

Ministry Of Higher Education And Scientific Research

University of Tikrit

College Of Education For Humanities

Department Of English

M.A Studies-Second Course

Sociolinguistics



Pidgin And Creole Languages

Diglossia And Lingua Franca

Submitted to:

Prof.Ahmed Mohammed Salih (PH.D)

2024 A.D.

1445 A.H.

Introduction

Among the many languages of the world are a few that have been assigned a somewhat marginal position in the study of linguistics: the various lingua francas, pidgins, creoles, and so-called mixed languages. Such languages have apparently existed since time immemorial, but we know much less about them than we know about languages that have a long history as standard languages spoken by a dominant group. A major issue in contact linguistics today is the status of such languages, an issue which we will return to below in our discussion of creole languages. At the center of this controversy is the issue of how different contact languages really are from other languages. For example, English (which is a Germanic language) is notorious for having loanwords from Romance languages which were borrowed during different periods of its development; it clearly changed considerably through language contact. Many, if not most, languages have been influenced at some point in their history by contact with other languages.

Lingua Francas

People who speak different languages and are in contact with each other must find some way of communicating, a lingua franca. A lingua franca was defined as 'a language which is used habitually by people whose mother tongues are different in order to facilitate communication between them'. At one time or another, Greek koiné and Vulgar Latin were in widespread use as lingua francas in the Mediterranean world and much of Europe. Sabir was a lingua franca of the Mediterranean (and later far beyond); originating in the Middle Ages and dating back at least to the Crusades, it survived into the twentieth century. In other parts of the world, Arabic, Mandarin, Hindi, and Swahili serve as lingua francas. Of these, Arabic is a lingua franca associated with the spread of Islam. Today, English is used in very many places and for very many purposes as a lingua franca, for example, in travel, business, technology, and international relations.

A lingua franca can be spoken in a variety of ways. Not only are they spoken differently in different places, but individual speakers vary widely in their ability to use the languages. English, for example, is for some speakers a native language, for others a second language, and for still others a foreign language. This is certainly the case in India, where even though Hindi is the official language, English, spoken in all kinds of ways, is widely used as a lingua franca. However, it also spread as a lingua franca inland and it is used in education in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi; it is also widely used in politics and other public venues through the Great Lakes region .

Pidgin and creole languages: definitions

Linguists studying pidgins and creoles often use the terms superstrate and substrate to refer to the different roles languages play in the development of a contact language. The *superstrate language* (usually only one) is the socially, economically, and politically dominant language in the multilingual context in which the pidgin or creole develops. It is also usually the language which provides the vocabulary for the pidgin or creole, and in that case may also be called the lexifier language. Although socially dominant, we must also recognize that the variety of the superstrate language spoken in a particular context was not always what was considered the standard. The European colonists who often provided the superstrate varieties for pidgins and creole languages were very rarely speakers of prestige varieties of their language. The *substrate languages* (by definition two or more) are the native languages of the speakers who contribute to the development of these pidgin or creole languages by providing some vocabulary but also phonological systems and grammatical structures. The speakers of these languages are usually socially subordinate to superstrate language speakers. While this social configuration is not necessary for the linguistic development of a pidgin or creole language, exceptions to this pattern are rare (Bakker 2008, Versteegh 2008).

Up until fairly late in the twentieth century, what was called the life cycle model was widely accepted (see figure 5.1). This model proposes that pidgin languages develop in situations in which speakers have no common language other than the superstrate, but a lack of access to this language. Because of limited input in the superstrate language, they do not simply acquire the superstrate but create a pidgin form of it to use among themselves. While there are many social environments in which a pidgin can arise, the two most common are in situations in which there is either mass migrant labor or increased trade (Winford 2003, 271). In either situation, there are people with a variety of linguistic backgrounds who need to communicate with one another, but one language is very much socially dominant. Pidgins are thus simplified languages. In some cases, they are used in contexts in which there is continued contact with the lexifier language and a continuum between the pidgin and the lexifier develops, usually ending with the pidgin dissolving and the lexifier language being spoken.

In other contexts, the pidgin expands and becomes stabilized. At this stage, if there is contact with native speakers of the superstrate language, it may again develop a continuum of varieties between the expanded pidgin and the lexifier, with the lexifier language ultimately winning out. In some cases, the expanded pidgin is used by the children in a community, and it becomes more elaborated and regularized grammatically and acquires registers so that it can be used in all social contexts. It may also become the first language of the next generation. The life cycle model is based on the idea that the distinction between a pidgin and a creole is about nativization, that is, that nativization brought about elaboration. Thus, the generalization was that these two aspects separated pidgins (non-native, simplified languages) from creoles (native, fully elaborated languages). Thus the role of first language acquisition was key to the development of creole languages from pidgin languages. This model is critical in the language bioprogram hypothesis proposed by Bickerton (Bickerton 1981, 1983), which argues that humans are programmed to create languages, and given only input in a simplified pidgin language, they will create an elaborated, full-fledged

language. Typically, creoles are developed by children who find themselves born into a multilingual environment in which the most important language for peer contact is a pidgin. Bickerton further develops this thesis, claiming that children have certain innate language abilities that they are actually forced to suppress as they learn languages like English and French.

Connections between P/C languages and second language acquisition

Winford (2003) discusses the important ways in which a pidgin can be distinguished from other types of simplified language use such as 'imperfect' second language learning (interlanguage). One important distinction is that pidgins are conventionalized systems of communication, not idiosyncratic production. A pidgin can itself be a target language, that is, something which a speaker is trying to learn. However, both pidgins and interlanguage have a substrate influence (i.e., influence from the speaker's native language). Although it is often recognized that some similar linguistic and cognitive processes are at work in second language acquisition and pidginization, the distinction has been made between the development of an interlanguage spoken by an individual and the sociolinguistic process involving communication between various individuals speaking a second language which forms a pidgin (Siegel 2008, 191). This leads us to the second issue, the role of second language acquisition in P/C language development. Obviously, some sort of second language acquisition is at work in P/C language development, but the question arises of why the acquisition does not come closer to the target language, that is, why what is called fossilization occurs. The concept of **transfer** in second language acquisition is that learners use features of their first language in the language they are learning.

Pidgin and Creole Formation

Pidgin formation generally involves some kind of ‘simplification’ of a language, for example, reduction in morphology (word structure) and syntax (grammatical structure), tolerance of considerable phonological variation (pronunciation), reduction in the number of functions for which the pidgin is used (e.g., you usually do not attempt to write novels in a pidgin), and extensive borrowing of words from local mother tongues. Winford (2003, 302) points out that ‘so-called pidginization is really a complex combination of different processes of change, including reduction and simplification of input materials, internal innovation, and regularization of structure, with L1 influence also playing a role.’ On the other hand, creole formation involves expansion of the morphology and syntax, regularization of the phonology, increase in the number of functions in which the language is used, and development of a larger vocabulary.

Even though the processes are different, it is still not always clear whether we are talking about a pidgin, an expanded pidgin, or a creole in a certain situation. For example, the terms Hawaiian Pidgin English and Hawaiian Creole English may be used by even the same creolist (Bickerton 1977, 1983) to describe the same variety. Likewise, Tok Pisin is sometimes called a pidgin, an expanded pidgin, and a creole. Mufwene (2008, 461) also adds a political dimension to the problems with these terms when applied to varieties developed from European languages in contexts of colonization or slavery, saying ‘Usage of the terms creolization and indigenization to identify their divergence from the European languages from which they developed reflects both a colonial disfranchising attitude toward the populations speaking them and ignorance among linguists of the role that contact has always played in language diversification.’

Linguistic Characteristics of P/C Languages

Winford (2003, 307) says that 'creoles constitute a motley assortment of contact vernaculars with different histories and lines of development, though of course they still have much in common . . . [and] there are no structural characteristics that all creoles share. . . [and] no structural criteria that can distinguish creoles from other types of language. In describing the linguistic characteristics of a pidgin or creole it is difficult to resist the temptation to compare it with the superstrate with which it is associated. In certain circumstances such a comparison may make good sense, as in the linguistic situations in Jamaica and Guyana; in others, however, it seems to make little sense, as in Haiti. In the brief discussion that follows some such comparisons will be made, but they are not meant to be invidious to the P/C language.

REFERENCE :

Wardhaugh, R. & Fuller, J. M. (2014). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.

John Wiley & Sons.