

## LANGUAGES IN CONTACT AND CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS

BRODER CARSTENSEN

*University of Paderborn*

According to previous research and our own investigations, it is or should be possible:

1. to describe correspondences and differences between the Languages in Contact (LiC)-situation and Contrastive Linguistics (CL).
2. to attempt to apply the results of research into LiC to CL.

Furthermore, it should be possible

3. to apply the results from 1 and 2 to historical linguistics, to bilingualism and to other linguistic disciplines.

The basic constellation for LiC as well as CL is that  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  exert an influence on each other. However, LiC is characterized by a linguistic situation which, in general, should be approached from a diachronic viewpoint and which develops spontaneously. On the other hand, CL, which is subject to intentional steering and whose results mostly are or have to be applied to practical language teaching, is essentially a matter of synchronic linguistics.

It is necessary to differentiate different LiC-situations: the one taken as the basis for the following observations is the influence of  $L_1$  (English) on  $L_2$  (German). This process is mainly restricted to the written language and does not result in bilingualism (or diglossia). A different situation can be found in countries in which  $L_1$ -speakers have to learn  $L_2$  which is  $L_1$  in this particular environment, e.g. speakers of German who emigrate to Australia, the United States etc. In general, this LiC-situation happens in the spoken language and, ideally, results in bilingualism.

Other forms of the LiC-situation are possible, e.g. those whose result is creolization.

Still, both LiC and CL show a great number of common features. Correspondences can most clearly be seen in the phenomena of transference

(LiC), which are or can be relevant in CL as cases of transference and especially as cases of interference.

This is most obvious with phenomena like the following: phonemes in  $L_1$  which do not exist in  $L_2$  have to be substituted; lexemes which are transferred from  $L_2$  to  $L_1$  can undergo a development independent of their semantic models, and even syntagmemes can be transferred from one language to the other. An outline of an attempt will be made to systematize such phenomena occurring in LiC and to investigate how they can be evaluated and applied to CL.

All the observations made on LiC will be based on the Paderborn research-project "English influences on the German language after 1945".  $L_1$  is German,  $L_2$  is English.

Amongst others, the following categories can be derived from this particular LiC-situation, in which influences of  $L_2$  are responsible for changes in  $L_1$ :

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| phonology  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Phonemes of <math>L_2</math> which do not exist in <math>L_1</math> are substituted by their closest phonological equivalent(s):<br/>[dʒ], [tʃ], [θ], → [j] ..., [ʃ] ..., [s] ...: job, check, thriller ...</li> <li>2. Voiced final consonants in <math>L_2</math> are devoiced in <math>L_1</math>:<br/>b→p, d→t, g→k, v→f: job, trend, gag, live ...</li> <li>3. Stress-patterns of <math>L_2</math> can be transferred to lexemes of <math>L_1</math>:<br/>make-up→Make-úp, radar→Radár ...</li> <li>4. Diphthongs in <math>L_2</math> ([ei], [əv]) become monophthongs in <math>L_1</math>:<br/>[e:], [o:]: steak, show ...</li> </ol> |
| morphology | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A general tendency towards neuter gender seems to be at work when <math>L_2</math>-words enter <math>L_1</math>.</li> <li>2. <math>L_2</math> substantives remain in their <math>L_2</math> declension-classes or change to classes of <math>L_1</math>; mixed forms are possible:<br/>der Test — des Test, des Tests — die Tests, die Teste</li> <li>3. Morphological patterns of <math>L_2</math> can be changed in <math>L_1</math>:<br/>Mixpickles, Happy End, Dropse, Tennis-Crack etc. (← mixed pickles, happy ending, drops, a crack athlete).</li> </ol>  |
| lexis      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Etymological" transference result in "false friends":<br/>become→bekommen, closet→Klosett<br/>dome→Dom, tract→Trakt</li> <li>2. <math>L_2</math>-words extend the "lexical field"<br/>(Lied, Schlager+French chanson, English song, hit, ever-green)</li> </ol>  |
| semantics  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Semantic" transferences result in "false friends":<br/>eventually→eventuel, Schreibmaschine→writing machine</li> <li>2. Loan-meanings increase the range of meaning of <math>L_1</math>-words:<br/>kontrollieren, feuern, Philosophie (control, fire, philosophy)</li> </ol>   |

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| syntax     | <p>Syntactic transferences can add syntactic possibilities which did not exist previously:<br/>das kannst Du vergessen, ich sehe Dich morgen, in Deutsch, Gewinnen Sie ...! (forget it, I'll see you tomorrow, in German, Win ...!)</p> |
| pragmatics | <p>paradigms existing in <math>L_2</math> can be transferred to <math>L_1</math>, e.g. thanking for compliments</p>   |

These characteristics, derived from a particular LiC-situation, can be applied to the theory and practice of CL in the following points:

1. the derivation of complete or partial correspondences and differences between  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  which are relevant for
2. foreign language teaching. Problematic linguistic patterns which represent particular instances of difficulty for learners of  $L_2$  should thus become predictable: in other words, we should be in a position to isolate the cases of interference from the total quantity of transferences.
3. Principles of language acquisition should be derivable when we take  $L_2$  as a starting-point.
4. Cases which present problems in CL could be illustrated by examples taken from the LiC-situation.

The concept of an (imaginary) norm is essential with regard to all these questions. There is a wide spectrum of possibilities as far as the LiC-situation is concerned, ranging from peripheral interferences ("false" pronunciations, syntactic constructions etc.) to changes of the norm. CL will have to deduce a notion of norm and will, essentially, have to base this notion on the principle of frequency. In other cases, the prestige value of  $L_2$  will be essential.

Furthermore, it will be important to investigate spoken and written language separately.

The problem of the norm will also have to be extended to the two related linguistic situations under consideration. The model outlined is based on a speaker who is competent in  $L_1$ , who is exposed to  $L_2$  and who integrates cases of transference of  $L_2$  at least partly; in this process, however, influences of extremely varying degrees can be observed, ranging from zero to actual interference(s). CL, however, is concerned with the investigation of all possible linguistic phenomena in  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  and particularly with the influences of  $L_2$  on  $L_1$ , whereas CL is primarily concerned with cases of transference in the field of grammar.

This outline makes possible some interesting insights and shows parallels in addition to results already known, e.g. devoicing of final consonants, a process which played an essential role in the Germanic Sound Shift; in the same way, changes in stress-patterns were of importance in (pre-)Germanic times.

In the field of lexis, the English language is a model example for the effects which an L<sub>2</sub>, in this particular case French, can have.

There are numerous examples of linguistic changes resulting from a LiC-situation. The description of these cases might possibly be the starting-point for observations on language-typology. There is a wide range extending from single phenomena like the English influence on German up to creolized languages, and all these possibilities have been recorded in the development of languages.