

Loanwords in the Taxonomy of Borrowing: A Sociolinguistic Analysis

Loae Fakhri Jdetawy and Mohd Hilmi Hamzah

School of Languages, Civilisation & Philosophy

Universiti Utara Malaysia

jdtwy@yahoo.com

Abstract

The current research paper discusses the phenomenon of loanwords in light of a range of other borrowing phenomena that are more or less closely related to loanwords. The study concluded that loanwords make up the most frequent type of lexical borrowing and an inevitable consequence, among other various outcomes, of the contact between languages. The study further concluded that borrowing loanwords allows the recipient language to expand its vocabulary. However, the loanwords borrowed from any donor language have to undergo certain processes to make them fit appropriately into the recipient language. These processes include: 1) a process of adaptation, in which non-native phonemes are substituted to fit the recipient language's sound structure, and 2) a process of accommodation, in which phonological patterns are modified according to the phonological rules of the recipient language. The results provided from this present study also showed that there are different levels to which a borrowed loanword from the donor language becomes assimilated into the recipient language. In addition, the level of such assimilation depends on two factors: time and usage. That is, the longer the loanword is borrowed from the donor language and the more it is used by the speakers of the recipient language, the greater its degree of assimilation and familiarity. Finally, many reasons and motives lying behind the existence of loanwords were highlighted in the current research paper.

Keywords: Language contact, loanwords, borrowing, cognates, calque, phono-semantic matching, donor language, recipient language.

Introduction

The linguistic diversity, or the diversity of the languages spoken worldwide by the world's population makes language a remarkable cultural phenomenon (Hennig, 2018). As for the map of the diversity of languages around the world, according to Lewis, et al. (2015) and Eberhard, et al, (2020), it is believed that around 7,099 living languages are spoken around the world among which 3,982 of these languages have a developed writing system.

In fact, the diversity of the languages includes the existence of various languages and their distribution in various regions, countries, or even among civilizations, as well as their evolution in historical context, and their mutual interaction. Further, the linguistic diversity can also include the influence of languages on each other. Additionally, linguistic diversity represents the specific measurement of a particular language's density, the concentration of unique languages together, the diversity of the language's populations, or even the linguistic diversity of a specific place in a way that such measurement covers various types of traits including; languages' families, languages' grammar, and their vocabulary.

In light of the previous mentioned linguistic diversity, all languages tend to show some degree of contact, interference, mixing, and borrowing due to the virtue of containing loanwords (Matras, 2000). Critically, the study of the contact and interference of the languages plays a significant role in presenting valuable information on the journey of languages, the journey of the people who speak these languages, and other communities who come into contact with these languages or their speakers and how this might give us a clarification on the outcomes of the contact and interference of the languages that can be seen through the use of exact same words and concepts by different nations and communities that are geographically remote (UL, 2020).

Moreover, languages expand their vocabulary using the usual word-formation processes such as: derivation, compounding, blending, and clipping. Moreover, languages can also achieve this goal through borrowing new words from other languages with which they come in contact which is indeed an almost inevitable consequence of this contact. Borrowing is defined as a process that occurs in various situations of language contact and by which a language or a variety of language takes new linguistic material, such as words or phrases, from another language or another language variety, usually called the donor. The term 'loanword', which makes up the most frequent type of lexical borrowing, refers to the borrowing of both, the form of a word and the associated word meaning (Grabmann, 2015). Haspelmath said that "loanwords often undergo changes to make them fit better into the recipient language. These changes are generally called 'loanword adaptation' (or loanword integration) [...]" (2009: 42).

The current research paper discusses the phenomenon of loanwords in light of a range of other borrowing phenomena that are more or less closely related to loanwords and which are all resulted from the occurrence of language contact.

Language Contact and Language Interference

During the communication process, the various languages or language varieties used by the interlocutors involved in a conversation or a dialogue are subject to language interference (in which linguistic features from one language are applied to another by a bilingual or multilingual

speaker) (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000; Chang & Mishler, 2012), and language contact (in which the speakers of two or more languages or varieties interact and influence each other) (Hickey, 2010; Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

Such adoption of new words occurs while using two or more languages or language varieties. The term ‘language varieties’, henceforth, refers to dialects, registers, styles, or other forms of language, including: 1) standard language varieties; which refers to the standardized entirety of a language that includes the dialects spoken and written in centers of commerce and government and employed by a population for public communication. These standard varieties are inherently superior and acquire the social prestige associated with commerce and government (Finegan, 2007; Curzan, 2002; Davila, 2016), and 2) nonstandard language varieties; which include the nonstandard dialects (also known as vernacular dialects) that are associated with a particular set of vocabulary, and spoken using a less prestigious or correct variety of accents, styles, and registers that have not historically benefited from the institutional support or sanction that a standard dialect has (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998; McWhorter, 2001).

As a result of such interference and contact that take place while interlocutors are interaction using two or more languages or language varieties, the linguistic phenomenon of loanwords occurs. In this phenomenon, word/words are adopted from one language (known as ‘the donor language’) and incorporated into another language without translation (Cannon, 1999; Einar, 1950; Stanforth, 2002). Such exchange of words shows how languages influence each other.

The most common way that languages influence each other is the exchange of words. Much is made about the contemporary borrowing of English words into other languages, but this phenomenon is not new, nor is it very large by historical standards. The large-scale importation of words from Latin, French and other languages into English in the 16th and 17th centuries was more significant. Some languages have borrowed so much that they have become scarcely recognizable. Armenian borrowed so many words from Iranian languages, for example, that it was at first considered a branch of the Indo-Iranian languages. It was not recognized as an independent branch of the Indo-European languages for many decades (Waterman, 1976).

Lastly, it is important to highlight that in the study of language contact and language interference in communities, ‘sociolinguistics’, which is the study of language use in society, is used effectively in this respect (Gooden, 2019). Meanwhile, there is a relevant, but boarder discipline that is also used effectively in this regard which is ‘linguistic ecology’, that is defined as the study of how languages interact with each other and the places they are spoken in (Mufwene, 2001).

Loanwords

During the process of communication, where language is its main verbal tool, new words might sometimes appear, and this is due to the self-developmental nature of the language. Further, each word in the language, whether original or new adopted one, is very significant as it represents a unit of a single distinct meaningful element of speech or writing, used with others to form a sentence that should be known and understood. As for the new words that are borrowed from other languages, these words are called ‘loanwords’ (Ilmina, 2016).

The concept of ‘loanwords’ is defined as the words that are borrowed and adopted from one language (the donor language) and incorporated into another language without translation. Hence, the loanword originates in a donor language and ends up in a recipient language. These are the two roles necessarily involved in any borrowing event. Loanwords are also defined as the lexical items that have been transferred from one linguistic variety into another through contact between their speakers by means of contact which leads to convergence instead of inheritance which leads to divergence (Haspelmath, 2009; Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009). In other words, the process of borrowing loanwords, which often entails a certain amount of bilingualism, includes taking over new words from other languages together with the concepts and ideas they stand for and adopt them in the original native language (Yule, 2006).

The language from which a loanword has been borrowed is called ‘the donor language’, (also called ‘source language’ or ‘borrowing language’) and the language into which it has been borrowed is called ‘the recipient language’ (also called ‘model language’ or ‘replica language’). Further, the word that served as a model for the loanword is called ‘a source word’ (Haspelmath, 2009). Haspelmath added that in the narrow sense, the loanwords are always lexemes (i.e. words), not lexical phrases, and these lexemes are normally unanalyzable units in the recipient language. However, and by contrast, the corresponding source words adopted from the donor language might be phrasal or even complex words, but their internal structures are lost when they enter the recipient language (2009). For example, in Russian language, the loanword ‘buterbrod’ (Eng. ‘sandwich’), was borrowed from German language; particularly the word ‘butter-brot’ (Eng. ‘butter-bread’). In this example, ‘butter-brot’ is a German transparent compound, and since Russian language has no other words with the elements ‘buter’ or ‘brod’, the loan word ‘buterbrod’ was borrowed this way, i.e., mono-morphemic and not analyzable by Russian native speakers. However, when any language borrows multiple complex words from any other language, the elements may recur with a similar meaning, so that the morphological structure may be reconstituted. For example, there are numerous Japanese loanwords which are based on Chinese compounds such as the Japanese borrowed loanword ‘kokumin’ – ‘国民’ (Eng. ‘citizen’) which was borrowed from Chinese word ‘guó-mín’ – ‘国民’ (Eng. ‘nationals’, ‘citizens’, ‘people of a nation’). Further, Japanese has also borrowed other loanwords with the element ‘kok(u)’ – ‘国’

(Eng. 'country'), for example 'kok-ka' – '国家' (Eng. 'nation'), 'kokuō' – '国王' (Eng. 'king') and other words with the element 'min' – '民' (Eng. 'people'), for example 'minshū' – '民衆' (Eng. 'population'), 'jūmin' – '住民', (Eng. 'residents' and 'inhabitant') (Haspelmath, 2009). Moreover, according to Häkkinen (2013), when borrowing loanwords, loanwords often undergo: 1) a process of adaptation, in which non-native phonemes are substituted to fit the recipient language's sound structure and 2) a process of accommodation, in which phonological patterns are modified according to the phonological rules of the recipient language, (e.g., the Finnish word 'peti' (Eng. 'bed') < Swedish word 'bädd' 'id.' (the foreign sounds 'b' and 'd' have been adapted to the native 'p' and 't'. Another example mentioned by Campbell (2013:60) shows how in the Finnish word 'ruuvi' (Eng. 'screw') < Swedish word 'skruv' 'id.', the initial consonant cluster which is formerly unpermitted in Finnish has been simplified into a single consonant, and thus accommodated into the native phonological structure. Campbell (2013) asserted that such substitution patterns should not be confused with the regularity of sound change in inherited words. Campbell added that the location in time of the borrowing event (due to the changing nature of languages' phonology) and the extent to which the speakers of the recipient language are familiar with the donor language are significant factors that may have an effect on the outcome of the substitution (ibid: 2013).

There are different levels to which a borrowed loanword from the donor language become assimilated into the recipient language. In addition, the level of such assimilation depends on two factors; time and usage, in a way that the longer since the loanword was borrowed from the donor language and the more it is used by the speakers of the recipient language, the greater its degree of assimilation and familiarity. In English language, for example, words such as 'area' and 'problem' which are from Greek are more familiar than other words such as 'euphoria' and 'persona', which are also from a Greek origin. Similarly, the word 'marriage', which is from French has been Anglicized while other French words such as 'montage' still retains its original French spelling and pronunciation.

A simple dichotomy divides loanwords into: 1) cultural borrowings (also called 'cultural loans'), which designate a new concept coming from outside, and core borrowings, which duplicate or replace meanings of existing native words (Myers-Scotton, 2002; Myers-Scotton, 2006).

The table below shows many examples on loanwords cases that can be found in many languages (CNRTL Ortolang, 2020; Jordan, 2019; Abdel Rahman 1989; Abu Ghoush, 1977; Bueasa, 2015; Hitchings, 2008; Kemmer, 2019; E.Z. Glot, 2020; Knapp, 2011; Chesley & Baayen, 2010; Sarah, 2001; Carr, 1934).

Language Loanwords Etymological origin

| | | |
|----------------|--------|---|
| English | ‘Café’ | French: ‘café’ |
| ‘bazaar’ | | Persian: ‘بازار’ |
| ‘kindergarten’ | | German: ‘Kindergarten’ |
| ‘déjà vu’ | | French: ‘déjà vu’ |
| ‘algebra’ | | Arabic: ‘al-djabir’ ‘الجبر’ |
| ‘alcohol’ | | Arabic: ‘al kohol’ ‘الكحول’ |
| ‘coffee’ | | Arabic: ‘qahwah’ ‘قهوة’ |
| ‘mustang’ | | Spanish: ‘mustango’ from ‘mesteño’ (Eng. ‘untamed’) |
| ‘abbreviation’ | | French: ‘abréviation’ |
| ‘almond’ | | Old French: ‘almande’. Modern French: ‘amande’ |
| ‘ancestor’ | | Old French: ‘ancestre’. Modern French: ‘ancêtre’ |
| ‘acrobat’ | | French: ‘acrobate’ |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Arabic | ‘باص’ ‘bas’ | English: ‘bus’ |
| ‘موضة’ ‘moda’ | | Italian: ‘moda’ (Eng. ‘fashion’) |
| ‘إسفنج’ /ʔisfanʒ/ | | English: ‘sponge’ |
| ‘اقليم’ /ʔiqlīm/ | | Greek: ‘klīma’ (Eng. ‘region’) |
| ‘سيجارة’ /sidʒa:rah/ | | English: ‘cigarette’ |
| ‘درهم’ /dirham/ | | Greek: ‘dhrakhmi’ (Eng. ‘a silver coin’) |
| ‘اسبرين’ /ʔisbiri:n/ | | English: ‘aspirin’ |
| ‘ميكانيكي’ /mikan'i:ki/ | | English: ‘mechanic’ |
| ‘بطريق’ /batri:q/ | | Greek: ‘patrikos’ (Eng. ‘penguin’) |
| ‘فايروس’ /fāyru:s/ | | English: ‘virus’ |
| ‘شوفير’ /ʃō-'fər/ | | French: ‘chauffeur’ |
| ‘شطرنج’ /ʃatrənʒ/ | | Persian: ‘شطرنج’ (Eng. ‘chess’) |
| ‘جمرك’ /jumrik/ | | Turkish: ‘djumrik’ (Eng. ‘customs’) |
| ‘أنشوجة’ ‘anchova’ /ʔanshūdjah/ | | Spanish: ‘anchoas’ (Eng. ‘anchovies’) |
| ‘كمنجة’ /kamandʒah/ | | Persian: ‘kamāncha’ (Eng. ‘violin’) |
| ‘دينار’ /dīnār/ | | Latin: ‘denarius’ (Eng. ‘money’) |

| | | |
|---------|-----------------------|---|
| Turkish | ‘ajanda’ / ‘gündem’ | French: ‘agenda’ (Eng. ‘agenda’) |
| | ‘enerji’ / ‘erke’ | French: ‘énergie’ (Eng. ‘energy’) |
| | ‘kapasite’ / ‘kapsam’ | French: ‘capacité’ (Eng. ‘capacity’) |
| | ‘akrep’ | Arabic: ‘عقرب’ (Eng. ‘scorpion’) |
| | ‘alaka’ | Arabic: ‘علاقة’ (Eng. ‘relationship’) |
| | ‘asıl’ | Arabic: ‘أصل’ (Eng. ‘origin’) |
| | ‘ders’ | Arabic: ‘درس’ (Eng. ‘lesson’) |
| | ‘fakat’ | Arabic: ‘فقط’ (Eng. ‘just’) |
| | ‘intikam’ | Arabic: ‘انتقام’ (Eng. ‘revenge’) |
| | ‘takvim’ | Arabic: ‘تقويم’ (Eng. ‘Calendar’) |
| | ‘sütyen’ | French: ‘soutien-gorge’ (Eng. ‘bra’) |
| | ‘kuaför’ | French: ‘coiffeur’ (Eng. ‘hairdresser’) |
| | ‘düşman’ | Persian: ‘دشمن’ (Eng. ‘enemy’) |
| | ‘şah’ | Persian: ‘شاه’ (Eng. ‘king’) |

| | | |
|--------|--------------------|--|
| French | ‘abricot’ | Arabic: ‘الْبَرْقُوقُ’ /al barqūq/ |
| | ‘algèbre’ | Arabic: ‘الجبر’ (Eng. ‘algebra’) |
| | ‘almanach’ | Arabic: ‘المناح’- almanakh’. (Eng. ‘environment’) |
| | ‘cabas’ | Arabic: ‘قفص’ (Eng. ‘basket for shopping’) قفص |
| | ‘carat’ | Arabic: ‘قيراط’ (Eng. (‘gem mass’ or ‘metal purity’) |
| | ‘chèque’ | Arabic: ‘صك’ (Eng. ‘check’) |
| | ‘cramoisi’ | Arabic: ‘قرمزي’ (Eng. (‘crimson’) |
| | ‘haschisch’ | Arabic: ‘حشيش’ (Eng. ‘cannabis plant’) |
| | ‘magie’ | English: ‘magic’ |
| | ‘airbag’ | English: ‘airbag’ |
| | ‘astéroïde’ | English: ‘asteroid’ |
| | ‘caméraman’ | English: ‘cameraman’ |
| | ‘électricité’ from | English: ‘electricity’ |

To sum up, loanword (also called ‘lexical borrowing’) is a term used to refer to the process by which a word is being transferred from one language, the source language (also known as the ‘donor language’), into another language (also known as the ‘recipient language’). Moreover, words which are borrowed into the recipient language are either getting adopted or adapted. Adoption is a term used to refer to the process of borrowing words from the source language yet keeping the loanwords’ original form and pronunciation as it is in the source language, as if the word is getting copied from the source language and pasted into the recipient language. Such

adopted loanwords are sometimes called foreignisms (Bueasa, 2015). Examples of such adopted words can be seen in English which borrowed ‘café’, ‘coffee’ from French and ‘kindergarten’, ‘children’s garden’ from German. In contrast, adaption refers to the process where loanwords undergo certain phonological, morphological, syntactic, or orthographical alterations. For example, English word ‘virus’, when integrated into Arabic was phonologically changed into the Arabic ‘fāyrus’, that is, English /v/ is changed into /f/ in Arabic which is due to the lack of such phoneme in Arabic; French ‘metre’, ‘meter’ was integrated into Arabic morphological patterns, which gave rise to the plural form ‘amtār’; and French ‘chauffeur’, when borrowed into Spanish, was orthographically altered as ‘chofer’ (ibid).

Loanwords and Borrowing

The terms ‘borrowing’, ‘borrowed words’, or ‘lexical borrowing’ and the term ‘loanwords’ are synonyms terms. Hock (1986) said that “the term, ‘borrowing’ refers to the adoption of individual words or even large sets of vocabulary items from another language or dialect (ibid: 380)”. This process is called borrowing, although the lending language does not lose its word, nor does the borrowing language return the word. A better term might be ‘copying’ but borrowing has long been established in this sense and words that are borrowed are called ‘loan words’ (Trask, 1996). Actually, in any case of lexical borrowing, a selected word from the source language (the donor language) is adapted for use into the target language (the recipient language) or vice versa. This adapted word is called ‘a borrowed word’ in the first case and ‘a loanword’ in the second case.

Although the term ‘borrowing’ has a common and broad sense since its types depend on whether the borrowers are native speakers or non-native speakers, and whether the borrowing process include adoption and imposition, or, equivalently, retention (Winford, 2005; Van Coetsem, 1988), however, in the current research paper, the researchers used the term ‘borrowing’ in a restricted sense in a way that it refers to ‘lexical borrowing’. In addition, since the borrowing of loanwords, according to Campbell, can include any aspect of language (2013), for example, phonological, morphological or syntactic features. However, the researchers narrowed the object of research paper down to lexemes (i.e. words), thus excluding all other types of borrowing.

Thomason & Kaufman (1988) pointed out that in the lexical borrowing of loanwords, at some point in the history of any particular language, a word entered its lexicon as a result of transfer (also called copying and borrowing). However, there are a number of points to note with regard to this explanation. The first point is that the notion of borrowing is used in two different senses, including: a) it is used prevalently and within a general sense to refer to all kinds of transfer or copying processes, whether they are due to native speakers adopting elements from other languages into the recipient language, or whether they result from non-native speakers imposing

properties of their native language onto a recipient language, and b) it is used in a more restricted sense to refer to the incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers' native language", i.e., adoption or imposition.

Furthermore, a distinction should be made between material borrowing (also called 'matter borrowing' and structural borrowing (also called 'pattern borrowing'). In material borrowing, the sound-meaning pairs (generally lexemes, or more precisely lexeme stems) are borrowed. In addition, affixes or even the entire phrases are sometimes borrowed. On the other hand, in structural borrowing, syntactic, morphological or semantic patterns are copied. For example, semantic patterns such as kinship term systems and word order patterns (Matras & Sakel, 2007). In both types, the word that is borrowed from the donor language is either inserted directly into the recipient language's lexicology without any concern for the original pronunciation of the word or its adaption to the phonological structure of the recipient language in order to maintain the donor language's form as much as possible (Lev-Ari and Peperkamp, 2013).

In fact, loanwords are considered the most significant type of material borrowing. On the other hand, the most important type of structural borrowing is loan translations (also called 'calques'), in which a single word or even a complex lexical unit, such as a fixed phrasal expression, are created by an item-by-item translation of the complex source unit. Compound nouns represent the most frequently cited examples of calques. For example, the German phrase 'herunter-laden' is calqued from the English phrase 'down-load'. Further, calques may take the form of morphological derivatives. For example, the Italian 'marcat-ezza' is calqued from English 'marked-ness'. Besides, calques may take the form of fixed phrasal expressions. For example, the English phrase 'marriage of convenience' is calqued from the French phrase 'mariage de convenance'. Loan meaning extension is also another extremely common type of structural borrowing, which refers to copying a polysemy pattern of a donor language word into the recipient language.

For instance, the English word 'head' is used in a technical sense to refer to the main word in a syntactic phrase, and following this usage, the German word 'kopf' (Eng. 'head') is also used to refer to the main word in a syntactic phrase. The last type of structural borrowing is loan creations, which refers to the words' formations processes that were inspired by a foreign concept but whose structures are not patterned on their expression by any chance. For instance, the German word 'umwelt' ('um'- 'welt') (Eng. 'around-world') was coined to render French word 'milieu' ('mi'- 'lieu') (Eng. 'mid-place') to refer to 'environment' (Haugen, 1950: 219). In the previous examples, these words, according to Haugen, "may ultimately be due to contact with a second culture and its language, but...are not strictly loans at all" (1950: 220). However, if the meaning

of the loan creation is an exact copy of the meaning of the model word, then it is a clear case of pure semantic borrowing (ibid).

Substantially, Haugen (1950) believed that loanwords are one of the most common phenomena in language contact, and almost every language exhibits one or more forms of borrowing. In lexical borrowing, words are transferred from one language and integrated into another language. Furthermore, Haugen suggested a notable taxonomy to distinguish between different borrowed items:

1. Loanwords which involve copying both the form and the meaning.
2. Loan-blends which are those borrowed words where a copied part exists along with a native part.
3. Loan-shifts which show copying only of the meaning and include both loan-translation and semantic borrowing.

Motivations and Reasons Behind Loanwords

In the field of contact linguistics, there are essentially two hypotheses about the motivations and reasons for the lexical borrowing, i.e., loanwords, in languages. The first hypothesis is called the ‘deficit hypotheses’ and the second hypothesis is called the ‘dominance hypothesis’ (Kachru, 1994). Kachru (1994:139) said that “the deficit hypothesis presupposes that borrowing entails linguistic ‘gaps’ in a language and the prime motivation for borrowing is to remedy the linguistic ‘deficit’, especially in the lexical resources of a language.” Based on Kachru’s point of view, loanwords are borrowed from other languages, i.e., the donor languages, because there are no equivalents of the borrowed words in the recipient language. For instance, some objects or creatures do not exist in certain places, hence their names are not part of the languages used in these places. As result, when there is a need to refer to these objects and creatures, the speakers of the recipient language tend to borrow their original names from the donor language/s. Such lexical borrowing applies also on cultural terms relating to food, dress, music, etc., which are peculiar to certain people, place, and environment. For example, English language does not have equivalents to several musical terms, thus terms such as ‘soprano’ and ‘tempo’ were borrowed from Italian. Similarly, culinary terms such as ‘casserole’, ‘puree’, and ‘sauté’ were borrowed from French (Jackson, 2002). Conversely, Czech language has borrowed words relating to Western culture and entertainment from English language. Besides, English sports terms such as ‘hockey’, ‘football’, and ‘tennis’ were also borrowed by Czech language. Equivalently, Japanese language has borrowed English sports terms such as ‘golf’, ‘table tennis’, and ‘baseball’. In addition, English terms for modern fashion and cosmetics were also borrowed by Japanese language (Ishiwata, 1986).

On the other hand, “the ‘dominance hypothesis’ presupposes that when two cultures come into contact, the direction of culture learning and subsequent word-borrowing is not mutual, but from the dominant to the subordinate” Higa (1979:378). Hence, according to the ‘dominance hypothesis’, borrowing loanwords is not necessarily done due to a lack of native equivalents in the recipient language or to fill lexical gaps, in fact loanwords are borrowed from the donor language because such words seem to have a high level of prestige –despite the availability of their native equivalents in the recipient language (ibid).

A case of borrowing loanwords in accordance with ‘dominance hypothesis’ can be seen in a prolonged socio-cultural interaction between the ruling countries and the countries they governed. For instance, English language has borrowed a lot of loanwords and lexicon from other languages, approximately from 84 languages, with French (25%) being the most important donor. In addition, English borrowed thousands of loanwords from French in the 11th century and a great deal of these words became a part of the English lexicon (Kachru, 1994; Stockwell & Minkova 2001; Thomas 2007; Katamba 2004). Such linguistic dominance of the French language over English language has started in 1066, especially During the reign of William I, through which French started to represent a higher social and cultural status as French nobles took over from English officials and a result, many French words were incorporated into English language which was, at that particular time, the language used among the masses (Fennell, 2001). The French borrowed loanwords included words from politics and economics domains such as: ‘labor’, ‘duke’, ‘market’, and other words associated with fashion and style such as ‘apparel’, ‘costume’, and ‘dress’ (Barber 2000: 147; Alastair, 2005: 248).

Nevertheless, when the English-speaking countries later became very powerful and advanced, and they colonized many other countries around the world, English language became the most influential language in the world and hence other languages started to borrow English loanwords instead of lending their loanwords to English (Kachru, 1994). Similarly, Japanese has also an influence on English language. Many Japanese words, especially those associated with military action and war were incorporated into English language English lexicon such as: ‘karate’, ‘kamikaze’, and ‘samurai’, in addition to other words from various domains such as: ‘kimono’ and ‘origami’ (Evans, 1997). Comparably, Spanish, which is widely spoken in the USA; approximately 22,400,000 people use Spanish as their second language, has similar influence on English language as well. Many Spanish words have entered the English lexicon since the 16th century such as ‘barracuda’, ‘alligator’, ‘canoe’, ‘avocado’, ‘domino’, ‘cargo’, ‘cigar’, ‘tobacco’, ‘tornado’, ‘potato’, ‘vanilla’, and ‘tortilla’ (Jackson & Ze Amvela, 2002: 40-41). Conversely, a great deal of Spanish loanwords borrowed into the Pilipino language in various domains such as religion, law and government, and social organization. Such influence was due to the Spanish 377-year colonialism of the Philippines (Bautista, 2004).

Finally, another influence on English language, as well as many European languages, was made by Greek language. Bien et al. (2004: 189) said that “thousands of words from ancient Greek entered Latin and then passed from Latin to the Romance languages. Thousands more travelled directly from Greece, especially to France, and from there once again to England. And, of course medical science today continues to rely on Greek to name its procedures”. To sum up, and based on the previous mentioned examples, it must be noted that the amounts of borrowed loanwords as well as the domains of these loanwords are determined by the degree of influence of the donor languages on the recipient languages.

Usunier & Lee (2005) added that a word is borrowed into a new language if it is coherent with the incorporating environment and culture. Further, Campbell (2013) asserted that a recipient language normally borrows words from other donor languages either: 1) out of need, through which a new concept is acquired by contact with another group from the donor language and due to the need for a word that expresses this concept, hence this word is borrowed from the donor language along with the concept. This is why many words such as ‘coffee’ and ‘tobacco’ are used literally in many languages; or 2) out of prestige, especially if the donor language is associated with a higher status.

Haspelmath (2009: 50) confirmed that borrowing loanwords could also occur due to therapeutic reason in case the original word in the native language is unavailable. In addition, the lexical borrowing of loanwords, according to some academics could occur because of other reasons including: 1) cultural borrowing (borrowing of new words along with new concepts); 2) core borrowing (borrowing for reasons of prestige); 3) borrowing due to word taboo (in some cultures, there are strict word taboo rules, e.g. rules in some Australian languages that prohibit a certain word that occurs in a deceased person’s name, or a word that occurs in the name of a taboo relative (Dixon, 2002). In such cases, a language may acquire large parts of another language’s basic lexicon, so that its genealogical position is recognizable only from its grammatical morphemes (Comrie, 2000); and 4) borrowing for reasons of homonymy avoidance (Rédei, 1970) (if a word becomes too similar to another word due to sound change, the homonymy clash might be avoided by borrowing. Thus, it has been suggested that the homonymy of earlier English ‘bread’ (from Old English ‘bræde’ which means ‘roast meat’) and ‘bread’ (from Old English ‘bread’ which means ‘morsel’, ‘bread’) led to the replacement of the first by a French loanword ‘roast’ (from Old French ‘rost’) (Burnley, 1992: 493).

Additionally, Fraser, K. (2019). Pointed out other reasons for borrowing loanwords. She said that borrowed loanwords result from the age of exploration in which new things were discovered from around the world and named from words taken from the local language. For example, the word ‘Chimpanzee’ was borrowed from the West African language Tshiluba, the

word ‘geyser’ was borrowed from Icelandic, the word ‘sauna’ was borrowed from Finnish, and the word ‘futon’ was borrowed from Japanese. Similarly, words may be borrowed because there are no equivalents for them in the native language, even though the object or notion is well known. For example, the German word ‘ohrwurm’ (literally translated into English as ‘ear-worm’) which refers to a situation when a song or a tune is stuck in your head that you cannot get rid of. Fraser added that other loanwords may already have equivalent words for them in the native language, but the new loanwords which are borrowed could be more descriptive (e.g. ‘entrepreneur’) or they add a particular shade of meaning (e.g. the French words: ‘scarlet’ and ‘vermillion’) (ibid. 2019).

Generally, there are two main reasons for lexical borrowing of loanwords. Some academics refer to the terms ‘cultural borrowings’ and ‘core borrowings’ (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009: 46-50) represented in the motives of ‘need’ and ‘prestige’ as the main reasons of the lexical borrowing of loanwords. Durkin (2009) and Haspelmath & Tadmor (2009) explained that the lexical borrowings of loanwords because of ‘need’, i.e., ‘cultural borrowing’, is meant to fill a lexical gap and it occurs when a new concept appears which does not have an equivalent or a name in the borrowing language yet. For example, such motive leads to lexical borrowing of many loanwords into English language in the Late Modern English period (Approx. 1700-1945.) in which the highest number of new loanwords were recorded, as the “society became increasingly complex and the growth of vocabulary correspondingly great, with many new words in the fields of finance, politics, the arts, fashion and much else” (Barber, et al. 2009: 231).

For instance, the word ‘schadenfreude’ is a case lexical borrowing of a new loanword into the English. In fact, this word was borrowed because a name for such phenomenon was completely missing in the English language at that time (Stanforth, 1996 in Grabmann, 2015). On the other hand, the lexical borrowings of loanwords because of ‘prestige’, i.e., ‘cultural borrowing’, occurs because of ‘prestige’, i.e., ‘core borrowing’. Actually, it “occurs in a context where the donor language has a particular status in any of various social or cultural situations [...]” (Durkin, 2009: 143). In this particular case, an already existing word in a recipient language is substituted by a word from a donor language to achieve its prestige, to provide a ‘foreign’ flavor” (Howard, 2002: 122 in Grabmann, 2015). For example, in the Early Modern English period (Approx. 1500-1700) “[i]t was argued that English lacked the prestige of French and Latin as a language of learning and literature. English was ‘rude’ and ‘barbarous’, inexpressive and ineloquent, and it did not have the technical vocabulary required in specialized domains of language use, for example in medicine” (Lass, 1999: 358). This is the reason why many French and Latin words were borrowed into English at that time.

Finally, the process of loaning words can go in both directions between languages when they are in contact. However, Darwish (2015) stated that there is an asymmetry where more words

go from one side to the other. Based on the history of loaning, there are many factors that influence the matter of loaning; these factors could be cultural, scientific or political.

Loanwords, Substrate, and Superstrate

Sometimes, the terms ‘substrate’ (or substratum- plural: substrata) and ‘superstrate’ (or superstratum- plural: superstrata) are often used to denote cases of loanwords (Weinreich, 1979). According to Weinreich, when two languages interact, the native speakers of a certain source language (the substrate) are somehow compelled to abandon it for another target language (the superstrate) (ibid, 1979). In other words, when one language succeeds another, the succeeding language is labeled as a ‘superstratum’ and the earlier language is labeled as a ‘substratum’. In fact, a substratum is defined as a language that influences an intrusive language which supplants it. The term is also used of substrate interference, i.e. the influence the substratum language exerts on the replacing language. On the other hand, superstratum refers to the influence a socially dominating language has on another, receding language that might eventually be relegated to the status of a substratum language.

Both, substratum and superstratum are considered as types of linguistic interference (also known as language transfer, linguistic interference, and cross-linguistic influence: which includes the application of linguistic features from one language to another by a bilingual or multilingual speaker. Language transfer may occur across both languages in the acquisition of a simultaneous bilingual, from a mature speaker's first language (L1) to a second language (L2) they are acquiring, or from an L2 back to the L1 (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000).

Examples on substratum and superstratum include the Japanese language consists of an Altaic (a language family that includes the Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic language families and possibly also the Japonic and Koreanic languages) superstratum projected onto an Austronesian (a language family, widely spoken throughout Maritime Southeast Asia, Madagascar, the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and in Taiwan by Taiwanese aborigines) substratum (Benedict, 1990). Another example is the influence of the Altaic superstrate on the varieties of Chinese spoken in Northern China (which is one of the two approximate mega-regions within China), although in this particular example, the superstratum refers to influence, not language succession (McWhorter, 2007). The last example is the case of the international scientific vocabulary (ISV) coinages from Greek and Latin roots adopted by European languages (and subsequently by other languages) to describe scientific topics (sociology, zoology, philosophy, botany, medicine, all ‘-logy’ words, etc.) can also be termed a superstratum. Actually, the suffix ‘-logy’ in the English language, which means ‘the study of ...’, ‘science or academic field’, and/or ‘a branch of knowledge’, and through the years, the suffixes ‘-logy’ and ‘-ology’ have come to mean, "study of" or "science of", is used with

words originally adapted from Ancient Greek roots ending in ‘-λογία / -logia) (English-Word Information, 2020).

On the same line and for more clarification, Hock & Joseph (1996), and stated that there are three types of relative social status of the participants in a lexical borrowing event of a loanword, namely: 1) adstratum, 2) superstratum and 3) substratum. Hock & Joseph mentioned that ‘adstrata’ is the case when a language comes into contact with another language which roughly is equal to its social status. Further, ‘adstratal relationships’ between languages are the most likely to give rise to borrowing of “everyday-life vocabulary, even basic vocabulary” (ibid:274). Whereas the cases of ‘superstratum’ (a high prestige language) and a ‘substratum’ (a low prestige language) occur respectively when contact happen between two socially imbalanced languages (ibid: 274). In other words, when a superstratum serves as the donor language, prestige borrowings almost always imply an imbalanced relationship between the donor and the recipient language. Hock & Joseph added that when the donor language is the superstratum, then its loanwords tend to belong to the more prestigious domains of the lexicon, and their connotations tend to be equally highly esteemed (1996). Epps (2014: 585) gave an example on the previous mentioned case. Epps mentioned that loanwords for animal meat such as ‘mutton’, ‘poultry’ and ‘pork’ were borrowed from the Norman French into Middle English, and till these days, the borrowed loanwords still exist in parallel with the inherited words for the animals themselves, i.e., ‘sheep’, ‘hen’ and ‘pig’.

On the other hand, when the donor language is the substratum, then its loanwords tend to be less uniform in this respect as the borrowing of loanwords from a substratum is usually limited to the ‘need’ purpose, often with derogatory connotations looking at it from a different angle. In other words, a need borrowing merely implies that the speakers of the recipient language are becoming familiar with a new concept of some kind and can thus involve both an ‘adstratal’ or a ‘super’ vs. ‘substratal’ relationship. Epps asserted that “the source of the loan is likely to represent the source of the concept”, and that “where loans have replaced pre-existing terms, they are likely to indicate the social importance of the corresponding concept in the interaction” (2014:580).

Loanwords and Cognates

Loanwords are in contrast to cognates (also called lexical cognates), which are defined as words in two or more languages that are similar because they share an etymological origin, i.e., a word is considered cognate with another if both are derived from the same word in an ancestral language. For example, the word ‘gratitude’ in English means the same as ‘gratitud’ in Spanish (both coming from the Latin word ‘gratitudo, which means ‘thankfulness’. Another example is the English words ‘dish’ and ‘desk’ and the German word ‘Tisch- table’ are cognates because they all come from Latin ‘discus’, which relates to their flat surfaces (Crystal, 2011; Rubén, 2011; Vocabulary, 2020). In fact, the word ‘cognate’ is derived from the Latin noun ‘cognatus’, which means ‘blood relative’ (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2020).

There are other cases in which cognates may have different or even opposite meanings although, to some extent, they have an indirect connection between them and they look or sound similar or/and having similar sounds or letters, yet they differ significantly in meaning and have different meaning. For example, the English word ‘embarrassed’ and the Spanish word ‘embarazada’, which means ‘pregnant’ seem to be cognates but in fact, they have different meaning. The cognates in these cases are called ‘false friends’ (Chamizo-Domínguez, 2008). Furthermore, in other cases, the cognates sound similar, but do not come from the same root, i.e., they have different etymologies. For example, the English ‘much’ and the Spanish word ‘mucho’ have similar meaning but a completely different Proto-Indo-European roots. The cognates in these cases are called false cognates (Rubén, 2011).

Loanwords and Calques

Loanwords are also in contrast to calques (Also known as loan translation), which involve literal word-for-word or root-for-root translation of the components of a borrowed word or phrase from another language, so as to create a new lexeme in the target language. In fact, the term ‘calque’ itself is a French loanword ‘calque’ which means ‘tracing’, ‘imitation’, and ‘close copy’ (Weston, 2016; Knapp, 2011). According to Durkin (2009: 135), calques or (loan translations) “show replication of the structure of a foreign-language word or expression by use of synonymous word forms in the borrowing language [...]”. This means in other words, that the borrowed word receives a more or less literal translation. There are many examples in English of common phrases that are calques, translated from other languages. An "Adam's apple," for example, is a calque of the French pomme d'Adam, and "beer garden" is a calque of the German Biergarten. In both cases, the English phrases came from a direct, literal translation of the original (Vocabulary, 2020).

The following are examples on calques in English from several languages: 1) from French origin: ‘Adam's apple’ – ‘pomme d'Adam’, ‘Bush meat’ – ‘viande de brousse’, ‘Flea market’ – ‘marché aux puces’, Marriage of convenience’ - ‘mariage de convenance’, ‘crime of passion’ - ‘crime passionne’; 2) from German origin: ‘Antibody’ – ‘Antikörper’, ‘Concertmaster’ - ‘Konzertmeister’, ‘Intelligence quotient’ - ‘Intelligenzquotient’, ‘Loanword’ – ‘Lehnwort’; 3) From Latin origin: ‘Commonplace’ - ‘locus commūnis’, ‘Devil's advocate’ - ‘advocātus diaboli’, ‘Wisdom tooth’ – ‘dēns sapientiae’; From Spanish origin: ‘Fifth column’ - ‘quinta columna’, ‘Killer whale’ – ‘ballena asesina’, ‘Moment of truth’ – ‘el momento de la verdad’. On the other hand, many calques found in many languages come from English such as: 1) French: ‘disque dur’ - ‘hard disk’, ‘carte mère’ - ‘motherboard’, ‘en ligne’ - ‘online’, ‘disque compact’ - ‘compact disc’, ‘média de masse’ - ‘mass media’; 2) Spanish: ‘escuela alta’ - ‘high school’, ‘grado (de escuela)’ - grade (in school), ‘tarjeta de crédito’ - ‘credit card’; 3) Italian: ‘aria condizionata’ - ‘air conditioned’, ‘fine settimana’ - week-end (Harper, 2020; Detreville, 2015; Fruyt, 2011; HMC, 2001; Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2019). Another good example for a calque presented by Scheler

(1977: 89) is the word ‘loanword’ itself which comes from the German word ‘Lehnwort’ (‘Lehn’ from ‘leihen’ = ‘lend’ + ‘wort’ = ‘word’).

It is worth mentioning that the process of calquing is distinct from the phono-semantic matching process in a way that calquing includes semantic translation, i.e., additional meanings of the source word are transferred to the word with the same primary meaning in the target language.

On the other hand, phono-semantic matching consists of phonetic matching in which the approximate sound and meaning of the original word or expressions which are originally borrowed from the source language are retained phonetically and semantically by matching them with similar-sounding pre-existing words or morphemes in the target language (Bloomfield, 1933). An example on Phono-semantic matching is the Arabic word ‘أرضي شوكي- arđī shawkī’ which means ‘artichoke’. Historically, the Arabic word that was used for ‘artichoke’ was ‘الخرشوف- 'al-khurshūf’, but later on the word was phono-semantically matched into the Arabic word ‘أرضي شوكي- arđī shawkī’ consisting of ‘أرضي- arđī’ (earthly) and ‘شوكي- shawkī’ (thorny) (Zuckermann, 2009).

Other Linguistic Borrowing Phenomena Caused by Language Contact

Although this work is primarily concerned with loanwords, however it will be useful to consider briefly a range of other borrowing phenomena that are more or less closely related to loanwords. It should also be emphasized that in addition to loanwords, it is typical that language contact can also lead to the development of a range of other linguistic borrowing phenomena such as:

1) Language convergence: which is defined as a type of linguistic change that occurs in geographic areas (referred to as linguistic areas) in which a mutual process that results in changes in all the languages involved, i.e., languages come to structurally resemble one another as a result of prolonged language contact and mutual interference between two or more unrelated languages (i.e., not from the same language family) in contact (Crowley & Bower, 2010; Thomason, 2001). Further, as a result of language convergence, certain linguistic features are become shared by linguistic groups in a linguistic area. Such features are called areal features (Crowley & Bower, ibid). For example, the case of convergence in the Khuzestani Arabic (abbreviated as Kh. Arabic: a dialect of Gelet (Southern) Mesopotamian Arabic spoken by the Iranian Arabs in Khuzestan Province of Iran). On this case, Persian, the official language in Iran and the dialect of Arabic spoken in Khuzistan province to the south of Iran have been in a very close contact for a long time. As a result of such contact, different kinds of changes have occurred in the Khuzestani Arabic. including a series of linguistic changes in this dialect such as changes in the Kh. Arabic’s noun-

noun and noun-adjective attribution constructions, definiteness marking, complement clauses, word order, discourse markers and connectors (Shabibi, 2004).

2) Language shift (also known as language transfer or language replacement): is defined as the replacement of one language by another language as a result of their contact. Hence, the speech community shifts to a different language, usually over an extended period of time and which sometimes leads to language endangerment or extinction. Such replacement often occurs when one of the two languages has a higher social position (prestige), i.e., one of the two languages in contact is perceived by its own speakers to be higher status stabilize or spread at the expense of the other language that is perceived by its own speakers to be lower-status (Bastardas-Boada, 2007: 2019). An example on the language shift is the shift which took place in Ireland, roughly between the early 17th century and the late 19th century. The shift from the original language of the vast majority in Ireland, Irish, to English, a language which was imported to Ireland in the late 12th century and which is now (early 21st century) became the dominant language of over 99% of the Irish population, in both the north and south of the country (Hickey, 2010). Another example is the language shift that took place in Egypt after the Arab conquest in the 7th century. The shift from the original language, the Coptic language (a descendant of the Afro-Asiatic Egyptian language), to Arabic language. Coptic language was in decline in usage since the 7th century till the 17th century. Eventually, Arabic is now the dominant language of the majority of the Egyptian population and Coptic language is today mainly used by the Coptic Church as a liturgical language.

3) Creolization: which is defined as the process through which a stable natural language develops from the simplifying and mixing of different languages into a new language within a fairly brief period of time. As a result of such mixing, a pidgin language is often evolved into a full-fledged language that is often characterized by a tendency to systematize their inherited grammar and it is also characterized by a consistent system of grammar, possess large stable vocabularies, and are acquired by children as their native language and primary language and at the same time it is used by adults for use as a second language (McWhorter, 2005; Louis-Jean, 2006; Sebba, 1997).

A pidgin is defined as is a grammatically simplified means of linguistic communication that is developed and constructed by impromptu or by convention between two or more groups who came from a multitude of languages' backgrounds and whom do not have a language in common, but they reside in the same country. Yet, a pidgin is not considered as the native language of any of the speech communities that use this language, but instead, they learn it as a second language and a common language between various linguistic groups within the same linguistic society and most commonly employed in situations such as trade (Muysken & Norval, 2008; Bickerton, 1976). For example, the Bimbashi Arabic (also known as the 'Mongaltese' or the

‘soldier Arabic’), which is an Arabic pidgin which was developed among military troops in Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and was popular from 1870 to 1920. Further, this pidgin was later developed and branched into three languages: Turku in Chad, Ki-Nubi in Kenya and Uganda, and Juba Arabic in South Sudan (Hammarström, et al., 2017).

4) Relexification: which is defined as a form of language interference and a form of a spontaneous second language acquisition in which much or all of the lexicon, including basic vocabulary, of one language are replaced with the lexicon of another language, without drastically changing the relexified language's grammar, i.e. the original language remains intact. In other words, a language takes the great majority of its lexicon from a superstrate or a target language (also called the ‘lexifier’) while its grammar comes from the substrate or source language. In conclusion, within the framework of relexification, a gradual relexification of the native or source language with target-language vocabulary. Besides, after relexification is completed, native language structures alternate with structures acquired from the target language (DeGraff, 2002; Bakker, 1997; Crystal, 2008; Campbell & Mixco, 2007). For example, the Haitian creole lexical item looks like French, but works like the substratum language(s) and was central in the development of Haitian Creole and that is due to the replacement of the phonological representation of a substratum lexical item with the phonological representation of a superstratum lexical item. This happens when the speakers of Haitian and Fon languages (Fon language is a language spoken mainly in the Republic of Benin in West Africa by approximately 1.7 million speakers), especially by the Fon-speaking African slaves, relexified their language with French vocabulary, and because of the underlying similarities between Haitian and Fon languages, a Haitian mixed language has arisen through relexification (Lefebvre, 2004). Finally, it must be noted that the process of relexification differs from the process of lexical borrowing, by which a language merely supplements its basic vocabulary with loanwords from another language.

5) Diglossia: diglossia refers to those situations in which two or more language varieties are used differently by the same speakers under different conditions and within a single geographical area. It was initially used in connection with a society that recognized two or more languages for internal (intra-societal) communication (Fishman, 1965). According to Richard (2018) in diglossic situation, two distinct varieties of a language are spoken within the same speech community. Richard added that there are several types of diglossia, such as: ‘bilingual diglossia’, in which one language variety is used for writing and another for speech, and ‘bidialectal diglossia’, in which people who speak the same language can use two dialects, based on their surroundings or different contexts where they use one or the other language variety.

In fact, the use of separate codes within a single society depends on each code’s serving a function distinct from those considered distinct for the others. This separation was most often along

the lines of high (H) and low (L) languages (Fishman, 1965). In a bit wider definition of diglossia, it can also include social dialects, even if the languages are not completely separate, distinct languages. In this wider definition of diglossia, the two languages can also borrow words from each other. An example on a diglossic community is the United States, in which speakers of dialects such as the African American Vernacular English (also known as ‘Black Vernacular’, and colloquially as ‘Ebonics’), which is the variety of English natively spoken, particularly in urban communities, by most working- and middle-class African Americans, Chicano English (also known as ‘Hispanic Vernacular English’: an imprecise term for a nonstandard variety of the English language influenced by the Spanish language and spoken as a native dialect by both bilingual and monolingual speakers), and Vietnamese English (also known as ‘Vietglish’ or ‘Vietnaminglish’, which is an informal term for a mixture of elements from Vietnamese and English. This variety is found in immigrant communities in Majority-English-speaking countries. Borrowed English words are also commonly used in everyday Vietnamese both inside and outside Vietnam in informal contexts) also function in a diglossic environment (Richard, 2020: Richard, 2018).

6) Mixed languages: language contact and language interference can also lead to the development of a mixed language. In this particular case, according to Matras & Bakker (2008), a language arises among a bilingual group combining aspects of two or more languages but not clearly deriving primarily from any single language. A mixed language differs from a creole or pidgin language in that, whereas a mixed language typically is aroused and formed by a linguistic community that is fluent in both of the source languages and in which the population tend to inherit much more of the complexity (grammatical, phonological, etc.) of their parent languages, creoles/pidgins are aroused and formed by communities lacking a common language.

Actually, creoles/pidgins begin as simple languages and then develop in complexity more independently. It is sometimes explained as bilingual communities that no longer identify with the cultures of either of the languages they speak and seek to develop their own language as an expression of their own cultural uniqueness (Viveka, 2015). An example on mixed languages is the case of ‘Cypriot Arabic’ and ‘Cappadocian Greek’. Both Cappadocian Greek and Cypriot Maronite Arabic are cases of mixed languages in which the Cappadocian Greek has witnessed an extreme borrowing from Turkish, including Turkish vocabulary, function words, derivational morphology, and some borrowed nominal and verbal inflectional morphology. Meanwhile, the Cypriot Maronite Arabic has witnessed an extreme borrowing from Greek, including Greek vocabulary and consequently Greek morpho-syntax. As for the Cypriot Maronite Arabic, (also known as ‘Cypriot Arabic’), it is an endangered language (also known as moribund variety) of Arabic spoken by the Maronite community in the Republic of Cyprus. The Maronite community members’ ancestors are originally from Lebanon, but their ancestors migrated to Cyprus during

the Middle Ages. A percentage of the Maronite Cypriots' community traditionally speak a Cypriot Arabic dialect which is a combination of Arabic, Turkish and Greek (Hammarström, et al, 2017). Being fluent in this mixed language variety goes along with Maronite Cypriots' fluency in Cypriot Greek which they also speak bilingually, side by side with Cypriot Arabic. On the other hand, the Cappadocian Greek is a mixed language spoken in Cappadocia which is located in the Central Anatolia in Turkey. Cappadocian Greek originally diverged from the Byzantine Empire's Medieval Greek. But after the Seljuq Turk victory in the battle of Manzikert, which was fought between the Byzantine Empire and the Seljuk Empire on 26 August 1071, as well as due to the following population exchange between Greece and Turkey in the 1920s, all Cappadocian Greeks were forced to emigrate to Greece and resettled there, and as a result, the Cappadocians rapidly shifted to Standard Modern Greek and their language was thought to be extinct since the 1960s (Janse, 2016; Van Dam, 2002). Lastly, it can be stated that the two languages have evolved out of intense language contact, extensive bilingualism, and a strong pressure for speakers to shift to the dominant language. Besides, the social context in which Cappadocian Greek and Cypriot Maronite Arabic arose largely, and since they are socially different, this contributes to identifying them closely with mixed languages and distinguishing them from pidgins and creoles.

In light of the above mentioned linguistic borrowing phenomena, and in addition to loan words, calques or other types of borrowed material, the most common products of language contact and language interference are pidgins, creoles, code-switching, hybrid languages, and mixed languages. Another common product of language contact and language interference is the development of new languages which occurs when people without a common language interact closely. This can lead to the development of a pidgin, which may eventually become a full-fledged creole language through the process of creolization. However, some linguists believe that it is not necessary that a creole needs to be emerged from a pidgin.

In other cases, the influence of languages in contact and language interference can go deeper in a way that there might be an adoption or exchange of even basic characteristics of a language such as morphology and grammar. For example, Newar language (also known as 'Newari'); which is spoken by the Newar people, the indigenous inhabitants of Nepal, is a Sino-Tibetan language (a family of more than 400 languages, including the Chinese languages, Burmese, Tibetic languages, languages spoken in the Himalayas, the Southeast Asian Massif, and the eastern edge of the Tibetan Plateau, etc.), distantly related to Chinese but has had so many centuries of contact with neighboring Indo-Iranian languages that it has even developed noun inflection (also called inflexion; which is a process of word formation in which a word is modified to express different grammatical categories such as tense, person, number, gender, etc., using affixation, including prefix, suffix. For example, most English nouns are inflected for number with the inflectional plural affix '-s', as in 'cat' - 'cat-s', and English also inflects verbs by affixation to

mark the present participle with ‘-ing’) (Crystal, 2008). Such development of noun inflection in the previous mentioned case is a trait that is typical of the Indo-European family (a large language family native to western and southern Eurasia. It comprises most of the languages of Europe together with those of the northern Indian subcontinent and the Iranian Plateau) but rare in Sino-Tibetan. It has absorbed features of grammar as well such as verb tenses (Winford, 2002; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988).

According to Hadzibeganovic, Stauffer & Schulze (2008), when speakers of different languages within the same linguistic community interact closely, it is typical that the used languages would influence each other. Language contact can occur at language boundary (also known as ‘language borders’); a term that is used to imply the lack of mutual intelligibility between two languages which are separated with a line between each other, i.e. the language boundary line. Hence, language contact can occur if two adjacent languages or dialects are mutually intelligible, no firm language boundary will be developed, and hence the two languages will continue to exchange linguistic inventions. Such influence will occur between adstratum languages, or as the result of migration, with an intrusive language acting as either a superstratum or a substratum.

As for the stratal influence, when language shift occurs, the language that is replaced (known as the substratum) can leave a profound impression on the replacing language (known as the superstratum), when people retain features of the substratum as they learn the new language and pass these features on to their children, leading to the development of a new variety (Gooden, 2019; Hadzibeganovic, Stauffer & Schulze, 2008). For example, the Latin that came to replace local languages in present-day France during Roman times was influenced by Gaulish (an ancient Celtic language that was spoken in parts of Continental Europe before and during the period of the Roman Empire, i.e., (the post-Republican period of ancient Rome: 27 BC – 286 AD). In the narrow sense, Gaulish was the language spoken by the Celtic inhabitants of Gaul (modern-day France, Luxembourg, Belgium, most of Switzerland, Northern Italy, as well as the parts of the Netherlands and Germany on the west bank of the Rhine) and Germanic languages (a branch of the Indo-European language family spoken natively by a population of about 515 million people, mainly in Europe, North America, Oceania and Southern Africa.

The most widely spoken Germanic language, English, is the world's most widely spoken language with an estimated 2 billion speakers. All Germanic languages are derived from Proto-Germanic, spoken in Iron Age Scandinavia (Hammarström, et al. 2017)). The distinct pronunciation of the Hiberno English dialect spoken in Ireland comes partially from the influence of the substratum of Irish. Outside the Indo-European family, Coptic (also known as Coptic Egyptian is the latest stage of the Egyptian language, a northern Afro-Asiatic language that was

developed during the Greco-Roman period of Egyptian history and was spoken until at least the 17th century); the last stage of ancient Egyptian, is a substratum of Egyptian Arabic (Emile, 1991). It is worth mentioning that in other cases, there might be a non-mutual influence during languages' contact and languages' interference, i.e., the change as a result of contact and interference is often one-sided. For example, Chinese has had a profound effect on the development of Japanese, but Chinese remains relatively free of Japanese influence other than some modern terms that were re-borrowed after they were coined in Japan and based on Chinese forms and using Chinese characters. Another example is Hindi language in India which has been influenced by English, and loanwords from English are part of its everyday vocabulary.

Admittedly, languages' contact and languages' interference can also lead to linguistic hegemony, in which a language's influence widens as its speakers grow in power. Chinese, Greek, Latin, Portuguese, French, Spanish, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, Russian, German and English have each seen periods of widespread importance and have had varying degrees of influence on the native languages spoken in the areas over which they have held sway. Within the framework of hegemony, a state has a political, economic, or military predominance or control over other states. Sometimes, the term 'linguistic imperialism', which is related to the concepts of colonialism, is also used to refer to Linguistic hegemony, as in both cases, a transfer of a dominant language takes place to other people (Bisong, 1995: 1994).

This language transfer comes about because of imperialism, which is defined as the policy or ideology of extending the supreme power, sovereignty, rule or authority of an empire or nation over foreign countries, or of acquiring and holding colonies and dependencies for extending political and economic access, power and control, through employing hard power especially military force, but also 'soft power' which involves shaping the preferences of others through appeal and attraction (Gilmartin, 2009; Magnusson, 1991; Edward, 1994). Bisong (1995: 1994) added that the transfer of a dominant language takes place in reach of a demonstration of military power, economic power, and within the dominance of culture which is usually transferred along with the language.

In addition to what has been said, the influence of languages in contact and language interference can be seen through how the internet, along with previous influences such as radio and television, telephone communication and printed materials during and since the 1990s, where has changed and expanded the ways that languages can be influenced by technology and by each other and (Nazaryan & Gridchin, 2006).

Finally, there is another undeniable fact that languages' contact and languages' interference can cause a dialectal and sub-cultural change, in which some forms of language contact affect only

a particular segment of a speech community. Consequently, change may be manifested only in particular dialects, jargons, or registers. For example, South African English has been significantly affected by Afrikaans in terms of lexis and pronunciation, but the other dialects of English have remained almost totally unaffected by Afrikaans other than a few loanwords (Gooden, 2019; Mufwene, 2001).

Conclusion

The current research paper discussed the phenomenon of loanwords in light of a range of other borrowing phenomena that are more or less closely related to loanwords and which are all resulted from the occurrence of language contact. The study concluded that all languages borrow words from other languages with which they come in contact and ‘loanwords’ represent one of other various outcomes of such contact. Besides, in case of a higher level of contact between languages, this can lead to other phenomena such as structural borrowing and convergence between nonaffiliated languages which can further lead to language shift.

The study also concluded that loanwords, which make up the most frequent type of lexical borrowing, can work as a connection bridge between the recipient language to the donor language. In fact, borrowing loanwords, which is an inevitable consequence of the contact between languages, allows any recipient language to expand its vocabulary, in addition to utilizing other word-formation processes such as: derivation, compounding, blending and clipping. However, the loanwords borrowed from any donor language have to undergo certain processes to make them fit appropriately into the recipient language. These processes include: 1) a process of adaptation, in which non-native phonemes are substituted to fit the recipient language’s sound structure.

Actually, loanwords adaptation involves the phonological and morphological transformation of foreign items to fit the grammatical system of the recipient language. However, the extent to which loanwords conform to the recipient language differs from one language to another. In other words, loanwords might adhere to the recipient language system of phonology and morphology in some respects, but they might conflict with other patterns. 2) a process of accommodation, in which phonological patterns are modified according to the phonological rules of the recipient language.

However, during the processes of loanwords' integration and adaptation (the terms 'integration' and 'adaptation' are used interchangeably in this research paper), sometimes the loanwords that are borrowed from the donor language have certain properties such as the phonological properties (i.e., the phonetics and phonemics of the language), the orthographic properties (i.e., the representation of the sounds of a language by written or printed symbols), the morphological properties (i.e., the system of word-forming elements and processes in a language) and syntactic properties (i.e., the part of grammar dealing with how the linguistic elements, such as words, are put together to form constituents, such as phrases or clauses), and these properties do not fit into the system of the source language (the recipient language). Hence, these unfitted loanwords often undergo changes to allow them fitting into the recipient language. These changes are called loanwords' integration (or loanwords' adaptation.)

Nevertheless, the degree of adaptation and/or integration of the loanwords may vary in various cases depending on many factors such as the age of the borrowed loanwords, the recipient language speakers' knowledge of the donor language, and their attitude toward it. For example, if the borrowed loanwords are recent and donor language is well-known among the speakers of the recipient language, then those speakers may choose to borrow certain inflected forms from the donor language instead of adapting the borrowed words in pronunciation. Admittedly, the term 'foreignisms' is used to refer to loanwords that are not capable of being adapted to the recipient language's system.

In addition, the process of borrowing loanwords, which often entails a certain amount of bilingualism, includes taking over and/or transferring new lexical items from other languages or other languages' varieties, by means of contact, together with the concepts and ideas they stand for, and adopt/incorporate them into the recipient language, i.e., the original native language, without translation.

The results provided from this present study also showed that there are different levels to which a borrowed loanword from the donor language become assimilated into the recipient

language. In addition, the level of such assimilation depends on two factors; time and usage, in a way that the longer since the loanword was borrowed from the donor language and the more it is used by the speakers of the recipient language, the greater its degree of assimilation and familiarity.

Additionally, the study concluded that there are several motives and reasons lying behind the adaptation of loanwords in the recipient language, such as: 1) borrowing loanwords due to the linguistic ‘deficit’ and the linguistic ‘gaps’ in the lexical resources of a language. Thus, loanwords are borrowed from other languages, i.e., the donor languages, because there are no equivalents of the borrowed words in the recipient language; 2) borrowing loanwords due to the high level of dominance of the donor language over the recipient language and due to the high level of prestige of the donor language’s words comparing their equivalents in the recipient language. Which means that despite the availability of the native equivalents of the borrowed loanwords in the recipient language, however due to their prestigious status, loanwords from the donor language are borrowed. In fact, the amount of borrowed loanwords as well as the domains of these loanwords are determined by the degree of influence of the donor languages over the recipient languages, especially if the donor language is associated with a higher status; 3) borrowing loanwords due to phonetical/phonological, morphological, graphical or semantical reasons; 4) some loanwords are borrowed into a new language if they are coherent with the incorporating environment and culture of the recipient language; 5) borrowing loanwords from other donor languages out of need, through which a new concept is acquired by contact with another group from the donor language and due to the need for a word that expresses this concept, hence this word is borrowed from the donor language along with the concept; 6) borrowing loanwords due to therapeutic reason in case the original word in the native language is unavailable; 7) the cultural borrowing of loanwords, in which new words are borrowed into the recipient language along with new concepts that are borrowed from the donor language; 8) borrowing loanwords due to the high level of tabooeness of the already existed native words, hence the recipient language may acquire large parts of the donor language’s basic lexicon, so that its genealogical position is recognizable only from its grammatical morphemes; 9) borrowing loanwords due to the homonymy avoidance as in some cases, a word becomes too similar to another word due to sound change, hence the homonymy clash might be avoided by borrowing new loanwords from other donor languages; and 10)

borrowing loanwords as a result from the age of exploration in which new things, objects or notions were discovered from around the world and named by words taken from their original local language since there are no equivalents for them in the recipient language/s.

=====

References

Abdel Rahman W. (1989). "A Critical Linguistic Study of Lexical Borrowing from Arabic to English". King Saud University Press: Vol.3, Art (1), pp 33-66.

Abu Ghoush, S. (1977). "10000 English Word from Arabic". Kuwait Printing Agency, Kuwait.

Alastair, H. (2005). "Equity and Trusts". London, Routledge.

DOI : 10.4324/9780203876725.

Bakker, P. (1997). "A Language of Our Own". New York: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, P & Matras, Y. eds. (2008). "The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances". p. 191. ISBN: 9783110197242.

Barber, C.; Beal, J., C. and Show, P. (2009). "The English Language: A Historical Introduction". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barber, C., L. (2000). "The English language: a historical introduction". Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bastardas-Boada, A. (2007). "Linguistic sustainability for a multilingual humanity". Glossa. An Interdisciplinary Journal (on-line), vol. 2, n. 2.

Bastardas-Boada, A. (2019). "From language shift to language revitalization and sustainability. A complexity approach to linguistic ecology". Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 2019. ISBN: 978-84-9168-316-2.

Bautista, M., L., S. (2004). "Tagalog-English code-switching as a mode of discourse". *Asia Pacific Education Review*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2004, pp. 226-233.

Benedict, Paul K. (1990). "Japanese / Austro-Tai". Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Bickerton, D. (1976). "Pidgin and creole studies". *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 5: 169–93. JSTOR: 2949309; DOI:10.1146/annurev.an.05.100176.001125.

Bien, p., Gondicas, D., Rassias, J., Karanika, A., Yiannakou-Bien, C. (2004). "Greek Today: A Course in the Modern Language and Culture". Lebanon, University Press of New England.

Bisong, J. (1995: 1994). "Language Choice and cultural Imperialism: A Nigerian Perspective". *ELT Journal* 49/2 122–132.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). "Language". New York: Henry Holt.

Bransford, J.; Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). "How People Learn: Brain, Mind, and Experience & School". Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bueasa, N., M. (2015). "The adaptation of loanwords in Classical Arabic: The governing factors". Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky. Retrieved on 11th, October, 2020 from: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=ltt_etds

Burnley, D. (1992). "Lexis and semantics". In Blake, Norman (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language*, Vol. 2: 1066–1476, 409–499. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, L & Mixco, M., J. (2007). "A Glossary of Historical Linguistics". Edinburgh University Press, p. 170, ISBN: 978-0-7486-2379-2

Campbell, L. (2013). "Historical linguistics: an introduction". (3rd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cannon, G. (1999). "Problems in studying loans". *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 25, 326–336.

Carr, C., T. (1934). "The German Influence on the English Language". Society for Pure English Tract No. 42. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chamizo-Domínguez, P., J. (2008). "Semantics and Pragmatics of False Friends". New York, Oxon: Routledge.

Chang, C. B.; Mishler, A. (2012). "Evidence for language transfer leading to a perceptual advantage for non-native listeners". *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 132 (4): 2700–2710. DOI:10.1121/1.4747615. PMID 23039462.

Chesley, P & Baayen, R., H. (2010). "Predicting New Words from Newer Words: Lexical Borrowings in French". *Linguistics*. 48 (4): 1343–74. DOI:10.1515/ling.2010.043.

CNRTL Ortolang. (2020). "Outils et ressources pour un traitement optimize de la langue". Center National De Resources Textuelles Et Lecicales. Retrieved on 7th, October, 2020 from: <https://www.cnrtl.fr/etymologie/baguette>

Comrie, B. (2000). "Language contact, lexical borrowing, and semantic fields". In Gilbers, Dicky & Nerbonne, John & Schaeken, Jos (eds.), *Languages in Contact (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 28)*, 73–86. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Crowley, T & Bower, C. (2010). "An Introduction to Historical Linguistics". New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 269–272. ISBN: 0195365542.

Crystal, D. (2008). "A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics". The Language Library (6th ed.), Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing. ISBN: 978-1-4051-5296-9, LCCN 2007-52260, OCLC 317317506.

Crystal, D., ed. (2011). "Cognate". *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Blackwell Publishing. ISBN: 978-1-4443-5675-5. OCLC 899159900

Curzan, A. (2002). "Teaching the Politics of Standard English". *Journal of English Linguistics*. 30 (4): 339–352. DOI:10.1177/007542402237882. S2CID 143816335.

Darwish, H. (2015). "Arabic Loan Words in English Language". OSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS): Volume 20, Issue 7, Ver. VII (July 2015), PP 105-109.

Davila, B. (2016). "The Inevitability of 'Standard' English: Discursive Constructions of Standard Language Ideologies". *Written Communication*, 33 (2): 127–148. DOI:10.1177/0741088316632186. S2CID 147594600.

DeGraff, M. (2002). "Relexification: A reevaluation". *Anthropological Linguistics*, 44 (4): 321–414.

Detreville, E. (2015). "An Overview of Latin Morphological Calques on Technical Terms: Formation and Success". M.A. thesis, University of Georgia.

Dixon, R., W. (2002). "Australian languages". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durkin, P. (2009). "The Oxford Guide to Etymology". Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.

Eberhard, D; Simons, F; and Fennig, D. (eds.). (2020). "Ethnologue: Languages of the World". Twenty-third edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>

Edward W., S. (1994). "Culture and Imperialism". Vintage Publishers.

Emile, M., I. (1991). "Coptic Language, Spoken". *The Coptic encyclopedia*, The Gale Group: volume 2. Original Publisher: Macmillan. Retrieved on 12th, November, 2020 from: <https://cdm15831.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/cce/id/520>

English-Word Information. (2020). "-ology, -logy, -ologist, -logist". *English-Word Information: word Info about English Vocabulary*. Retrieved on 24th, November, 2020 from: <https://wordinfo.info/unit/1463/page:14>

Einar, H. (1950). "The analysis of linguistic borrowing". *Language* 26, 210–231.

Epps, P. (2014). "Historical linguistics and socio-cultural reconstruction". In Bower, C. & Evans, B. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics* (pp. 579-597). New York: Routledge.

Evans, T., M. (1997). "A dictionary of Japanese loanwords". Westport CT, Greenwood Publishing Group.

E.Z. Glot. (2020). "List of French words of English origin". Retrieved on 11th, October, 2020 from: <https://www.ezglot.com/etymologies.php?l=fra&l2=eng>

Fennell, B., A. (2001). "A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach". Oxford and Malden, Blackwell.

Finegan, E. (2007). "Language: Its Structure and Use (5th ed.)". Boston, MA: Thomson Wadsworth. ISBN: 978-1-4130-3055-6.

Fishman, J. A. (1965). "Who speak what language to whom and when?". *La Linguistique*: 2: 67-88.

Fraser, K. (2019). "Why do we use loanwords?". Quora; Retrieved on 15th, December, 2020 from: <https://www.quora.com/Why-do-we-use-loanwords>

Fruyt, M. (2011). "Latin Vocabulary". In James Clackson, ed., *A Companion to the Latin Language*, p. 152. Edited by J. Clackson, 144-56. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gilmartin, M. (2009). "Colonialism/Imperialism". In Gallaher, Carolyn; Dahlman, Carl; Gilmartin, Mary; Mountz, Alison; Shirlow, Peter (eds.). *Key Concepts in Political Geography*. SAGE. pp. 115–123. DOI:10.4135/9781446279496.n13. ISBN: 9781412946728.

Gooden, S. (2019). "Language Contact in a Sociolinguistics Context". in *The Routledge Companion to the Work of John R. Rickford*.

Grabmann, J. (2015). "German loanwords in English: An assessment of Germanisms such as "Sauerkraut, Pretzel and Strudel". University of Rostock: Munich, Term Paper, 2015. Published

on GRIN Verlag. Retrieved on 9th, December, 2020 from:
<https://www.grin.com/document/321361>

Hadzibeganovic, T., Stauffer, D., & Schulze, C. (2008). "Boundary effects in a three-state modified voter model for languages". *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 387(13), 3242–3252.

Häkkinen, K. (2013). "Nyky-suomen etymologinen sanakirja: Etymological dictionary of Contemporary Finnish". (6th ed.). Helsinki: WSOY.

Hammarström, H; Forkel, R; Haspelmath, M, eds. (2017a). "Germanic". *Glottolog 3.0*. Jena, Germany: Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History.

Hammarström, H.; Forkel, R.; Haspelmath, M., eds. (2017b). "Cypriot Arabic". *Glottolog 3.0*. Jena, Germany: Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History.

Hammarström, H.; Forkel, R.; Haspelmath, M, eds. (2017c). "Early East African Pidgin Arabic". *Glottolog 3.0*. Jena, Germany: Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History.

Harper, D. (2020). "the origins of English-language words". *Online Etymology Dictionary (Etymonline)*. Retrieved on 1st, November, 2020 from: <https://www.etymonline.com/>

Haspelmath, M. (2009). "Lexical borrowing: concepts and issues". *Research Gate*: published on December 2009. DOI: 10.1515/9783110218442. Retrieved on 6th, October, 2020 from:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279973916_Lexical_borrowing_concepts_and_issues

Haspelmath, M & Tadmor, U. (2009). "The Loanword Typology project and the World Loanword Database". In book: *Loanwords in the World's Languages* (pp.1-34). *Research Gate*: DOI: 10.1515/9783110218442.1. Retrieved on 22nd, October, 2020 from:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344083038_I_The_Loanword_Typology_project_and_the_World_Loanword_Database

Haugen, E. (1950). "The analysis of linguistic borrowing". *Language*: 26:210–231.

Hennig, B. (2018). "Language Diversity". Views of the world: published November 19, 2018. Retrieved on 28th, November, 2020 from: <http://www.viewsoftheworld.net/?p=5663>

Hickey, R. (ed.) (2010). "The Handbook of Language Contact". Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Higa, M. (1979). "Sociolinguistic aspects of word borrowing". In W.F. Mackey & J. Ornstein (Eds.), Sociolinguistic studies in language contact (pp. 277-294). The Hague: Mouton.

Hitchings, H. (2008). "The Secret Life of Words: How English Became English". London: John Murray, ISBN: 978-0-7195-6454-3.

Hock, H., H. (1986). "Principles of Historical Linguistics". Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hock, H., H. & Joseph, B., D. (1996). "Language history, language change, and language relationship". Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Houghton Mifflin Company (HMC). (2001). "The American Heritage Dictionary". Fourth Edition (21st Century Reference)". Published: Publisher: Dell; Reissue edition (June 26, 2001). ISBN-10: 9780440237013.

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMC) (2019). "The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language". Fifth Edition: Fiftieth Anniversary Printing. Retrieved on 23rd, September, 2020 from: <https://www.hmhbks.com/shop/books/The-American-Heritage-Dictionary-of-the-English-Language-Fifth-Edition/9781328841698>

Ilmina, H. (2016). "Borrowed Words in 'World Student' Magazine". Thesis: Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang. Retrieved on 5th, October, 2020 from: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/79435609.pdf>

Ishiwata, T. (1986). "English borrowings in Japanese". In W. Viereck & W. Bald (Eds.), English in contact with other languages (pp. 457-471). Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

Jackson, H. (2002). "Lexicography: An Introduction". Routledge.

Jackson, H & Ze Amvela, E. (2002). “Words, Meaning and Vocabulary: An Introduction to Modern English Lexicology”. London, Continuum International Publishing Group.

Janse, M. (2016). “The Resurrection of Cappadocian (Asia Minor Greek)”. *Ao International*: 3. Retrieved on 12th, December, 2020 from: <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/741991>

Jordan, J., E. (2019). “111 English Words That Are Actually Spanish”. *Babble Magazine*: published on April 24, 2019. Retrieved on 10th, October, 2020 from: <https://www.babbel.com/en/magazine/english-words-actually-spanish>

Kachru, B., B. (1994). “Englishization and contact linguistics”. *World Englishes*, 13, 135-151.

Katamba, F. (2004). (2004). “English Words: Structure, History, Usage”. Abingdon, Routledge.

Kemmer, S. (2019). “Loanwords: Major Periods of Borrowing in the History of English”. *Words in English public website: LING 216*. Rice University. Retrieved on 25th, November, 2020 from: <https://www.ruf.rice.edu/~kemmer/Words/loanwords.html>

Knapp, R., D. (2011). “Robb: German English Words”. In *Robb: Human Languages*. Published on 27 January 2011. Retrieved on 1st, October, 2020 from: <http://www.humanlanguages.com/germanenglish/>

Lass, R. (1999). “Phonology and Morphology”. In: Roger Lass (ed.). *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. III: 1476 – 1776. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lev-Ari, S., & Peperkamp, S. (2013). “Low inhibitory skill leads to non-native perception and production in bilinguals' native language”. *Journal of Phonetics*, 41(5), 320–331.

Lefebvre, C. (2004). “Issues in the Study of Pidgin and Creole Languages”. *Studies in Language Companion Series*: 70, 2004. xvi, 358 pp. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved on 1st, December, 2020 from: <https://benjamins.com/catalog/slcs.70>

Lewis, P. M.; Simons, G., F.; Fennig, C., D. (2015). "Ethnologue: Languages of the World". 18th ed. Dallas: SIL International.

Louis-Jean, C. (2006). "Toward an Ecology of World Languages". Translated by Andrew Brown. Cambridge; Malden, MA: Polity Press: 173-6, c2006.

Magnusson, L. (1991). "Teorier om imperialism (in Swedish)". Södertälje. p. 19. ISBN: 978-91-550-3830-4.

Matras, Y. (2000). "Mixed languages: a functional–communicative approach". *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. 3 (2): 79–99.

Matras, Y. & Sakel, J. (2007). "Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective". Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McWhorter, J., H. (2001). "Word on the Street: Debunking the Myth of a Pure Standard English". Basic Books.

McWhorter, J., H. (2005). "Defining creole". Oxford University Press.

McWhorter, J., H. (2007). "Mandarin Chinese: Altaicization or Simplification?". *Language Interrupted: Signs of Non-Native Acquisition in Standard Language Grammars*. Oxford University Press.

Mufwene, S., S. (2001). "The ecology of language evolution". Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. & Norval, S. (2008). "The study of pidgin and creole languages". In Arends, Jacques; Muysken, Pieter; Smith, Norval (eds.). *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction*. John Benjamins.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). "Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism". Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). "Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes". Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 20:12 December 2020

Loae Fakhri Jdetawy and Mohd Hilmi Hamzah

Loanwords in the Taxonomy of Borrowing: A Sociolinguistic Analysis

132

Nazaryan, A & Gridchin, A. (2006). "The influence of internet on language and email stress". *Facta Universitatis, Series: Law and Politics* Vol. 4, No 1, 2006, pp. 23 - 27. University of Niš, Serbia.

Rédei, K. (1970). "Die syrjänischen Lehnwörter im Wogulischen". The Hague: Mouton.Ross, Malcolm. 1991. Refining Guy's sociolinguistic types of language change. *Diachronica* 8 (1): 119–129.

Richard, N. (2018). "Diglossia in Sociolinguistics". Thoughtco: Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms. Published on December 04, 2018. Retrieved on 24th, November, 2020 from: <https://www.thoughtco.com/diglossia-language-varieties-1690392>

Richard, N. (2020). "Chicano English (CE)". Thoughtco: Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms. Published on February, 12, 2020. Retrieved on 24th, November, 2020 from: <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-chicano-english-ce-1689747>

Rubén, M. (2011). "Cognate Linguistics". Kindle Edition, Amazon.

Scheler, M. (1977). "Der englische Wortschatz". Berlin: Schmidt.

Sebba, M. (1997). "Contact Languages: Pidgins and Creoles". Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press.

Shabibi, M. (2004). "Discourse markers and connectors in Khuzistani Arabic". *Language Contact and Pragmatics Seminar. The University of Manchester. Khuzestani Arabic: a case of convergence.* Retrieved on 12th, November, 2020 from: <http://languagecontact.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/McrLC/contact/convergence.html?casestudy=MS>

Stanforth, A., W. (2002). "Effects of language contact on the vocabulary: An overview". In: Cruse, D. Alan et al. (eds.) (2002): *Lexikologie: ein internationales Handbuch zur Natur und Struktur von Wörtern und Wortschätzen/Lexicology: an international handbook on the nature and structure of words and vocabularies.* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, p. 805–813.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 20:12 December 2020

Loae Fakhri Jdetawy and Mohd Hilmi Hamzah

Loanwords in the Taxonomy of Borrowing: A Sociolinguistic Analysis

133

Stockwell, R., P. and Minkova, D. (2001). "English words: history and structure". Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, (2000). "cognate". The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4th ed. (reissued in 2006). Retrieved on 23rd, November, 2020 from: <https://www.ahdictionary.com/>

Thomas, H., M. (2007). "The Norman Conquest: England After William the Conqueror". Plymouth, Rowman & Littlefield.

Thomason, S., G. (2001). "Language Contact: An Introduction". Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, S. & Kaufman, T. (1988). "Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics". University of California Press.

Thomason, S., G. (2001). "Language Contact: An Introduction". Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 89–90, 152. ISBN: 0748607196.

Thomason, S., G. & Kaufman, T. (1988). "Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics". Berkeley: University of California Press.

Trask, L., R. (1996). "Historical Linguistics". Oxford University Press.

UL. (2020). "Language Diversity: Language as key to understanding humanity". Leiden University Centre for Linguistics. Retrieved on 4th, October, 2020 from: <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research-dossiers/language-diversity>

Usunier, J & Lee, J. (2005). "Marketing Across Cultures". Harlow, Pearson.

Van Coetsem, F. (1988). "Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact". Dordrecht: Foris.

Van-Dam, R. (2002). "Kingdom of Snow: Roman rule and Greek culture in Cappadocia". Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Viveka, V. (2015). "Pidgins, Creoles and Mixed Languages". Creole Language Library. 48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: 10.1075/cll.48. ISBN: 9789027252715.

Vocabulary. (2020). "calque". Vocabulary online dictionary. Retrieved on 11th, November, 2020 from: <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/calque>

Waterman, J. (1976). "A History of the German Language". University of Washington Press.

Weinreich, U. (1979). "Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems". New York: Mouton Publishers, ISBN: 978-90-279-2689-0.

Weinreich U. (1953). "Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems". Linguistic Circle of New York, New York.

Weston, P. (2016). "If my 'calque-ulations' are correct". A Day in the Life WordPress; published on 13 January 2016. Retrieved on 2nd, November, 2020 from: <https://paulweston80.wordpress.com/2016/01/13/if-my-calqueulations-are-correct/>

Winford, D. (2002). "An Introduction to Contact Linguistics". Blackwell, 2002. ISBN 0-631-21251-5.

Winford, D. (2005). "Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes". *Diachronica* 22(2):373–427.

Wolfram, W & Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). "American English: dialects and variation". Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Yule, G. (2006). "The Study of Language". 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zuckermann, G. (2009). "Hybridity versus Revivability: Multiple Causation, Forms and Patterns". *Journal of Language Contact*. *Varia* 2: 40–67.