

Vašek, Antonín

**Linguistic interference in communication : to professor Demetrius
John Georgacas**

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada
jazykovědná.* 1991, vol. 40, iss. A39, pp. 63-81

ISBN 80-210-0362-6

ISSN 0231-7567

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/101486>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

ANTONÍN VAŠEK

LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE IN COMMUNICATION¹

To Professor Demetrius John Georgacas

0. The process of human communication has different aspects. These are, e. g., the type of its realization (direct v. indirect), the role of its participant(s) (active v. passive), their number (individual v. social, mass), etc., last but not least, the manner of communication (non-verbal v. verbal). Whereas non-verbal communication is considerably imperfect, representing either some sort of substitute for interpersonal verbal understanding (the usual case in the dumb) or a potential complement of it, verbal communication as linguistic exchange of thoughts represents the fundamental vehicle of interpersonal understanding and a basic component of the personality of man. Verbal communication is a functional aspect of language contact (representing its proper motivation), and in such a way it is a mirror of intercultural contact, too. Potential manifestation of the mutual contact of cultures and of their subsequent conflict and interaction can in the sphere of language be realized as a change in one/both/all of the participating contact languages and is often called by scholars *linguistic interference*. This denomination appears thus as a crucial one in a geographic region with mutual contacts of several cultures and of many national languages, both being often reciprocally quite different, as is, e. g., the situation in the Indian subcontinent (cf. Khubchandani 1974). Then there is not only a mere question of understanding of the new cultural and linguistic status quo, but through its understanding also of making possible the sensitive steering of the all-country cultural and linguistic policy, i. e., of language planning and of its implementation by the authorities. In such a way, getting acquainted with the substance of linguistic inter-

¹ Paper delivered at the XIth World Congress of Sociology (Sociolinguistic Section), New Delhi, India, 18—23 August 1986.

ference and with its relation to human communication appears as one of the fundamental preconditions for the ethically proper mental harmonization of such ethnically and culturally diverse parts of the world.

1. The study of language contacts is the subject of contact linguistics. This linguistic discipline investigates the causes, nature and consequences of mutual contact between two or more variously (formally and/or functionally) distributed forms (dialects) of the same language, in extreme cases between two subsystems/levels of the same language system, and thus considers language (language system) in its development. Language contact (originating in linguistic communication of an individual or a group in a language structure other than their own; cf. Vašek 1978) and its consequences, starting with mutual linguistic influences, also occur during the study of any foreign language (cf. Vašek 1976, 1978), and therefore can also be a subject of the study of contact linguistics.

Already in 1884 Schuchardt was aware of the fact: "Der Einfluss der Muttersprache (oder einer anderen welche an ihre Stelle getreten ist) macht sich bei der Erlernung einer neuen Sprache auf jeden Fall geltend; seine Stärke und seine Dauer wird aber eine verschiedene sein" (p. 128).

Since linguistic changes may occur as a result of language contacts — and they do occur, given favourable conditions — contact linguistics is at the same time the study of impetuses leading to potential linguistic changes, an attempt to explain changes which have occurred, and to indicate the lines upon which the development of languages is to take place.

2. Although the problem of linguistic contact in communication and the mutual influences of languages on each other is very old, in fact as old as human speech itself, systematic research on the subject, leaving aside occasional older works (cf. Schuchardt 1886) dates back only to the works on language mixing by Schuchardt (1881—91, 1884, inter al.). It is thus no wonder that the lexical unit in question — interference — appears as a linguistic expression relatively late. The first evidence of its appearance is from the first quarter of the 20th century, in Epstein's work on multilingualism (1915):

"Interférence auditivo-phonique chez le polyglotte... La pensée verbale ou la parole subit, chez le polyglotte, quelle que soit la langue qu'il emploie à un moment donné, l'action interférente de tous les autres idiomes qui lui sont familiers p. (69)... En analysant séparément chacun des facteurs de concurrence dans la polyglossie, nous verrons que, même sous sa forme latente, l'influence inhibitrice peut être souvent découverte et que ses effets sont aussi variés qu'inéluçables. Chercher les diverses formes de cette interférence, c'est chercher et quelquefois trouver les conditions dans lesquelles on pourrait la réduire au minimum (p. 70)... L'interférence verbo-phonique n'étant qu'une des multiples manifesta-

tions de la tendance générale des langues à s'inhiber mutuellement, on peut . . ." (p. 82).

In contrast to Epstein's (peculiarly defensive) concept of interference as a unidirectional linguistic influence, Meillet (1926) uses the designation in the sense of "a mutual influence of languages":

"Du mot hébreu, de valeur religieuse, à notre terme familier pour exprimer la tendresse il y a loin; mais sans l'interférence qui s'est produite un jour entre un mot grec et un mot hébreu, la maman française ne dirait pas: mon petit ange à son enfant" (348).

As witnessed by Jordan (1971, p. 451), Meillet used the term in his university course on general lexicology as early as the academic year 1924—25.²

The members of the Prague Linguistic Circle (PLC) were very interested in resolving questions of linguistic contact and linguistic interference. Thus in the very first lecture to take place in the circle, given by the young German guest speaker H. Becker on 6th October, 1926 on the theme "Der europäische Sprachgeist", and the discussion connected with it dealt with the interaction of European languages, conditioned by the common culture of their users (cf. Trnka 1928, Vachek 1966, pp. 8—9). On 13th January, 1927, R. Jakobson ("The Concept of Sound Laws and the Teleological Principle") spoke on the sociofunctional and teleological aspect required for a study of language systems. On 1st June, 1928 in the PLC he also dealt with the problem of borrowed words in Standard Language (on the mutual influence of the Old Slavic heritage and Russian territorial dialects in the formation of Standard Russian), referring to the works of N. S. Trubetskoï and V. V. Vinogradov. In the PLC on the 6th October, 1927, J. Rypka spoke on the question of interlingual contacts and interferences in the group of languages whose users profess the Islamic faith, particularly in Arabic, Persian and Turkish, i. e. languages systemically quite different, but connected by a strong cultural bond — religion — between users ("On the Mutual Penetration of the Major Islamic Languages"; cf. Trnka 1929). The necessity of studying questions of language contacts and interference (as the mutual influence of various linguistic forms and the history of Old Slavic elements in standard Slavic languages) was also expressed by the members of the PLC in their collective theses prepared as the basis for the Proceedings of the 1st International Congress of Slavists in Prague (1929, pp. 15, 22), and, of course, in the theses presented to the VIth International Linguistic Congress in Paris (1949) in the form of answers to a point of the congress questionnaire. Here the members of the PLC showed that from the moment of linguistic contact there occurs an interaction of languages which reveals itself in two ways: (i) one language undergoes

² The lecture was delivered in October, 1925.

a change, assimilating (author's underlining), borrowing elements of the other language and adapting them to its own system; (ii) both/all the given languages in contact with each other change (the transformations are bilateral, mutual); their mutual approximation is also evident in the appearance of new phenomena, common to these languages; this is linguistic interference (author's underlining):

"... Quand, par suite, d'une interférence linguistique, se transforment deux (ou plusieurs) langues intéressées, le rapprochement se traduit aussi par l'apparition de phénomènes nouveaux communs à ces langues. Ce processus évolutif peut être caractérisé comme évolution convergente, dans le sens plus étroit du mot (le terme d'évolution convergente pris dans un sens plus étendu désigne un rapprochement quelconque des structures linguistiques). Les innovations communes se produisant dans le cours d'une évolution des langues interférentes sont parfois considérées à tort comme dépendant d'un prétendu substrat (dans le cas des langues balcaniques, par exemple)" (p. 305).

In the year 1929 we find Havránek's work on the influence of the function of the Standard Language on the phonological system and the grammatical structure of Standard Czech, where the author expresses, *inter alia*, his views on the question of linguistic contacts and interference (pp. 112—113).

3. From the 1950s interest in questions of linguistic contacts, and also of course of linguistic interference, began to intensify. Weinreich (1953) especially began to pay detailed attention to questions of linguistic interference:

"Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i. e. as a result of language contact, will be referred to as interference phenomena... The term interference implies the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of the morphology and syntax, and some areas of the vocabulary (kinship, color, weather, etc.)... In the more loosely patterned domains of a language — some of the syntax, or vocabulary of an incidental nature — 'borrowing' might more properly be spoken of when the transfer of an element as such is to be stressed. But even there the possibility of ensuing rearrangements in the patterns, or interference, cannot be excluded" (p. 1)... "The forms of mutual interference of languages that are in contact are stated in terms of descriptive linguistics" (p. 3).

According to Weinreich interference takes place as soon as a bilingual person identifies an element of the secondary system with an element of the primary system, and reproduces it, in doing so subjecting it to the phonetic rules of the primary language (p. 14). For Weinreich (though he never explicitly says so, it can be inferred from his work as a whole)

interference thus means a penetration of foreign language elements into a language system, resulting in changes to that system.

Of the Polish linguists, Kuryłowicz (1954) uses the designation interference as a linguistic expression in the meaning of a mutual penetration of certain pronunciational tendencies into neighbouring dialects (cf. Paluszkiewicz 1965). Paluszkiewicz (ibid.) shows that the contemporary Polish *interferencja*, representing a generally used scientific term in physics, is beginning to appear; inter alia, in linguistics where it is an expression for linguistic influence and/or penetration. He recalls Woźnicki's (1964) statement:

"Szczególnie niekorzystny (w nauce języka francuskiego) był wpływ pisowni na wymowę, np. litera e wywołuje interferencję polskiego e, tam gdzie w języku francuskim powinno wystąpić e, ə, ø, oe"; "... (on mistakes) wynikających z wpływu interferencji języka polskiego".

According to Haugen (1956) — cf. Semchyn's'kyi 1974, pp. 79—80 — the phenomenon of linguistic interference is based on the fact that a person assimilates the outside world through the familiar schemes of his mother tongue. An insufficient command of the system of a second language leads to the use of its structural elements through the medium of the norms and systemic relationships of the mother tongue. As a result of the natural attribute of the human psyche which identifies or on the contrary differentiates, the speaker either differentiates the elements of the foreign language from the corresponding elements of the mother tongue or identifies them. At the same time linguistic interference is not confined to cases of borrowing the material units of a foreign language or changes in the functions of identified units of a foreign language model. Linguistic interference may also decelerate or accelerate the realization of certain tendencies in a language.

Round about the middle of the 60s — in 1966 — Havránek returns to the question of interference. He takes it to mean common phenomena arising as a result of linguistic contact:

"Sprachmischung fasse ich hier im weiten Sinne; ich will da ... mehr die Resultate der Sprachmischung als den Prozess selbst ins Auge fassen ... Ein völlig entsprechender Terminus für das fragliche Phänomen wäre "Sprachkontakt". Dieser Terminus, der von André Martinet geprägt³ und durch U. Weinreich bekannt wurde, ist durch die Arbeiten

³ However, it must be called to mind that already in 1904 Wackernagel used the naming unit "Kontaktsprachen":

"Nicht scharf zu trennen von den zwei bisher besprochenen Gruppen von Erscheinungen (= influence of the speech of lords and rulers on that of their subjects and vice versa — author), oft wol eine Vorstufe dazu, ist eine dritte, die uns im ganzen weniger gewohnt, aber für gewisse Gebiete fast selbstverständlich ist: die gegenseitige sprachliche Beeinflussung heteroglotter Bewohner desselben Gebietes; sei es, dass engste Nachbarschaft oder das förmliches Durcheinander-

der letzten Zeit... allgemein üblich geworden; er ist passend und vor allem weit genug; er erklärt aber nichts in sprachlicher Hinsicht, sondern bezeichnet lediglich sprachliche Situationen; diesen stehen dann als Resultat gewisse gemeinsame Spracherscheinungen, die wir zusammenfassend als die sprachliche Interferenz bezeichnen können, gegenüber... Der Weg vom "Kontakt"... zur "Interferenz" ist mannigfaltig..."

For Petrovici (1967) the designation linguistic interference indicates on the one hand a (unidirectional) penetration of foreign language (lexical and "structural") elements into a language (1. system), and on the other a mutual penetration of languages (1. systems):

"Interpénétration des systèmes linguistiques... Des faits d'interférence entre langues ont été discutés... Tous ces problèmes se réduisent en fin de compte à celui du bilinguisme, par l'intermédiaire duquel se réalise le contact entre les langues, qui occasionne des interférences, des emprunts de toutes sortes... Ce qui empêche la diffusion, dans une langue quelconque, des formes étrangères au code, usitées par les bilingues, ce n'est pas une force mystique quelconque, l'"esprit" de la langue, mais le besoin qu'éprouve le bilingue de se faire comprendre par la masse unilingue et de se conformer aux normes de la langue de ses interlocuteurs. C'est la cause principale qui détermine la 'résistance' des langues, des systèmes linguistiques, à l'invasion des éléments étrangers... Bien entendu, la réaction contre l'interférence linguistique peut être due aussi à des facteurs psychologiques et sociaux..."

Rot (1967, 1973) does not offer a definition of linguistic interference as such, but it is implied in his work as a whole that he takes it to be linguistic influence ("Na úrovne morfológii... propuskayusheĭ tchuzherodnyĭ élement tol'ko v sluchae intensivnoĭ yazykovoĭ interferentsii marginal'nogo i intraregional'nogo tipa i chastichnogo bilingvizma, my mozhem govorit' o sleduyushchikh karpaticzmakh issleduemykh yazykov..."⁴ 1967), arising as a result of language contacts (1973, p. 3). To him interference is a mutual linguistic influence, a language interaction

wohnen stattfindet. Hier spielt die Zweisprachigkeit grosser Bevölkerungsteile, das Dasein von 'Kontaktsprachen' eine wichtige Rolle."

Thus, for Wackernagel Kontaktsprachen meant collective bilingualism, the coexistence of two languages in the same speakers. Epstein, too, takes the expression (linguistic) contact as the coexistence of two languages in the same speaker (but being a psychologist, he speaks on an individual bilingualism):

"L'action interférente que langue maternelle exerce sur langue étrangère... atteint le maximum d'intensité lorsque les antagonistes (= language systems in a bilingual speaker — author) sont mis en contact, c'est-à-dire quand on veut exprimer une même pensée successivement dans les deux langues" (pp. 211—212).

⁴ In transliterating the Russian alphabet the practice of the Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English⁶ (ed. by J. B. Sykes, Oxford 1976) has been followed. As for Ukrainian, the letters і, и, ї are transliterated by the present author as i, y, ĭ, respectively.

(1967, 1973, p. 87), though here and there the formulation gives the expression of a unidirectional influence: "... a) rezul'taty lingvisticheskoi interferentsii karpatsko-balkanskikh substratov; b) (?; the author) rezul'taty lingvisticheskoi interferentsii mnogostoronnykh (mnogolateral'nykh) yazykovykh kontaktov..." (1973, p. 115).

Il'yashenko (1970), in accordance with Weinreich's definition, thinks that interference is "strukturnoe izmenenie modelei yazyka vsledstvie vvedeniya élementov drugogo yazyka" (p. 47). The initial stage of interference in the lexicon or in grammatical structure is, according to this authoress, usually represented by some deviation from the norm. Such a deviation may remain a "deviation", but it may spread, establish itself in the standard language, expand the sphere of its application, and in that case it will be an interference phenomenon — a penetration of new elements into the tissue of the language (p. 47).

Juhász (1970) says that linguistic interference is a disturbance of the norm brought about by the influence of elements of another language, or the process of this influencing:

"Unter Interferenz ist in der vorliegenden Arbeit die durch die Beeinflussung von anderen sprachlichen Elementen verursachte Verletzung einer sprachlicher Norm bzw. der Prozess der Beeinflussung zu verstehen" (p. 9).

Villegas (1970) speaks of linguistic interference as (unidirectional) linguistic influence and/or penetration of one language into another:

"En relación con el predominio de una lengua sobre otra u otras, puede observarse que mientras algunos bilingües emplean la segunda lengua sólo para leer, otros la emplean también para hablar; que mientras en algunas ocasiones la interferencia mútua de las lenguas es mínima, en otras hay mezclas que se producen en proporción variable, que determina la formación de idiomas pichines y que, a veces, llegan a contribuir, así, a la formación de una lengua nacional propia" (p. 20).

Rozentsveig (1972) considers linguistic interference to be the bilingual's breaking of the rules of the mutual relationship between languages in contact with each other, appearing in his speech as a deviation from the norm:

"Narushenie bilingvom pravil sootneseniya kontaktiruyushchikh yazykov, kotoroe proyavlyatsya v ego rechi v otklonenii ot normy, nazyvaem interferentsiei..." (p. 4).

The Swedish researcher Oksaar (1972) considers the above-mentioned definition of Weinreich to be the most current and apparently inclines towards it as being satisfactory. Thus, she takes linguistic interference to be (unidirectional) penetration of foreign language element into a language system, resulting in changes to that system:

"Its (= Vildomec's research work — author) empirical parts... offer interesting observations on mutual interference between languages among bilingual and trilingual individuals... that verify the earlier observa-

tions... An important problem that remains to be solved is: 'whether the total amount of interference between two similar languages is really greater than between two dissimilar ones, and what are the differences between the mechanism of interference of related and unrelated languages'."

Desheriev and Protchenko (1972) characterize linguistic interference as the phenomenon of the interaction of linguistic systems and systemic elements *yavlenie vzaimodeistviya struktur i strukturnykh elementov*) of the two languages in the process of contact (*obshcheniya*) among bilingual populations. An analysis of that interaction which concerns the effect of the first language of a bilingual population on the second leads them to speak of "substrate character" interference, in the opposite case (B → A), "adstrate (here perhaps better: superstrate — author) character" interference.

Barannikova (1972) conceives linguistic interference as one of the results of the mutual influence of languages, which can occur only with the regular use of different languages by the same person or group. She takes interference to be an expression of this influence — a change in the system or the systemic phenomena of one language under the influence of another:

"Interferentsiya — èto izmenenie v strukture ili èlementakh struktury odnogo yazyka pod vliyaniem drugogo yazyka."

For another Soviet worker, Ershova (1972), in a contribution to the same conference, the denomination linguistic interference designates the result of interaction of languages and of bilingualism. The authoress, however, considers the concept of linguistic interference to be extremely dubious and as yet insufficiently rooted in specialized literature:

"V issledovanii problemy vzaimodeistviya yazykov ponyatie lingvisticheskoi interferentsii yavlyaetsya naibolee spornym i eshchë ne vpolne utverdivshimsya v spetsial'noi literature".

Bulakhov (1972) takes linguistic interference to be the mutual penetration of elements of two different languages used alternately in various situations by the same speakers.

Linguistic interference is taken by Semchyns'kyi (1974) to mean the mutual influence and/or penetration of systems and system elements of two languages as a result of linguistic contacts, and since language is a system where all is interconnected, an influence leading to reorganization of the phonological, grammatical and lexical system of the language in question if foreign language elements enter into it:

"Takym chynom, lingvistychnu interferentsiyu mozhna rozumity yak vzaemodiyu system i elementiv system dvokh mov vnaslidok movnykh kontaktiv. Ta oskil'ky mova — tse taka systema où tous se tient, (de vse vzaemopovyazane) ineterferentsiya pryvodyt' do reorganizatsii fonologichnoi, gramatychnoi chy leksychnoi systemy danoi movy, yakshcho do nei vkhodyat' inshomovni elementy" (pp. 76—77 et passim).

Bernshtein and Klepikova (1976) give no definition of linguistic interference; they characterize it indirectly, conceiving its theory as a new stage in the development of substrate theory:

“V nastoyashchee vremya možno uzhe govorit' o sushchestvovanii osoboi teorii interferentsii yazykov, kotoraya predstavlyaet soboi novyi etap v razvitii teorii substrata.”

They emphasize the important active role of the substrate in the transformation of the internal laws of development of the language assimilating the substrate language, and stress the importance of a thorough, processual conception of the relation substrate — superstrate.

Moskovich (1976) also gives no definition of linguistic interference, but from the formulations of his study it follows that he thinks of interference as linguistic interaction and/or reciprocal effect (mutual penetration? — author):

“Interference of Hebrew and Russian in Israel . . . The process of interaction and reciprocal influences of different languages in modern Israel give rich material for linguistic observation. Israel is one of those linguistic ‘melting pots’ where various languages are commonly used in a parallel way, with a substantial degree of interference among them . . . Linguistic interference of Hebrew and Russian within the specific conditions of mass bilingualism and multilingualism in Israel represents a challenging and hitherto unexplored field of research.”

Straková (1981) understands linguistic interference as mutual impact (*Kooperation, Interaktion*) of individual language subsystems/levels. Its result is the structuring of language units, especially words. The authoress studies the system of accentuation of the present Russian derivation. She explains the accentual differentiation of the means of derivation by the interference of two subsystems — the derivational system itself and the lexicon (= material).

4. The diverse definitions and characterizations of linguistic interference, of which about a score have been mentioned here, can be divided according to what they express into a number of basic groups, where interference between linguistic forms in contact with each other has the following meanings: a) linguistic influence, either aa) unidirectional, i. e., the impact of one language (linguistic form, linguistic system, linguistic subsystem) on another/others, or ab) linguistic interaction; b) language penetration, either ba) unidirectional, i. e., the penetration of linguistic elements from one language (linguistic form, linguistic system) into another, or bb) mutual penetration of linguistic forms/systems; c) a linguistic element which has penetrated into another linguistic form/system; d) a new linguistic phenomenon arising from linguistic contact, common to both/all contact language forms/systems; e) a modified linguistic norm or linguistic system arising from the penetration of a foreign language element or the appearance of an innovation common to the contact languages.

The above-mentioned linguists can then be assigned to the same groupings according to the concept(s) of linguistic interference to which they to a greater or lesser extent seem to subscribe, as follows:

a) aa) Bernshtein and Klepikova, Juhász, Paluszkiewicz, Rot, Villegas, Woźnicki;

ab) Desheriev and Protchenko, Moskovich, Rot, Semchyns'kyi, Straková;

b) ba) Barannikova, Desheriev and Protchenko, Epstein, Ershova, Haugen, Il'yashenko, Oksaar, Paluszkiewicz, Petrovici, Villegas, Weinreich, Woźnicki;

bb) Bulakhov, Kuryłowicz, Meillet, Moskovich, Paluszkiewicz, Petrovici, PLC, Semchyns'kyi;

c) Meillet, Semchyns'kyi;

d) Havránek, PLC;

e) Barannikova, Juhász, Il'yashenko, Oksaar, PLC, Rozentsveig, Semchyns'kyi, Weinreich.

The results of such classifications must, however, be approached with considerable reserve. Every definition of a scientific concept (here linguistic interference), together with its individual naming units, can have — and often does have — a different content for different researchers. This follows from the fact that there is always a certain degree of subjectivization in the theoretical conception of a complete complex of questions studied (here questions of contact linguistics) by individual workers: an isolated judgement, excised from a researcher's complete exposition, can sometimes amount to a falsification of his opinions. What is more, in the case of many researchers, there is no question of a definition in the strict sense, but rather of a variously situationally or contextually motivated, and in effect also variously accurate, characterization of a given concept. Not least it must be said that the experts themselves do not use the naming unit in question entirely consistently in a single sense. They often seem to be unsure at what point in time (and development) between the moment of the occurrence of linguistic contact (i. e., the moment when linguistic forms/systems/subsystems in contact with each other begin to influence each other) and the moment when a change in one (or all) of them, or its/their lasting exchange for a new system, occurs, they should refer to linguistic interference. Or should a certain substantial part of this time interval be thus designated, rather than a single stage of development of the given language system(s) (as it is in fact by many researchers)? Or should interference be conceived in its widest sense, encompassing the whole of this process of development?

5. As can be seen, the expression interference (and the same applies to the original verb to interfere) is not as yet fully terminologized in linguistics, and is still used in a number of clearly distinct meanings, though the concepts which are designated are common and very important in linguistics, and indeed basic to contact linguistics. The question arises

whether there in fact exists a criterion according to which it would be possible to lay down objectively which of the given (or other⁵) meanings would be best suited to the terminologization of this naming unit (linguistic/language interference) in linguistics, i. e., in what does the terminological specificity of the naming unit lie?

The author is of the opinion that it is not crucial to the resolution of this question which of the meanings expressed (designated) is linguistically weightier, nor is the (desirable but not indispensable parallelization of the term with the situation of this naming unit in the development of terminology in other scientific fields, e. g. physics, of great importance, nor, when all is said and done, is it relevant whether the expressed meaning of the word which is to be terminologized as its notional content is or is not compatible with the present-day meaning of the word as it follows from its present-day descriptive character, i. e., from this denomination as a descriptive naming unit, though all these facts do have a certain bearing on the process of terminologization of the expression. The present author considers the decisive factor to be the terminological roots of the lexical meaning of our naming unit in linguistics, i. e., which of the above-mentioned (or of other parallelly occurring) meanings of the word to interfere, interference is, in some mode of expression, already used as a linguistic term (thus terminologized) and which not. In the meaning which has not yet been terminologically rooted in international linguistics, the (introduction and) terminologization of the naming unit to interfere, interference is undoubtedly desirable, and should not be too difficult to bring about. If, however, the given meaning of the word to interfere, interference is commonly expressed in international linguistics by means of some other denomination and functions as a specialized term, its terminologically conceived designation by a further naming unit (i. e., using the word interfere, interference) is from the point of view of formal expression redundant, and from the point of view of the content expressed in addition often polysemanticizing, and therefore from both these points of view — the first for the speaker, the second for the addressee — undesirable. It must be borne in mind here that the com-

⁵ E. g. Rau defines linguistic interference as a disturbing factor slowing down language acquisition:

“Unter Interferenzen werden die Störfaktoren erfasst, die den Spracherwerbsprozess hemmen... Konjunktivformen interferieren mit dem Indikativ von sein und werden. Die Entwicklung des Konjunktivs... beeinflusst den Indikativ Präsens von sein, der bis dahin — einschliesslich des Imperativs sei, ohne Interferenz — zum gesicherten Formenbestand gehörte, so dass Philipp (examined child — author) vorübergehend ich bin/ich sei gleichbedeutend und alternativ verwendet...”

Thus, in fact, Rau understands linguistic interference as interaction of language subsystems, i. e., it might be classified here as ab, see above.

mon noun differs from the specialized term precisely in its ability to be ambiguous. It follows from this that not every designation (naming unit) of a specialized concept is a specific lexical item of the specialized language (a technical term): some of them are unterminologized appellativa. Thus if a naming unit is to assume the character of such a specific unit, a specialized term, it must be the only widespread means of expression (desirably on a more or less international level — usually with certain formal variations) reserved for the given concept. The international character of specialized terms is extremely important and vitally necessary. It makes them the most progressive lexical body in today's age of the scientific and technical revolution, and thus of an ever intensifying process of interlingual (because intersocial) convergence. Thus it is also essential for acquiring of technical significance of the expression (linguistic) interference to take place in that of its notional contents as is not reserved in known world languages for other accepted naming units. In this direction the situation in international linguistics of the word in question is comparatively clear. Of the above-mentioned meanings sub a, b, c, d, and e, the conceptual content of the naming unit interference as a linguistic term should be the meaning given sub b, more precisely ba, "the penetration of a linguistic element into the contacted language".

As is known to experts, however, this penetration has different forms and levels. It begins with the individual ad hoc entry of single foreign linguistic items as new elements into the contact language form. For example: *da:l mu amendu ze nemne:l s'õneriju a svjetlo* "he (a man on a bicycle) was given a fine (by a policeman) because he had no bell and light" (Vašek 1968). Here Romanian, as the language of official contact, penetrates with two of its expressions into the territorially coexisting isolated Czech of a number of the Czech ethnic minority in conditions of collective plurilingualism in the region of Banat in Romania. It is easy to see that this type of interference into the contact language (viewed here from the opposite, the Czech side, this involuntary use of elements of a foreign language system in speech carried on in the domestic, i. e., Czech language) is the more common and the richer in the extent of the penetrating means of expression, the lower is the level of knowledge of the contact (= Czech) language on the part of its speakers. There is a great quantitative and qualitative difference between such cases of linguistic interference and relatively established and generally used foreign language elements in a new linguistic setting, penetrated into a new language system, i. e., evidence of systemic language change that might be called language shift (cf. Vašek 1983). An example is the type *ne.iñi*, standard Czech (StCz) *není* "he/she/it is not", *mo.ũda*, StCz *móda* "fashion" (Vašek 1968, 1976), with the change /e:/ → /e:!/ , /o:/ → /o:ũ/ , conditioned by German (G) and Hungarian (H), cf. *Ĝ jne:ʔ*, StĜ *Schnee*

"snow", H *keňe:ɹ*, StH *kenyér* "bread", G *lo:ũpn*, StG *loben* "to praise", H *ho:ũ*, StH *hó* "snow", and well-known in the environment mentioned, that of the region of Banat in Romania, or the pronunciation *ɣiba*, *ɣak* (similarly as, e. g., *kɣeifi*), given by the penetration of the Am. /ɣ/ into the system of US isolated Czech, and alternating the old Czech /r/ with the American /ɣ/ sound (Vašek 1976).

It in no way follows from this that the remaining meanings (a, c, d, e) are irrelevant from the point of view of contact linguistics. All of them are important: they are, however, sufficiently well expressed by means of other expressions. The first of them, a, "(unidirectional v. mutual) linguistic effect", has, in various languages, e. g., these naming units: linguistic influence, linguistic impact v. linguistic interaction/interplay (E.); influence linguistique v. influence linguistique réciproque (F.); sprachliche (Ein)wirkung, -er Einfluss, -e Beeinflussung v. wechselseitige sprachliche (Ein)wirkung, -er -er Einfluss, -e -e Beeinflussung (G.); *yazykovoe vozdeistvie*, *yazykovoe vliyanie* v. *mezhyazykovoe vzaimodeistvie* (Russian, R.). The third meaning, c, "a penetrated foreign language element", has, for example, the following parallel expressions: borrowing, loan, loanword, interference phenomenon (E.); *emprunt linguistique*, *phénomène d'interférence linguistique* (F.); sprachliche Übernahme, Lehnwort, sprachliche Interferenzerscheinung (G.); *yazykovoe zaimstvovanie*, *yavlenie interferentsii* (R.).

It is necessary to point out in this connection that not all the experts consider these expressions fully synonymous, designating the same content, i. e., any kind of foreign language element in a linguistic system, whether desirable or undesirable. So, for example, in the case of the English naming units mentioned, the expression *borrowing* often indicates a penetrated foreign language element which is necessary, and therefore desirable for the assimilated language system; the expressions *loan*, *loanword* simply express a penetrated foreign language element, without reference to the degree of desirability to the recipient language system; the expression *interference phenomenon* expresses a penetrated foreign language element unnecessary to the assimilated language system, and therefore undesirable. Elsewhere experts take the borrowing verbally, thus processually, as the act of borrowing, while loan, loanword, and interference phenomenon are taken as the partial resulting expressions of this penetration. A lack of uniformity of conception can also be observed among the French, German and Russian groups of expressions mentioned. From the point of view of the study of linguistic interference it does not, of course, matter how many meanings (one? two? three? four?) these four expressions imply. What is important is the fact that the meaning(s) c is/are thus sufficiently expressed in international linguistics by other means, and therefore it is not necessary or even desirable to introduce another naming unit, e. g., (linguistic) interference, for it/them.

The fourth meaning, d, "a new, common linguistic phenomenon/element, resulting from interlingual convergence arising out of mutual linguistic influence", is not normally designated in current international linguistics by a special, independent technical term, but appellatively, by means of descriptive naming units. The same applies to the fifth meaning, e, "modification of the linguistic norm or linguistic system by the penetration of a foreign language element or by the appearance of an innovation common to the given contact linguistic forms/systems". At the same time the question arises which of the mentioned proponents of the cases c, d, and e hold the unequivocal view that the particular meaning of the expression interference is the only notional content of the word: some of these researchers are likely to intend the word broadly, understanding by it not only the process of linguistic influence (meaning a) and/or linguistic penetration (meaning b), but at the same time, as an obvious fact, also the expression for, and/or result/consequence of, this process, i. e., the meaning given sub c, d, or e. As far as the third meaning is concerned, it would be desirable to remove the naming unit interference phenomenon from the terminological sphere as being an incorrect designation. For in part this designation is too broad (interference, a. "somehow pertaining to interference /n./") and in part it is too narrow: not every penetrated foreign language element can in the author's opinion be called an interference phenomenon, but only one which represents an expression competing with its counterpart in the domestic language system. However, even in the case of such a narrower content of c it would be preferable to speak of an interfering language element or interfereme (here cf. Zatočkaňuk 1978). The naming unit interference phenomenon would then be more suitable as an appellative designation of any of the cases indicated by ba, c, d, e without further classification.

What has been said applies only if the cases ba, c, d, e concern a concrete utterance, i. e., if they concern (i) a penetration of a foreign language element into the utterance (ba), (ii) a penetrated language element in the utterance (c, d), (iii) an unusual case of realization of language norm owing to the penetration of a language element (e). All the enumerated cases pertain to the level of speech, parole. However, if they pertain to the language system, i. e., the level of langue it would be more precise not to designate them as interference phenomena, but as cases of language changing/shifting, or as cases of a completed language change/shift, or cases of a changed/shifted language system. (For details, see Vašek 1983.)

In the case of the fourth meaning, d, "a penetrated common neologism", the undesirability of its appearance is a point in favour of its inclusion among interference phenomena, since it has penetrated into a linguistic form as something communicatively isofunctional with a phenomenon already existing in the domestic system. Thus, even if in a case of this

meaning d there is no transmission of a phenomenon from language A to language B or vice versa, and even if neither of the given contact languages is the transmitter, but both/all are recipients, one can still speak of an interference phenomenon, if only *sui generis*.

As far as the question of whether the expression (linguistic) interference should be terminologized in linguistics in its unidirectional or its mutual meaning, the above-mentioned preference of the author for the first alternative (= ba) is in no way arbitrary. One must not be misled by the fact that this view is not in line with the original (etymological) meaning of the word *interfere*, which was "mutually to hit, strike, beat", i. e., "to have an undesirable effect on each other". The recognition of penetration as a possible manifestation of a mutual linguistic influence (linguistic interaction) is older in linguistics than the earliest recorded use of the expression *interference* in the function of designating a linguistic notion. One can, for example, quote here the above-mentioned work of Schuchardt on language mixing. Quite understandably, in the case of the meaning "penetration", linguistics at first tended to consider this unilateral. This corresponded to the conviction that from the point of view of linguistic importance the actual (in a way — by mutual linguistic influence — conditioned) changing of a linguistic form/system was of greater significance than the fact of whether the (thus conditioned) change involved only one of the forms/systems in contact, or more than one, perhaps all. If, then, penetration into the contact language involves at the same time a certain change in it, on the basis of an accentuation of just this fact it is fitting to terminologize the expression (linguistic) interference in the sense of a linguistic penetration which is unidirectional: that is the minimum requirement for linguistic penetration, and at the same time is essential to it, while various degrees of mutuality of penetration are potential, and are explicitly easily expressible lexically (as is in fact done by many researchers), e. g. by means of the expression mutual (linguistic) interference. It is therefore not surprising that the first mentioned use (Epstein) of *interference* as a designation for a linguistic notion is in the sense of a unidirectional penetration. At the same time *interference* is associated with an old undertone of undesirability connected with the genesis of the expression: not every penetration of a foreign element into a language means a disturbance of that language (i. e., *interference*). It does not include the penetration of designations of new notions, concepts as yet unknown to the person communicating by means of the so affected and changed language, i. e., cases where there is no competition between expressions. Whereas linguistic interference always represents the resolution of the competition between the means of expression of language A with the communicationally isofunctional means of language B, where the penetration of an element of language A into the contacted language B does not involve competition of the penetrating element with a communicationally equivalent element in lan-

guage B, there is no actual interfering, interference (as an undesirable entry, meddling, changing) of "B" by "A", but only an enriching of the power of expression of the assimilated language B (cf. Vašek 1979). Thus, linguistic interference can be defined as "the penetration of a competitive foreign language element into the contacted language form".

However, not even interfering itself — as the author would finally like to emphasize — can be considered from the point of view of the affected and changed language to be a destructive process only, for such an interpretation would be too onesided and incorrect. It must always be borne in mind that linguistic interference can also act as an enlivening factor instigating further linguistic development: if continually repeated, interference converts into a systemic language change which means a certain modification of the affected (= recipient) contacted system, a disturbance of its relative stability (if the state of the system before its reception of externally penetrated linguistic material, i. e., before the occurrence of language change, be thus described), and thus also an impulse to the further development of the given system with a view to regaining its internal equilibrium. The penetrated material then behaves in its new environment (= further develops) in harmony with the action of a whole new complex of factors of linguistic development. So linguistic interference must appear as a desirable and vitally important subject of linguistic research, thus helping towards a better understanding of the relation between culture and communication, the participation of the former in the character of the latter, and leading to a better understanding even of the interlinguistic and intercultural relations in the countries with a great ethnic and cultural diversity.

REFERENCES

- BARANNIKOVA, L. I.: Suščnost' interferencii i specifika jejo pojavljenija. In: Problemy dvujazyčija i mnogojazyčija. Moskva 1972, pp. 88—98.
- BERNŠTEJN, S. B., KLEPIKOVA, G. P.: Processy jazykovej interferencii na Karpatach i 'Obščekarpatskij dialektologičeskij atlas'. Sovetskoje slavjanovedenje, 1976, 2, pp. 63—69.
- BULACHOV, M. G.: Osobennosti interferencii belorusskogo i russkogo jazykov. In: o. c. Problemy dvujazyčija . . . , pp. 217—224.
- DEŠERIJEV, Ju. D., PROTČENKO, I. F.: Osnovnyje aspekty issledovanija dvujazyčija i mnogojazyčija. In: o. c. Problemy dvujazyčija . . . , pp. 26—42.
- EPSTEIN, I.: La pensée et la polyglossie. Essai psychologique et didactique. Paris 1915(?).
- FISHMAN, J. A.: Language Loyalty in the United States. London—Den Haag—Paris 1966.
- HAUGEN, E.: Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. Alabama 1956.

- HAVRÁNEK, B.: Influence de la fonction de la langue littéraire sur la structure phonologique et grammaticale du tchèque littéraire. In: Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague, 1, Praha 1929, pp. 106—120.
- HAVRÁNEK, B.: Zur Problematik der Sprachmischung. In: Travaux linguistiques de Prague. 2. Les problèmes du centre et de la périphérie du système de la langue, Praha 1966, pp. 81—95.
- ILJAŠENKO, T. P.: Jazykovye kontakty. Na materiale slavjano-moldavskich otnošenij. Moskva 1970.
- IORDAN, I.: Romanskoje jazykoznanije. Istoričeskoje razvitije, tečenija, metody. Translation from Rumanian. Moskva 1971.
- JERŠOVA, Je. N.: O nekotorych formach lingvističeskoj interferencii i o vozmožnosti ich ispolzovanija v metodike prepodavanija jazykov. In o. c. Problemy dvujazyčija . . . , pp. 130—139.
- JUHÁSZ, J.: Probleme der Interferenz. Budapest 1970.
- KHUBCHANDANI, L. M.: Language Factor in Census: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. Paper delivered at the VIIIth World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, August 1974. Simla 1974, pp. 1—39.
- KLEPIKOVA, G. P., see Bernštejn, S. B., Klepikova, G. P.
- KURYŁOWICZ, J.: Uwagi o mazurzeniu. Biuletyn PTJ, XIII, 1954, pp. 9—19.
- MEILLET, A.: Les interférences entre vocabulaires. In: Linguistique historique et linguistique générale. 2nd edition, Paris 1926, pp. 343—350.
- MOSKOWICH, W.: Interference of Hebrew and Russian in Israel. In: Slavica Hierosolymitana. 4. Contacts of Slavic Languages with Non-Slavic Languages. Jerusalem 1976, pp. 215—234.
- OKSAAR, E.: Bilingualism. In: Current Trends in Linguistics. 9. Linguistics in Western Europe. Den Haag—Paris 1972, pp. 476—511.
- PALUSZKIEWICZ, M.: Interferencja znaczy 'ingerencja'. Język Polski, XLV, 1965, 3, pp. 184—186.
- PETROVICI, E.: Interpénétrations des systèmes linguistiques. In: X^{ème} Congrès International des Linguistes. 28 août — 2 septembre 1967. Bucarest — Roumanie. Rapport. Cluj 1967, pp. 1—16.
- PRAŽSKÝ LINGVISTICKÝ KROUŽEK /Prague Linguistic Circle (PLC)/: Mélanges Linguistiques dédiés au Premier Congrès des Philologues Slaves. Thèses. In: Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague. 1. Praha 1929, pp. 5—29.
- PRAŽSKÝ LINGVISTICKÝ KROUŽEK (PLK). Answer to Congress Questionnaire, item no. IV "Dans quelles conditions et dans quelles limites peut s'exercer sur le système morphologique d'une langue l'action du système morphologique d'une autre langue? Et de quelles conséquences sont ces actions pour l'accession des langues moins évoluées au rôle des langues de culture?" In: Actes du Sixième Congrès International des Linguistes. Paris 1949, pp. 305—306.
- PROTČENKO, I. F., see Dešerijev, Ju. D., Protčenko, I. F.
- RAU, M. L.: Die Entwicklung von Vergangenheitsstrukturen in der Sprache eines Dreijährigen. In: Folia Linguistica, ASLE, XIII, The Hague 1979, 3—4, pp. 357—412.
- ROT, A. M.: Osobennosti vzaimodejstvija jazykov i dialektov Karpatskogo bassejna i vengersko-ukrainskaja interferencija. In: Studia Slavica Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae, XIII, Budapest 1967, pp. 247—266.
- ROT, A. M.: Osobennosti vzaimodejstvija jazykov i dialektov Karpatskogo areala. Užgorod 1973.
- ROZENCVEJG, V. Ju.: Jazykovye kontakty. Leningrad 1972.
- SCHUCHARDT, H.: Kreolische Studien. 1—9. Graz (?) 1881—1891.
- SCHUCHARDT, H.: Dem Herrn Franz von Miklosich zum 20. November 1883. Slawo-deutsches und slawo-italienisches. Graz 1884.
- SCHUCHARDT, H.: Zu meiner Schrift 'Slawo-deutsches und Slawoitalienisches. II'. Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien 1886, V, pp. 321—352.

- SEMČYNS'KYJ, S. V.: Semantyčna interferencija mov. Na materialí slovjano-schid-noromans'kich movnych kontaktiv. Kyjiv 1974.
- STRAKOVÁ, V.: Zur Interferenz von Teilsystemen. Beitrag zur akzentologischen Analyse der russischen Sprache der Gegenwart. In: *Folia Linguistica*, ASLE, XV, The Hague 1981, 3—4, pp. 437—442.
- TRNKA, B.: Pražský lingvistický kroužek. ČMF, XIV, pp. 182—186.
- TRNKA, B.: Pražský lingvistický kroužek. ČMF, XV, pp. 78—82, 173—175.
- VACHEK, J.: *The Linguistic School of Prague*. Bloomington — London 1966.
- VAŠEK, A.: K vzájemným vztahům slovanských a neslovanských jazyků v rumunském Banátě. Na základě analýzy jazyka moravského osídlení v RSR. In: Československé přednášky pro VI. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Praze. Praha 1968, pp. 165—169.
- VAŠEK, A.: On the Problem of the Isolated Language. In: *Folia Linguistica*, ASLE, IX, The Hague 1976, 1—4, pp. 85—124.
- VAŠEK, A.: Kontakty izolovaného slovanského jazyka. In: Československé příspěvky pro VIII. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů (Záhřeb 1978). Praha 1978, pp. 43—54.
- VAŠEK, A.: Bilingvismus, diglosie a jazykové kontakty v Karpatech. Paper delivered at the VIth International Conference on the Carpathian Linguistic Atlas in Cracow, November 17—21, 1976. In: *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Językoznawcze*, 61, Warszawa — Kraków 1979, pp. 23—37.
- VAŠEK, A.: On Language Shift and Language Switch in Isolated Languages. Paper delivered at the XIVth International Congress of the SLE in Copenhagen, August 16—18, 1981. In: *SPFFBU, A* 31, 1983, pp. 15—23.
- VILLEGAS, O. U.: *Sociolingüística Concreta*. (Algunas facetas.) México 1970.
- WACKERNAGEL, J.: Sprachtausch und Sprachmischung. In: *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Geschäftliche Mittheilungen aus dem Jahre 1904*. Göttingen 1904.
- WEINREICH, U.: *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York. I. 1953. Sixth Printing. The Hague — Paris 1968.
- WOŹNICKI, T.: U źródeł niepowodzeń w nauczaniu języków obcych. *Nowa Szkoła*, 13, 1964, 6, p. 26.
- ZATOVKAŇUK, M.: Formal'no-smyslovyye otnošenija v oblasti jazykovoj interferencii. *Československá rusistika*, XXIII, 1978, pp. 70—77.

JAZYKOVÁ INTERFERENCE V KOMUNIKACI

Jazyková komunikace jako jazyková výměna myšlenek je základní podobou komunikace a zároveň funkčním aspektem jazykového kontaktu, představuje jeho vlastní motivaci, a je tak i zrcadlem kontaktů mezikulturních. V oblasti jazyka se potenciální projevy vzájemného kontaktu kultur a jejich následného vzájemného působení realizují jako změny v daných kontakto­vých jazycích, což bývá lingvisty označováno výrazem jazyková interference. Autor přináší historický přehled užívání tohoto pojmenování spolu se stratifikací jeho pojmového obsahu; studuje přitom názory více nežli dvaceti badatelů širokého mezinárodního spektra, počínaje I. Epsteinem (1915). Pokouší se najít kritérium, které by umožňovalo objektivní zjištění žádoucnosti terminologizace tohoto pojmenování i objektivní určení obsahu, který by měl být přijatým termínem vyjadřován. Za rozhodující zde považuje otázku terminologického zakotvení lexikálního významu v mezinárodní lingvistice: terminologizovat možno ten význam, který v ní dosud není obsazen ustáleným pojme-

nováním jiným. Analyzuje pojem označovaný daným pojmenováním i jeho terminologické vyjádření, opíraje se o vlastní dlouhodobý výzkum dvou sociálně lingvistických scén evropských (Československo, Rumunsko) a jedné americké (USA). Dochází k přesvědčení o oprávněnosti termínu jazyková interference a definuje jej jako „pronikání konkurenčního cizojazyčného prvku do kontaktového jazykového útvaru“. To vše napomáhá lepšímu chápání vztahu kultury a komunikace, účasti první na povaze druhé, stejně jako lepšímu porozumění mezijazykovým a mezikulturním vztahům vůbec. Poznání podstaty jazykové interference a jejího vztahu ke komunikaci se pak jeví i jako základní předpoklad pro eticky správný mentální soulad mezi obyvatelstvem v zemích s velkými etnickými a kulturními rozdíly.

