrowing into another language.

In the case of some ancient languages that are not them- selves extant but are nowhave functioned as substrata, apparent borrowings in the relevant surviving language (along with toponyms and personal names) may be the only surviving material to work with.

6.2 Lexical Core

What the linguists interested in studying the distribu- tion of borrowings over different sectors of the lexicon for its own interest, the matter is of particular concern to historical linguists. If a area of the lexicon is safe from borrowing, the very possibility of establishing long-distance genetic relationships among languages may be threatened. Certain scholars from the USA and former Soviet Union wish to push the horizons beyond Proto-Indo-European and other intermediate protolanguages to things like Proto-Eurasian or even Proto-World, arguing that long-distance relationships can be established based on very small lexical cores (including a few personal and demonstrative pronouns, but mostly nouns and verbs) thought to be highly resistant to borrowing or internal turn.
More controversial are efforts to use borrowings to establish more ancient contacts among ethnic groups and to equate the relevant proto-languages with archeological assemblages. One much-debated issue, identifying the geographical homeland of the original Indo-Europeans, involves a convergence of distinct methodologies from different disciplines, including the evaluation and chronological specification of borrowings between Proto-Indo-European and other ancient languages such as Proto-Italo-Latini (Mallory 1989). As multidisciplinary research of this type expands, an understanding of borrowing patterns is likely to have significant new applications.
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Bosnia and Herzegovina: Language Situation
At the time of writing it is difficult, following the breakup of Yugoslavia in 1992, to foretell with any degree of confidence the political future of the six republics that made up the country. The outcome of the fighting involving the different communities in Bosnia-Herzegovina—Serbs, Croats, and Muslims—is particularly hard to predict. Within the boundaries of the republic as they stood at the beginning of the period of unrest, the majority of the population speak Serbo-Croatian, though the preferred label for this language may vary from group to group.

See also: Serbo-Croat; Yugoslavia.

Botswana: Language Situation
Botswana is largely composed of the Kalahari Basin of the southern Africa Plateau; apart from the Limpopo and Chobe rivers, drainage is internal, and largely to the Okavango Swamp in the northwest.

The population is 1.2 million (1988 official estimate), and population density is a mere 2 people/sq. km. However, the population is concentrated in the more hilly sector in the east (80 percent), while the Kalahari desert of the central, west, and southwest of the country is home to numerous small nomadic Bushman (Khoisan) bands. The territory often attributed to Khoisan in language maps such as Greenberg's (see Greenberg, Joseph H.), is misleadingly extensive. Settled areas are better considered to be Bantu; Khoisan groups are a vanishingly small population (total some 40,000) restricted to arid areas. Some 24 percent of the population is reported as urban (World Bank estimate, 1984), which represents a rapid increase since 1965.

R. J. Sim

Bovelles, Charles de (1479–1566)

Bovelles was born in Saint-Quentin in 1479; he died in Ham (Somme) in 1566. A philosopher, theologian, and mathematician, he also wrote a treatise on his linguistic thoughts in 1533, published by Robert Etienne, in Paris: Liber de differentia vulgarium lingvarum et Gallicis sermonis varietate. It is his only book on linguistic matters. He was the disciple of Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples, then became a professor, possibly of mathematics. After various trips to Switzerland, Germany, Spain, and Italy he lived for some time in Paris before settling in Picardy from where he maintained an important correspondence in Latin with French and foreign scholars. He was appointed canon of the collegiate church in Saint-Quentin, then in Noyon.

In his treatise, he raises the question of the relation between the vernacular languages, French in particular, and Latin. As French grammar books were just beginning to be published, Bovelles wanted to show that the idea of fixing rules for the language is utopian considering the instability of language and the inconsistency of its use. He gives a historical account of the shaping of the French language with its parenthesis to Latin, then in a sort of phonetic approach, he studies the pronunciation of the letters of the Latin alphabet and its variations under the influence of heaven (horoscopus caelus) and the will of men (arbitrium hominum). His conclusion is that the vernacular language shows too many disadvantages for it to be corrected with rules and that none of its dialectal forms could be chosen as a model. Latin only is unalterable, the ideal archtype being the original language, the one used by God when he spoke to Adam and Eve, the one all men will find again on judgment day. This treatise is followed by a sort of etymological dictionary presenting tables of words that are explained and commented upon. It is to be noticed that about 60 percent of the etymologies provided are correct, which is a rather good score at a time when so many fanciful explanations were given as to the origin and meaning of words. Finally, the book closes on a brief and rather flighty collection of onomatopoeic topography, which constitutes no more than a curiosity.
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Boxhorn, Marcus Zuerius (1602–1253)

With C. Saunmaire, De hellemistica (1643) and G. K. Kirchmayer's school in Wittenberg (see Metcalfe 1974). Boxhorn's work represents one of the most accomplished efforts in pre-Copernicanism, in its search for a European prototype called "Sicythian."

Born in Bergenz op Zee (Netherlands) in 1602 or 1612, he studied at Leiden, where he became professor of rhetoric and history, until his untimely death in 1635. As a young teacher, he submitted to his famous colleague Claude Saunmaire linguistic comparisons (for example, between Greek Audo 'sweet,' Latin suavus, and 'Celtic' suad'). A strong Flemish tradition pushed him to look for the key of such a "harmony" in his national language. The latter had been set among the oldest mother-tongues, on the basis of a relation between the Cimmerians of the Black Sea and the Dutch-Cimbrians (see Swiggers 1984). Correspondences joining Persian and the Germanic languages had also been recently popularized by Justus Lipius.

Boxhorn undertook a systematic exploration of the analogies which united the European languages, including
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Boyce, Daniel (1806–1848)

Bora (Jare)_