

64. T.N.P.J. p.5.
 65. T.N.P.J. p.5
 66. T.N.P.J. p.6-7.
 67. T.N.P.J. p.85.
 68. T.N.P.J. pp.85,86.
 69. T.N.P.J. pp.88-90.
 70. T.N.P.J. p.90
 71. T.N.P.J. pp.91-93.
 72. T.N.P.J. pp.94-98.
 73. <http://www.the-noh.com/en/plays/data/program029.html>
 74. T.N.P. p.116.
 75. T.N.P. pp.117-118.
 76. T.N.P.J. pp.12-17. Ikuta means 'field of life'.
 77. T.N.P.J. pp.12-17.
 78. T.N.D.
 79. T.N.D.
 80. T.N.D.
 81. <http://www.the-noh.com/en/plays/data/program031.html>
 82. T.N.P.J. pp.119-127.
 83. T.N.P.J. pp.122-124.
 84. T.N.P.J. p.126.
 85. T.N.P.J. p.127.
 86. T.N.D.
 87. T.N.P.J. p.230.
 88. T.N.P.J. pp.101-107.
 89. T.N.P.J. p.107.
 90. Japanese Religion p.29.
 91. J.R. p.2.
 92. Japanese Religion pp.30-31.
 93. —do—pp.34-35.
 94. —do—pp.35-36.
 95. —do—p.37.
 96. J.R. p.3.
 97. Japanese Religion p.38.
 98. —do—p.39.
 99. —do—p.40.
 100. —do—p.41.
 101. —do—p.42.
 102. —do—p.37.
 103. T.P.N.T. pp.130-131.
 104. T.P.N.T. pp.133-142.
 105. T.P.N.T. p.135.
 106. T.P.N.T. pp.139-140.
 107. T.P.N.T. p.141.
 108. T.P.N.T. p.142.
 109. T.N.P.J. pp.51-57.
 110. T.P.N.T. p.194.
 111. T.P.N.T. p.194.
 112. T.P.N.T. p.194.

THE BASE LANGUAGE EFFECT AND THE BILINGUAL

Dr. Chamindi Dilkushi Senaratne Wettewe

Theories on the base language effect demonstrate the influence of one language over the other in bilingual speech production. Just the notion of a base language indicates that the bilingual is always dominated by one language and the assumption that the mixed utterances may always reveal affiliation to one particular language used by the speaker. This paper analyses Grosjean's (1982) theory which provides a psycholinguistic interpretation to bilingual speech production. Grosjean's (1982) theory observes two language modes operating within the bilingual: the monolingual and the bilingual language mode. Each mode is characterized by specific bilingual language mixing strategies. In addition, a situational continuum is observed in bilingual interaction. Bilinguals are observed as speakers who are either at the two ends or somewhere in the intermediary levels of the continuum. This paper will provide an analysis of Grosjean's theory in relation to Code-mixing, Code Switching and Borrowing which are language contact phenomena. It will also reveal the skilled performance of the bilingual when negotiating the base language indicating that language mixing patterns are strategies employed by the speaker to perform certain functions related to topic, situation and interlocutor.

1. Introduction

Bilingualism or multilingualism has been previously described as an 'unskilled' linguistic performance. Where some scholars argue that bilingualism resulting in language mixing is a skilled performance, others maintain that bilinguals are rarely fluent in their languages. Scholars point out that stable bilingualism exists in bilingual communities where the languages enjoy equal prestige. In these situations, the languages are international prestigious languages. In post-colonial bilingual societies where one language is always dominant over another, a different situation prevails. In these communities, the socially dominant language is usually the colonial language.

Previous views on the bilingual's use of two languages were different to those that are held at present. Bilingualism, according to Weinreich (1953) occurs when a person uses two languages 'alternatively'. In

defining the perfect bilingual, Weinreich in *Languages in Contact* (1953) held the view that the 'perfect bilingual' cannot mix unless there are changes in the 'speech situation' and 'not within a sentence' (p.73). In addition, Haugen in the *The Norwegian Language in America* (1953) reiterates that even if bilinguals 'switch' languages rapidly in conversation, at any given moment 'they are speaking only one language'.

The revolutionary perception of the bilingual as a 'skilled' and competent user of two or more than two languages came about when research in bilingual studies acknowledged the significant impact external forces had on language change. From the 1970's to the 1980's perceptions of the bilingual and bilingual phenomena transformed mainly as linguists acknowledged the significant influence of external factors that result in changes in languages perhaps even more than internal factors. Current research now includes terms such as 'skilled', 'performance' and 'strategy' to describe bilinguals and their speech. Linguists after the 1970s, for example Timm (1975), Pfaff (1976), Lipski (1978), Kachru (1978), identifies mixing languages as both functionally and formally, a rule-governed process that has collocational and grammatical constraints. The bilingual's use of two languages is viewed as 'socially significant' (Gumperz 1982: 72), emphasizing the speaker as a skilled performer using both languages at his/her disposal as a tool in society. This attitude towards the use of two languages in speech resulted in the flourishing of research in the years that followed. The bilingual's use of the two languages depends on the domain, topic and interlocutor. It is also governed by social and individual norms.

1. Theoretical framework

Grosjean's definition of the bilingual

According to Grosjean (1982: 230) the main criterion used to describe bilingualism¹ is the fluency of the languages concerned. It seems that a number of linguists shared this view of the bilingual. Bloomfield (1933) as quoted by Grosjean (1982: 231) writes:

In the extreme cases of foreign language learning, the speaker becomes so proficient as to be distinguishable from the native speakers round him. In the cases where his perfect foreign-language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism (the native like control of two languages (pp.55-56)

Haugen (1969) as quoted by Grosjean (1982: 232) views bilingualism as a continuum:

Bilingualism... may be of all degrees of accomplishment, but it is understood here to begin at the point where the speaker of one language can produce *complete, meaningful utterances* in the other language. From here it may proceed through all possible gradations up to the kind of skill

that enables a person to pass as a native in more than one linguistic environment (pp.6,7)

Accordingly, Grosjean (1995) defines the bilingual as follows:

we will call bilingual those people who use to, or more, languages in their everyday lives. Bilinguals are not the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals but have a unique and specific linguistic configuration. They have developed competencies in their languages to the extent required by their needs and those of the environment. They normally use their two language separately or together for different purposes, in different domains of life with different people. (p.259)

It can be observed that the notion of a continuum in measuring the bilingual's competency of the languages concerned has influenced the definition of bilingualism. The identification of 'balanced' bilinguals (those who have equal fluency of both languages) as opposed to 'non-balanced' bilinguals (those whose utterances reveal the dominance of one language) have been tested. Grosjean (1982) observes that most bilinguals opt for different languages in different circumstances with different interlocutors, thus indicating the functional use of the languages concerned. This has been justified by Fishman (1971: 560), who views that society does not need two languages for 'one and the same set of functions'. What all these arguments indicate is that the bilingual will be influenced, at some part of the bilingual utterance by one language in particular.

Accordingly, the bilingual is described as a unique person who will use two languages:

for different purposes and with different people and often one of the two languages will be their more familiar, more personal code. (1982: 256)

Note the reference to the 'more familiar' and 'more personal' code implying that the bilingual is always dominated by one language. Grosjean (1982) reiterates that the strategy of 'borrowing' is the legacy of those who live with two languages. In essence, borrowing belongs to the bilingual language mode.

Accordingly, it is the prerogative of the bilingual to code-mix (Code Mixing CM), code-switch (Code Switching CS) and borrow from the languages available to him/her. Contrary to monolingual views, CM, CS and lexical borrowing in bilingual communities is the norm and not the exception. It is now understood and acknowledged that bilinguals do not speak in a haphazard way, and that CM, CS and lexical borrowing are rule-governed phenomena.

Psycholinguists in bilingualism are intrigued by the rules that govern language mixing in the bilingual. How is this mixed language processed in the bilingual? Is the bilingual functioning with one or two lexicons? How many grammars are employed by the bilingual when speaking to

monolinguals and bilinguals? Though there have been many explanations including the co-ordinate, compound and sub-ordinate distinction, Grosjean (1982) observes that a successful explanation for the intricacies of language processing of the bilingual has still not been provided.

2. Situational continuum

Reviewing a number of studies conducted on bilingual aphasics and the processing of language in the bilingual brain, Grosjean proposes that the bilingual's fluency in each language reflects the 'need for that skill in that language'. The analysis emphasizes that the needs and skills differ according to the language history of the bilingual and the domains of use of each language. This in turn influences the fluency of each language in the bilingual. The emphasis now is on the processing of language in the bilingual's different language modes:

- a. the monolingual mode (where interference, overgeneralizations, hypercorrections takes place)
- b. the bilingual mode (where CM, switching and borrowing takes place).

Based on the observation Grosjean (1995: 261) proposes that bilinguals travel along a *situational continuum*² where at one end bilinguals are 'restricted' to be monolingual with their monolingual counterparts and at the other, they can be bilingual with their bilingual counterparts. Underlying this observation is another significant analysis. In the preface to the book *Life with two languages* (1982), Grosjean observes that:

Contrary to general belief, bilinguals are rarely equally fluent in their languages; some speak one language better than another, others use one of their languages in specific situations and others still can read and write one of the

languages they speak. (Preface)

Accordingly, Grosjean proposes that bilinguals differ among themselves for many reasons: as a result of not being totally fluent in their respective languages, as to the 'extent they travel along the continuum' and due to the 'intermediary levels' that exist between the two ends of the continuum (Grosjean 1995: 262). Grosjean observes that bilinguals have to 'restrict' themselves to the monolingual mode, when they are among monolinguals. Since bilinguals cannot totally deactivate their bilingual mode, this imposed restriction causes language deviations. The language deviations are due to the deactivated language. Hence, the indication is that the base language effect is most visible in the bilingual mode. The visibility is due to the bilingual's inability to deactivate the dominant language completely.

3. Language deviations

According to Grosjean one of the best methods to investigate the language processing mechanisms that functions in the bilingual brain is through language deviations. However, note that this premise is based on the notion that the bilingual's language competencies with regard to each language differ and that the bilingual is not 'totally' fluent in his/her languages. Grosjean stresses that the bilingual develops proficiency in his/her languages based on the communication needs required of each language.

The underlying theme of the theory is that the bilingual can never be totally fluent in both languages. This is best exemplified according to Grosjean, when the bilingual speaks to a monolingual. In such an instance, the language of the bilingual is characterized by many language deviations as a result of the deactivated language. Though false starts, slips of the tongue and hesitations are common to any speaker, Grosjean proposes that these very features enable to identify the language processing mechanisms that take place in the brain of the bilingual. This is because in the monolingual language mode, the bilingual is restricted to activate only one language and since this is a near impossible task according to Grosjean, certain deviations occur that mark the 'interference of the 'deactivated' language. Such deviations are of two types:

- a. within language deviations (such as overgeneralizations, hypercorrections and simplifications) and
- b. between language deviations (such as interference)

Overgeneralization is also referred to as false analogy or under learning. Grosjean lists a number of examples where the non-fluent bilingual will over generalize patterns (such as the past tense rule) which result in language 'deviations'. This observation is important in analyzing errors in the Sinhala-English corpus (where non-fluent speakers of English overuse the plural marker which results in 'furnitures, jewelleries, informations', overuse or omission of determiners, overuse or omission of prepositions etc). Hypercorrection, avoidance of certain difficult words and phrases and spelling pronunciation are also listed as 'within language' deviations. Interference according to Grosjean is a speaker-specific 'deviation', which is caused due to the influence of the 'deactivated' language. Interference is defined as 'the involuntary influence of one language over the other' Grosjean (1982: 299) which is most prominent when a bilingual is speaking to a monolingual. Grosjean observes that in words and idiomatic expressions which are similar to borrowings (at word level), the appearance of syntactic patterns of one language in another which are ungrammatical but understood (at syntactic level) and the influence of one language over the spelling system of the other (at orthographic level) can cause interference.

4. Bilingual language mode

Unlike the monolingual mode where language deviations characterize the verbal repertoire of the bilingual, in the bilingual mode, both languages are activated and the bilingual's language is characterized by obvious strategies such as CS, CM and lexical borrowing. In fact, CS, CM and lexical borrowing are considered 'an integral part of the language varieties developed in bilingual communities (Grosjean 1982: 330). It is acknowledged that in the bilingual communities several language varieties are developed as a result of these phenomena. Similar to monolingual language norms developed in monolingual communities, there are also bilingual language norms where mixed varieties are present. Hence, code-switching and lexical borrowing are part of the bilingual community and is the norm and not the exception. The analysis proposes that these phenomena are governed by both structural and social constraints.

In the bilingual mode, the speaker is able to access another language freely. This link with the other language may be merely for a word, a phrase or a complete sentence which results in the mixed language varieties. The social constraints proposed are significant. According to Grosjean, the bilingual chooses his/her language depending on the situation, topic, and the interlocutor. Switching or mixing takes place if the environment permits. Grosjean also proposes that the numerous single word items that occur in bilingual discourse as 'speech borrowings'. Speech borrowings' (or 'nonce borrowings') accordingly differ from a word that has 'become part of a language community's vocabulary' (Grosjean 1995: 263). In borrowing, the bilingual can 'extend the meaning of a word from the language he or she is speaking under the influence of the other language (Grosjean 1982: 308).

The situational continuum consists of two ends: the bilingual and the monolingual end. The bilingual speaker may be at the extremes of both ends and also sometimes may travel in the 'intermediary levels that exist in the continuum' (Grosjean (1995: 262). It is also observed that some bilinguals may never be at the bilingual end (purists, language teachers) whereas others may 'rarely leave this end'. It is at this end the mixed language is born. Observe that this is also the end where the base language has the most impact.

5. Base language

Observing Weinreich's (1968) suggestion that in a bilingual speech interaction both the listener and the speaker can determine the base language they are using Grosjean (1982: 320) points out that this is not always an easy task. The observation is that it's easier to identify the base language when the speaker code mixes words from the less fluent language. However, CM does not take place to fill in gaps in the

vocabulary. The change of topic, interlocutor, and the situation may demand the bilingual to switch the language in the same utterance. Hence, the bilingual can change languages at well defined points in the utterance, marking a situation, change of topic or interlocutor. In such situations Grosjean (1982) reveals, it is extremely difficult to define the effect of a base language on the bilingual utterance.

Determining the base language being used is far from easy, except in the most straightforward cases, such as tag switches or single noun switches. (p.321)

In this sense, the influence of the base language in the bilingual mode is most important. The influence of topic, interlocutor and situation when choosing a base language in bilingual speech production is also significant in Grosjean's psycholinguistic analysis. In some cases it is observed that 'bilinguals also switch back and forth between languages within one semantic domain' (Grosjean 1982: 321). Hence, difficulties are observed in determining a base language to every mixed utterance spoken by a bilingual.

Providing a psycholinguistic interpretation to CS, Grosjean's theory focuses on single word elements that can be analyzed as either code-switches or borrowings. It is observed that the elements are perceived by bilinguals to be either code switches or borrowings depending most significantly on the phonological effect of the base language on the word. Grosjean (1982) observes that the effect of the base language 'probably depends on the acoustic-phonetic characteristics' of the code-switched words. In an analysis to test how bilinguals accessed 'guest' words in bilingual speech production, Grosjean (1995) refers to a study, which confirmed

- a. that the words identified sooner were phonotactically marked as belonging to the guest language than words that were not marked in this way and
- b. that words belonging solely to the guest language only were identified sooner than words belonging to two lexicons and
- c. that words that have homophones in the base language as well as the guest language were identified with difficulty by the bilingual informants.

The tests also confirmed that the probability for single word items to be code-switches than borrowings is much greater in mixed data. This observation is significant as borrowings indicate the phonological, syntactical and morphological integration into the base language. In borrowings, the words have become part of the borrower language and the identification of the base is not a necessity.

The study proved that the phonotactics of the guest word and the absence or presence of homophones are significant factors for the bilingual in the access of single word items in the bilingual mode.

In recent studies, Grosjean proposes that what actually happens is a negotiation of a base language in bilingual interaction. In the bilingual language mode the bilingual chooses a base language whenever interacting with another bilingual. This base language is defined as the 'main language of interaction' (Grosjean 1995: 262). Though a base language is chosen the bilingual may 'decide' to switch the base language during the conversation. This decision is also referred to as the 'language choice' (Grosjean 1995: 263) of the bilingual. Accordingly, language mixing (CM and CS) occurs when the bilingual decides to bring in other-language elements into the already chosen base language. If a word, phrase or a sentence is taken from another language then there is a 'language shift' (or CS) and if these other-language elements are integrated into the base language (which is decided by the bilingual) then borrowing takes place. This observation emphasizes that the bilingual negotiates the base language depending on external as well as internal variables. This observation acknowledges the social and psycholinguistic constraints governing language mixing in bilingual societies, which cannot easily be comprehended by monolingual language norms.

6. Borrowing

Spontaneous speech, idiosyncratic or nonce borrowings are extremely important in a study of CM as they occur most frequently and are an integral part of the bilingual's speech. Are words initially borrowings or are they code-mixes? Why do some speakers borrow a word and some other speakers use the same word as a code-mix? Grosjean (1982: 333) observes that a word is initially a 'speech borrowing' before it gets phonologically or morphologically adapted to the receiving language and becomes a 'language borrowing'. It is also noted that a word undergoes a transitory period or an 'uncertain linguistic period' (Haugen 1956: 55 as quoted by Grosjean 1982: 314) between being a speech and a language borrowing.

A word becomes a language borrowing when it becomes a part of the borrowing language and is no longer treated as an other-language element according to Grosjean (1982). Words that are borrowed go through phonological, morphological and syntactical integration into the base language. The most significant change a word undergoes when it is borrowed is phonological adaptation into the base language where base language phonemes are substituted for the original phonemes of the word. In morphological adaptation of loan words, pluralization is mostly affected. Pluralization, when adapting a loan word, usually patterns along base language rules. Grosjean (1982) analyses an example from German-English such as 'two carpenter' as a borrowing patterned along German pluralization rules. Referring to Weinreich's description of loan words, Grosjean (1982) observes many reasons for words to become part of a

language such as expressing new concepts, ideologies, technology, new places, as well as spread of religion and colonial invasions. The prestigious status and other positive elements associated with international languages are also significant factors that influence speakers to borrow. Speakers may also borrow if they wish to integrate into the majority or dominant group in society especially if the dominant group is also linguistically powerful. In essence, borrowing is a 'reflection' of the speaker's wish to acculturate. Accordingly, it is observed that 'those who wish to acculturate faster are more prone to borrow than those who wish to maintain their identity as members of a different linguistic group' (Grosjean 1982: 313)

7. Summary and conclusions

Grosjean's theory indicating the base language influence and the effect it has on bilingual speech is significant in analyzing mixed data. It is important to take into account that CS, CM are identified as mixing strategies used by the skilled bilingual to perform different functions in a bilingual society. All strategies CS, CM and lexical borrowing are observed as the norm and not the exception in bilingual language use. Accordingly, borrowing, CM, CS are phenomena that takes place in the bilingual mode. The aptness of using these strategies depends on the interlocutor, topic and situation. Hence, new language varieties each with specific norms and domains of use evolve as a result of CS, CM and lexical borrowing. The analysis reiterates that single lexical items can be both code-switches and borrowings depending on the nature of integration into the base language. The importance laid on phonological features of single words when deciding the degree of integration into the base, is also significant. When the base language effect is most dominant, hypercorrections, overgeneralizations and simplifications occur in bilingual speech.

Note the observation that the base language is negotiated and chosen by the bilingual. When interacting with fellow bilinguals, the bilinguals opt to negotiate a language of interaction, which is also referred to as the base language. The moment this language choice is made, the bilingual may wish to extract a word, a phrase, or a complete sentence from another language resulting in CS or CM (language shift). Lexical borrowing or language borrowing occur when the word becomes part of the borrower language phonetically and morpho- syntactically. Language use of the bilingual in the monolingual mode of the situational continuum is of utmost importance as it is in this mode that language deviations take place. The analysis of language deviations is based on the base language effect as well. It is based on the assumption that bilinguals are not 'totally 'fluent' in either of the languages. Here too the argument is that the bilingual's proficiency of the languages is based on his/her communicative needs.

Language deviations of the bilingual in the monolingual mode provide insight into the language processing of the bilingual.

Note that many of the language deviations observed by Grosjean will be viewed differently by post-colonial researchers in Contact Linguistics. In fact, interference, which results in producing certain 'grammatical' syntactic and phonological features modeled on native languages when speaking English in post-colonial societies are an integral part of the new Englishes around the world. These language deviations are not considered non-standard or as errors, though they differ largely from the native English varieties. These non-native English varieties with their 'language deviations' are acculturated and culture-bound in the societies which have produced them. These same deviations are an essential part of the identity of the bilingual in modern post-colonial societies.

References

- Bloomfield, L. (1933) *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with two languages. an introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1995) A psycholinguistic approach to code-switching. In Milroy and Muysken, 259-75
- Haugen, E (1969) *The Norwegian language in America: a study in bilingual behavior*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1978) Code-mixing as a communicative strategy. In J. Alatis ed., *International dimensions of bilingual education*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press, 107-24.
- Lipski, J. M. (1978) Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In Paradis, 250-64.
- Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (1995) *One speaker, two languages, cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000) *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Pfaff, C. W. (1979) Constraints on language mixing: intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language*, 55: 291-318.

Poplack, S. (2004) Code-switching. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K.J. Mattheier, and P. Trudgill, eds., *Sociolinguistics. an international handbook of the science of language and society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 589-96.

Poplack, S. and Sankoff, D. (1988) A variationist approach to languages in contact, in U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, and K. J. Mattheier eds., *Sociolinguistics. an international handbook of the science of language and society*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 174-80.

Poplack, S. and Meechan, M. (1995) Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse. In Milroy and Muysken, 199-233.

Poplack, S. and Meechan, M. (1998) Introduction. How languages fit together in code-mixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2, 127-38.

Poplack, S., Wheeler, S. and Westwood, A. (1987) Distinguishing language contact phenomena: evidence from Finish-English bilingualism. In P. Lilius, M. Saari eds., *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics*, 6. (Proceedings of the sixth international conference of Nordic and General Linguistics in Helsinki, August 18-22 August 1986.) University of Helsinki, 33-56.

Weinreich, U. (1953) *Languages in contact, findings and problems*. The Hague.

Timm, L. A. (1975) Spanish English code-switching: El porque y by how-not-to. *Romance Philology*, 28: 473-82

(Footnotes)

1. Bilingualism is defined as the regular used of two languages in speech (Grosjean 1982: 230)
2. Emphasis is the author's