

**'BORROWED BORROWINGS' TRACED FROM
SANSKRIT TO MALAY TO MALAYSIAN ENGLISH**

MANJIT KAUR A/P BALWANT SINGH

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2019

**'BORROWED BORROWINGS' TRACED FROM
SANSKRIT TO MALAY TO MALAYSIAN ENGLISH**

MANJIT KAUR A/P BALWANT SINGH

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND
LANGUAGE**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2019

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: _____ (I.C/Passport No: _____)

Matric No: _____

Name of Degree: _____

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis (“this Work”): _____

Field of Study: _____

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
- (2) This Work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya (“UM”), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate’s Signature _____

Date: _____

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness’s Signature _____

Date: _____

Name: _____

Designation: _____

**‘BORROWED BORROWINGS’ TRACED FROM SANSKRIT
TO MALAY TO MALAYSIAN ENGLISH**

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the influence of Sanskrit language in Malaysian English tracing the indirect route of the loanwords through Malay as the intermediary language, known as the phenomenon of “borrowed borrowings” in this study. The Sanskrit loanwords found in the online versions of the Malay Newspapers; Berita Harian and Utusan, were examined for their current change in form and function in the process of acculturation by the multicultural speakers and the same procedure was applied to trace these loanwords in the online versions of the Malaysian English Newspapers; the Star and New Straits Times. The Old Malay language was heavily influenced by Sanskrit around the seventh century. Examples include words like Maharddhika ‘prosperous’ borrowed as Merdeka ‘independence’ in Malay which are also found with the same meaning in Malaysian English. These changes were analyzed using Haugen's (1950) theoretical framework of lexical borrowing and recent developments in the field. The categories of loanwords found in the written data were mostly loanwords, derivational and compound blends, and semantic loans. The Malaysian English has been researched for influences of Malay, Chinese and Tamil, the three major languages in Malaysia, but rarely has the indirect influence of the minority groups speaking Indic languages under the Sanskrit umbrella been investigated in its rich tapestry.

**‘BORROWED BORROWINGS’ DIKESAN DARI SANSKRIT
KE BAHASA MELAYU KE BAHASA INGGERIS MALAYSIA**

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini meneliti pengaruh bahasa Sanskrit dalam bahasa Inggeris Malaysia (Malaysian English), mengesan laluan secara tidak langsung kata pinjaman melalui bahasa Melayu sebagai bahasa perantara yang dikenali sebagai fenomena "meminjam pinjaman" dalam kajian ini. Kata pinjaman bahasa Sanskrit yang dijumpai dalam versi online akhbar Melayu; Berita Harian dan Utusan, diperiksa untuk sebarang perubahan semasa mereka dalam bentuk dan fungsi dalam proses pembudayaan oleh penceramah pelbagai budaya. Prosedur yang sama digunakan untuk mengesan kata pinjaman ini dalam versi online akhbar bahasa Inggeris Malaysia; Star dan New Straits Times. Bahasa Melayu lama banyak dipengaruhi oleh bahasa Sanskrit dalam abad ketujuh dan kata-kata seperti *maharddhika* 'sejahtera' yang dipinjam sebagai *merdeka* 'kemerdekaan' dalam bahasa Melayu juga terdapat dalam bahasa Inggeris Malaysia dengan mendukung makna yang sama. Perubahan ini dianalisis dengan menggunakan kerangka teori peminjaman leksikal Haugen (1950) dan lain lain perkembangan yang terbaru dalam bidang ini. Kategori kata pinjaman yang ditemui dalam data bertulis kebanyakannya kata pinjaman, derivasi dan sebatian campuran, dan juga kata pinjaman semantik. Bahasa Inggeris Malaysia telah dikaji bagi pengaruh tiga bahasa utama di Malaysia iaitu, Melayu, Cina dan Tamil tetapi, jarang dikaji pengaruh secara tidak langsung golongan minoriti yang bertutur dalam bahasa Indo-Aryan yang terletak di bawah naungan bahasa Sanskrit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am most grateful to the Lord Almighty for giving me the health and wisdom to endeavor such a feat after having retired from a normal job.

Secondly, a simple thank you to my supervisor, Dr Toshiko Yamaguchi, will not justify the dedication and professionalism she practiced during our repeated consultations to gear me onto the right track. I am truly appreciative of the fact that she allowed me to grow along with my dissertation in spite of her busy schedule and I extend my heartfelt gratitude to her. I am also greatly indebted to my panel of judges for their probing questions which led me to timely address the potential problems and I am sincerely grateful to them. Thank you to all my lecturers for sharing their knowledge and my friends for being there for me throughout my journey.

Thirdly, I would like to thank my husband for being the beacon and pillar of strength in the dark hours while I battled with my dissertation and his quiet disposition often led me work on into the wee hours of the night. I also have great appreciation for my daughter, son and their spouses for being most supportive and passionate about my studies, while my beautiful grandchildren cheered me on to the finish line.

Last but not the least, I dedicate this dissertation to my late son who was the reason for me to venture on this lifelong learning expedition.....see you when I get there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Original literary work declaration..... | ii |
| Abstract..... | iii |
| <i>Abstrak</i> | iv |
| Acknowledgements..... | v |
| Table of Contents..... | vi |
| List of Tables..... | ix |
| List of ABBREVIATIONS..... | x |
| List of Appendices..... | xi |
| | |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of the study..... | 1 |
| 1.2 The Malaysian setting..... | 2 |
| 1.3 The Malay influence in ME..... | 3 |
| 1.4 The Problem Statement..... | 3 |
| 1.5 The Research Objectives..... | 4 |
| 1.6 The Research Questions..... | 6 |
| 1.7 The scope of the study..... | 6 |
| 1.8 The ethical considerations of the study..... | 7 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 9 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 9 |
| 2.2 Variations in forms..... | 9 |
| 2.2.1 Meaning change in borrowing..... | 10 |
| 2.2.2 Context dependent meaning..... | 11 |
| 2.2.3 Attitudes to variations in the lexicon..... | 11 |
| 2.3 Variations in production..... | 12 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.3.1 | Phonological and orthographical differences | 13 |
| 2.3.2 | Spelling in the written form..... | 14 |
| 2.4 | Vocabulary in borrowing..... | 14 |
| 2.5 | Milestones of history | 15 |
| 2.6 | The borrowing phenomena of Old Malay | 16 |
| 2.6.1 | Spelling change impacting meaning change of loanwords in Old Malay | 16 |
| 2.6.2 | Variations in production of Old Malay | 17 |
| 2.6.3 | Semantic distinctions in gender marking forms of ancient Malay | 18 |
| 2.6.4 | Vocabulary of Sanskrit loanwords in Old Malay | 19 |
| 2.6.5 | The case of a less distributed phonemic inventory of Old Malay | 20 |
| 2.7 | Borrowing of Malay lexis in Malaysian English..... | 21 |
| 2.7.1 | Meaning change of Malay loanwords in Malaysian English | 22 |
| 2.7.2 | Variations in meaning change of Malay loanwords in ME..... | 22 |
| 2.7.3 | Vocabulary of loanwords in Malaysian English | 23 |
| 2.8 | The phenomena of “Borrowed Borrowings” | 24 |
| 2.8.1 | Spelling in the written forms of Nahuatl and Spanish..... | 24 |
| 2.8.2 | Non-analysis and orthographical differences | 25 |
| CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | | 26 |
| 3.1 | Introduction..... | 26 |
| 3.2 | Main concepts of the study | 26 |
| 3.3 | Factors leading to Haugen’s framework of Lexical borrowing..... | 27 |
| 3.3.1 | The direction of borrowing..... | 28 |
| 3.4 | Haugen’s theoretical framework of Lexical borrowing..... | 28 |
| 3.4.1 | Importation and substitution..... | 29 |
| 3.4.2 | Loanwords, loanblends and loanshifts | 29 |
| 3.5 | The research instruments | 32 |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 3.6 | The research data | 32 |
| 3.7 | The research method..... | 33 |
| 3.7.1 | Data collection of loanwords from Sanskrit to Old Malay..... | 33 |
| 3.7.2 | Data collection of loanwords from Malay to Malaysian English..... | 34 |
| 3.7.3 | Data entry of Sanskrit loanwords from Malay to Malaysian English | 34 |
| CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION | | 36 |
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 36 |
| 4.2 | The analysis of data | 36 |
| 4.3 | Categories of loanwords | 38 |
| 4.3.1 | Loanwords | 39 |
| 4.3.2 | Loans blends..... | 41 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Compound blends..... | 41 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Derivational blends | 49 |
| 4.3.3 | Loanshifts | 50 |
| 4.4 | Discussion of forms and meanings of loanwords..... | 55 |
| 4.5 | Variations in spellings from Sanskrit to Malay and ME | 59 |
| CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | | 62 |
| 5.1 | Introduction..... | 62 |
| 5.2 | Addressing research question one | 62 |
| 5.3 | Addressing research question two | 64 |
| 5.4 | Implications of the study | 65 |
| 5.5 | Limitations of the study..... | 65 |
| 5.6 | Conclusion and recommendations for future research | 66 |
| REFERENCES..... | | 68 |
| APPENDIX..... | | 72 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 3.1: A simplified classification of Haugen's (1950) framework | 31 |
| Table 3.2: Borrowed borrowings - Haugen's categories & Winford's terminology | 35 |
| Table 4.1: The process of borrowed borrowings traced from SL to RL1 to RL2..... | 37 |
| Table 4.2: Loanword with exactly the same meaning without any substitution..... | 40 |
| Table 4.3: Using Sanskrit suffix "vant" & assigning numerical value | 42 |
| Table 4.4: Borrowed borrowing showing a compound blend in ME | 45 |
| Table 4.5: Borrowed borrowings in derivational and compound blends..... | 48 |
| Table 4.6: Semantic widening or broadening in borrowed borrowing | 51 |
| Table 4.7: Borrowed borrowings with restricted meaning in ME | 53 |
| Table 4.8: Borrowed borrowings of partly the same meaning in ME..... | 57 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|--------|---|------------------------------------|
| AmE | : | American English |
| AmN | : | American Norwegian |
| Amport | : | American Portuguese |
| BH | : | Berita Harian |
| E | : | English |
| Fr | : | French |
| G | : | German |
| ME | : | Malaysian English |
| N | : | Norwegian |
| NST | : | New Straits Times |
| PaG | : | Pennsylvania German |
| RL1 | : | 1 st Recipient Language |
| RL2 | : | 2 nd Recipient Language |
| S | : | Spanish |
| SL | : | Source Language |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| APPENDIX A: A simplified classification of Haugen's (1950) framework..... | 72 |
| APPENDIX B: The process of borrowed borrowing data file..... | 73 |

University of Malaya

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The English language has been in Malaysia for more than 200 years brought to the Malaysian shores by the early English traders in 1786. In the two centuries of contact with the various local languages namely; Malay, Chinese and Tamil, which started primarily for trade, the English language has been embedded with their influence and continues to evolve borrowing localized vocabulary items. It is now being “equipped to function effectively” in a non-western environment by the multiethnic, multilingual speech communities becoming the mutual interethnic language (Lowenberg P. H., 1986, p. 7). However, in Malaysia the interethnic language is Bahasa Malaysia, the National Language of the country and Malaysian English (ME), an all-encompassing term for the English language used in Malaysia, is an evolving “non-native” variety (Yamaguchi & Deterding, 2016, p. 9). It is “being appropriated” by the local speakers and “diversifying and developing new dialects.....” (Schneider, 2003, p. 233).

These diversifications have led to the study of emerging varieties of *New Englishes*, also labelled as *World Englishes* or even *Global Englishes*, as these terms are somewhat adaptable and used “almost interchangeably, with minimally varying connotations” (Schneider, 2003, p. 234). Furthermore, the groundbreaking founding of the *World Englishes* platform by affluent pioneers like Kachru (1986) have segregated the countries into the Inner Circle, Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle according to the role played by the English language in the country. While others, have proposed typical phases which eventually result in the formation of new dialects and begun to study the indicative stages and resultant implications of these phases segregated by the function of the English language in these countries. Schneider (2003) places Malaysia at stage three of his five phase Dynamic Model namely; Foundation, Exonormative Stabilization, followed by Nativization, Endonormative Stabilization and eventually Differentiation. While Moag

(1992) claims these New Englishes go through a four stage life cycle of transportation, indigenization, institutionalization and finally deinstitutionalization.

1.2 The Malaysian setting

Malaysia is grouped into the Outer Circle of countries by Kachru (1994) as the English used here is similar to other post-colonial varieties, such as Singapore and Indian English. He refers to them as “institutional varieties” and views them as “distinct culture-bound codes, in terms of their function and forms” (p.148). The competent speakers of this institutionalized variety of English in present-day Malaysia consists of three main ethnic groups, mostly Malays and indigenous tribes, followed by Chinese and Indians making up the population of 31.7 million. Statistically it is estimated that the Malays form 68.6% of the population while the Chinese 23.4% and the Indians constituting 7% and the balance 1.0% are the minority groups as assessed from the website of the Department of Statistics Malaysia. The Malays speak several Malay dialects like the Northern Malay dialect, Johor-Riau and Kelantanese dialects, to name a few (Hajar Abdul Rahim, 2014, p. 12), followed by the Chinese speaking Southern Chinese languages like Hokkien, Hakka, Cantonese, Teochew, Hainanese, Kwangsai, Hokchiu, Henghua and Hockchia dialects (Tan, 2009, p. 451). The local Indian community however speak South Indian languages like Tamil, Telugu, and Malayalam, while some of them speak North Indian languages like Punjabi, Hindi, Gujerati, Sindhi and Bengali (David, Naji, & Sheena Kaur, 2003, p. 2). In this manner the Malays, Chinese, and the Indian community all display linguistic heterogeneity, and it is often quoted that these diverse local languages contribute to the rich tapestry of ME. Most of the speakers in Malaysia are at least bilingual if not multilingual as Malay, “the king of all languages in the country” is the national cum official language and the medium of instruction in all the national schools and universities (Asmah Haji Omar, 2000, p. 241). And as reported by (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p. 67) “A high level of bilingualism in turn reflects the more nebulous

factor of cultural pressure; a population that is under great cultural pressure from another speech community is likely to be largely bilingual in the language of that community”.

1.3 The Malay influence in ME

Much of the literature on borrowing in ME has claimed Malay as the major source of influence with the prevalence of Malay forms elucidated by Asmah (2008) and the preponderance of Malay words explained as “pride of place” held by the language (Azirah Hashim & Leitner, 2011, p. 566). Additionally Tan (2009) elaborates on the Malay influence in ME with the famous tagline “overriding influence of Malay” (Morais, 2001, p. 35).

But what has not been pondered upon critically is the Malay language itself. Colossal borrowing of Sanskrit words into Old Malay occurred around the seventh century A.D. during the Sriwijayaan Empire (de Casparis, 1997) and Asmah (2008) recounts the “three waves of influences” with the Indian influx being the earliest (p. 7). This is also resonated by Azirah & Leitner (2011) who ratify Malay to have had three scripts, the Indian script from the 7th to the 14th century. Subsequently, the Sanskrit words borrowed to Old Malay during this period would have been used repeatedly hence communicated to other language users and they now provide evidence of borrowing. These are referred to as the “uncontroversial examples” of a language as it takes a few decades for words to be assimilated into the language (Traugott, 2017, p. 3).

1.4 The Problem Statement

Inevitably, the English language spoken in such a pluralistic society of a Malaysian setting is likely to bear the influences of all the local speakers’ ethnic languages. And Kachru (1990) posits that the English adopted by the local communities inevitably includes many “adaptations and innovations from local languages and cultures”, further suggesting that this “linguistic asset of world Englishes.....within the framework of functional linguistics” should be extensively investigated (p. 21). Nonetheless, the

influence of the major ethnic languages in ME has been researched in various studies such as Lowenberg's (1986), who attributes the lexical items borrowed from Malay are to fill lexical gaps when there are no pre-existing English words. While Baskaran (2005) lists the use of the local lexicon in ME under the Substrate Language Referent group itemizing six categories of words borrowed from the local languages to ME. Then the influence of Malay and Chinese using a corpus study has been expounded by Tan (2009a, 2009b, 2013) and the lexical borrowing of all three major languages namely Malay, Chinese and Tamil explicated by Chalaya, (2007). Insufficiently, this literature is lacking the secondary influence of the minority groups speaking Indic languages like Punjabi, Hindi, Gujarati, Sindhi and Bengali under the Sanskrit umbrella, of whom the Malaysian Sikh Punjabis form the largest group (David, Naji, & Sheena Kaur, 2003, p. 2). These languages having syntactic and semantic similarities have all enriched ME through indirect contact known as "borrowed borrowings" in this study, from a kaleidoscope of societies and cultures of the Indian continent. They exerted their major effects on the socially more differentiated among the constellation of Southeast Asian communities; that is those practising wet-padi farming and the use of metals" (Ray, 2011, p. 42). Inevitably, Malay words such as *bumi* 'earth' and *roti* 'bread' taken from the Sanskrit language are frequently used in ME. It is pertinent to ME as a "progeny of New Englishes" (Baskaran Loga Mahesan, 2005, p. 18) that the influence of all the local cultures is documented to fill the gap of inquiry. These "New Englishes" are "distinct forms of English" that have risen in postcolonial settings around the world (Schneider, 2003, p. 233).

1.5 The Research Objectives

There were two specific objectives and a couple of peripheral reasons to have conducted this research. Firstly, very little research has been done on the loanwords in ME in the area of the paths taken through the different social strata of each community

that play a crucial role in the forms and functions they serve in ME. The Malay language has existed since yesteryears and was the lingua franca for trade of a people who had great kingdoms with advance cultures and thus held the position of exercising great influence in the neighboring regional languages (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982). Secondly the newspapers are representative of the four official languages in the Malaysia and thus imperative in dissemination of ideas and shaping societal thoughts, opinions and attitudes. They encompass an incredibly wide array of text types, genres, topics, styles and levels of formality quoted as "characteristic of the respective period and society they are published years in" (Rademann, 1998, p. 49). Conclusively the adaptations and innovations of the loanwords found in most Malaysian dallies still conserve the formal variety of Malaysian English or acrolect which is relevant for educational and communicational purposes, while maintaining the endonormative standard. And as ratified by Crystal (1994, cited in Tan, 2013, p. 39) that although the English in Malaysia is converging towards an international standard, it still bears a 'distinct linguistic identity'.

Peripherally, Haugen (1950) had observed that the terms "mixed" or "hybrid" had acquired a pejorative sense in the linguistic world and some purist had set about "purifying" the English language (Haugen, 1950, p. 211). Bearing in mind these ramifications the research objectives are encapsulated thus;

1. To analyze the borrowed borrowings of Sanskrit origin for the secondary influence of the intermediary Malay language and determine the effects of the social strata of the community that play a crucial role in the forms and functions they serve in ME.
2. To determine the extent to which these loanwords required to be modified for the participants to negotiate the intended meanings for the required purposes through linguistic patterning driven by the social factors involved.

1.6 The Research Questions

Therefore, the two research objectives listed above lead to the research questions in an attempt to trace these borrowed borrowings in the acrolectal variety of language used in the online versions of the Malay newspapers; the Utusan Online and Berita Harian (BH online) as well as the online versions of the English Newspapers; the Star online and New Straits Times (NST online). The data consists of the latest news covering the home events in the country associated with the administrative policies, local and foreign news.

In the first question the selected loanwords of Sanskrit origin were traced for the forms created and the functions they serve according to the categories proposed by Haugen (1950) in both the Malay and English dailies. The snippets of news for each loanword provide evidence that these words are in circulation at the present day of time and their current use in the various contexts is recorded.

The second question examines the linguistic constraints in adapting these loanwords for the various functions they serve. This is revealed by the meanings associated with their context of use by the multilingual community of speakers, who share the common repertoire of experiences and knowledge of their community usually disseminated by the newspapers in Malaysia. Hence, these two questions which saturated the entire research objective are presented below:

1. What are the forms and functions of Sanskrit loanwords found in the selected Malay and English Newspapers in Malaysia?
2. What are the linguistic constraints in adapting the loanwords for the various functions they serve in the Malay and ME dailies?

1.7 The scope of the study

The scope of study is to trace the transition of Sanskrit loanwords from Malay to ME in the dailies which are quoted as being the major source of a language that target a considerably large number of the speakers who represent the community and their

sociocultural background. The multilingual and multicultural setting of the new environment inevitably leads to the process of indigenization, that is, “a process of language change by which a new variety of English becomes distinct from the parent imported variety” (Moag, 1992, p. 235). And these New Englishes have been born in postcolonial settings under idiosyncratic historical conditions (Schneider, 2003) and not by choice of the nations in the outer circle that have now become a burgeoning discipline; an exploratory topic of linguistic research for their most dynamic expansions and restructuring of the English language.

However, the transition of Sanskrit words into ME is indecisive as to whether Sanskrit or even the Arabic words entered English in the Malayan region or in areas close to their original location (Azirah Hashim & Leitner, 2011). Viewed differently, the Sanskrit loanwords could have been borrowed into Old Malay around the 7th century when there was direct contact between the languages or perhaps through other Austronesian languages like Javanese (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), but the main object of inquiry in this study is the transition from Malay to ME.

1.8 The ethical considerations of the study

This study traces Sanskrit loanwords to Malay and hence to Malaysian English and the data is extracted from the online versions of the Malay newspapers; the Utusan Online and Berita Harian (BH online) as well as the online versions of the English newspapers; the Star online and New Straits Times (NST online). This data consists of the latest news covering the home events in the country associated with the administrative policies, local and foreign news. The language used targets a large multilingual readership of diverse cultures and backgrounds and as Rademann (1998) notes it is “characteristic of the respective period and society” (p. 49).

An extensive literature review was done on renowned researchers and their time tested theories were used to explain certain variations in the lexicon, semantic distinctions,

spelling and orthographical differences in the languages involved. Thus this research adheres to ethical norms of promoting true knowledge with prohibitions against falsifying, fabricating or misinterpreting the research data.

University of Malaya

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Language is the communicative tool that we humans use to express our thoughts and the repository of our language is the lens which colours and shapes our shared experiences and beliefs. There can be two schools to meaning of thought, the referential which formulates the meaning between the words and the referent, and the functional which looks at how words denote meaning in speech (Ginzburg, Khidekel, Knyazeva, & Sankin, 1966). This study looks at the form to function perspective; of how meaning changes with morphosyntactic variations of a word taking into account correlations or points of contact between purely linguistic facts and the underlying social facts comprising the status of the community, their roles, cultural beliefs and facets of shared assumptions among the community of speakers. Though the functional approach is adopted in this study, the referential approach is a complement, for any linguistic investigation requires collecting samples of contexts whereby the “meanings of linguistic units will emerge from the contexts themselves” (Ginzburg, Khidekel, Knyazeva, & Sankin, 1966, p. 18). In borrowing, the source and the relative status of the loan-giving language are also deliberated on as these attributes reveal the extra-linguistic factors which play an important part in the modifications of the loaned forms.

2.2 Variations in forms

Changes in forms happen when individual speakers innovate while using language creatively and hearers innovate when they interpret what has been said, and while the innovations are unintentional, some are repeated and others fall out of use (Traugott, 2017). Those forms that get repeated are then evidence that the innovations have been transmitted to other language users, who are also the active participants negotiating these changes through linguistic patterning driven by the social factors (Traugott, 2012). Thus it can be said that change is not only internal but also external and according to Croft

(2000) “languages don’t change: people change language” (p. 4). And with language being a communicative activity the most significant channel of change in a language is through the influence of other languages or dialects in the context of linguistic borrowing. The phenomena of borrowing is the process of loaning words from one language and using them in the lexical context of another thus impacting their original sense to evoke new meanings and forms.

2.2.1 Meaning change in borrowing

Words that evoke new meanings in the borrowing phenomena are known as semantic loans which fall under the category of loanshifts in Haugen’s (1950) framework for borrowing and in this category, no importation of the structural elements of the source language word takes place, only the meaning is imported which then causes a shift in the semantics of the word in the recipient language. When this shift occurs in simple stems as Haugen (1950) clarifies, there can be two possible results depending on the degree of similarity between the old and the newly evoked meaning. If there is nothing in common, then it is described as a loan homonym which is evident in the American Portuguese word *grosseria* a ‘rude remark’ based on the English word grocery ‘grocer’s shop’(p. 219). There are then two totally unrelated homonymous meanings for *grosseria* and they would be listed as two words in the dictionary and the intended word has to be resolved in the context of the word. However in the event there is a certain degree of similarity or overlapping of meaning, then a loan synonym is created providing “a new shade of meaning” and further segregated into loan displacement and semantic confusions. In loan displacements, recipient terms are similar in meaning to the source language such as when American Portuguese use the Spanish word *peso* ‘weight’ to denote ‘dollar’. The idea of weight is compared to the power of the dollar. But in semantic confusions, Haugen (1950) gives the example of the source word *livraria* ‘book store or home library’ to imply ‘library’ as such in English, even though there is the word *bibliotec* in Portuguese for a

full scale library per se. Overall in this category of loanshifts total “morphemic substitution without importation takes place (Haugen, 1950, p. 215). This simply infers that the speakers of the recipient language replace the source language compound forms with the equivalents from their own recipient language.

2.2.2 Context dependent meaning

But when there is nothing in common in the old and new meanings and there is a complete shift from the original meaning of the loanword in question, the intended meaning is then extracted from the context of the word as proposed by the semantic field theory; that the meaning of a word cannot be derived from the individual word in isolation but in relations to its neighboring words that articulate the content field and “stand in the relation of affinity and contrast to the word(s) in question” (Lehrer, Kittay, & Lehrer, 2012, pp. 3-4). Of particular importance to this research is the notion in frame semantics proposed by Fillmore (1992) that the meaning of a word is understood "with reference to a structured background of experience, beliefs, and practices" (Fillmore & Atkins, 1992, p. 4). In the same vein Traugott (2017) agrees that language is a communicative process that is highly dependent on context and context dependent meaning she explains, is remarkable in the loanword “sanction”, the verb borrowed from French in the 18th century to denote ‘law, decree’ such as to ‘impose a penalty’ but since the second half of the 20th century it is used to imply ‘approve’ conjuring an opposite meaning from imposing a penalty (p. 5). And since both meanings are now in use the intended sense has to be resolved by the linguistic context as the meaning emerges from the context itself (Ginzburg, Khidekel, Knyazeva, & Sankin, 1966).

2.2.3 Attitudes to variations in the lexicon

Durkin (2012) in his research on variations in the lexicon and meaning change, comments on sociolinguists tending to steer clear of this topic quoting methodological difficulties in explaining certain changes related to lexis and citing it as “the Cinderella

that was excluded from the ball” (p. 3). As the Principal Etymologist he perceives that even if the area of lexis is “most accessible and most salient for a non-specialist audience” meaning change is not always recognized as a change and further elaborating that only when the change is dramatic like the word “gay in the meanings ‘happy’, ‘homosexual’.....is commonly apprehended as a change in meaning and discussed as such” (Durkin, 2012, p. 3). His study is based on Justyna Robinson’s (2010a) contribution to his research where she draws from her own data on lexical polysemy with the recent use of the word “wicked or awesome” to mean “excellent” (Robinson, 2010). This change may pose problems for the non-specialist audience who might not identify the change in its correct perspective but rather as “misuse” or even “overuse” instead of plainly meaning change (Durkin, 2012, p. 4). Imperative however, are the discerning comments from her interview subjects on this topic which unveil “how attitudes to semantic change can be bound up and influenced by attitudes to social change”, (Durkin, 2012, p. 4). These “attitudes to social change” are highly significant for loanwords found in ME, borrowed by the new age multilingual speakers of today and their quest for social change but conversely for the reasons stated above, the change may not be easily understood by the “non-specialist audience”, presuming these are the speakers who do not share the common repertoire of experiences or knowledge of the community.

2.3 Variations in production

Another viewpoint leading to variations in production is Haugen’s (1950) remark very early in his pioneering research on his groundbreaking framework that, in any bilingual group there will be “variations in reproduction because of the varying degree of bilingualism”. His proposition was based on Portuguese American immigrant groups in America in 1949 where he found the younger generation using different forms of the same loanword from the older generation and termed it as “Reborrowing”. Loanwords like

these are “subjected to continual interference from the model” hence referring to the process as “Re-borrowing” (Haugen, 1950, p. 222).

2.3.1 Phonological and orthographical differences

Barrs (2015) in his study on what appeared to be erroneous use of English in Japan to the native English speakers attributed the incorrect spelling and wrong selection of words as an outcome of integrating English loanwords into the Japanese inventory and not the result of careless mistakes. The errors were easily detectible in English words displayed in a variety of scripts such as the signs in shops, restaurant menus or even product packaging, used apparently for stylistic and advertising purposes. However, he clarifies this usually occurs in words when they are first converted to the Japanese script and back-transliterated from the phonetic script of Katakana to English with the wrong graphemic distinction chosen in the process. Barrs (2015) gives examples of the graphic distinction of the consonants /l/ and /r/ in words such as “original” spelt as *oliginal* and the movie title “Flying Jaws” spelt as *Frying Jaws* which are realized as a liquid consonant with a single substitution for both consonants /l/ and /r/ (p. 32). This problem he explains, is rooted in the four different categories of how words sound and are spelt and the logical reason of the phonological and orthographical differences between Japanese and English is quoted as the Japanese phonological system is smaller with a less “distributed phonemic inventory”. These differences could probably apply to words borrowed from languages having an elaborate sound system to a language with a much smaller phonemic inventory. And in the case of the words borrowed from Sanskrit, which has 35 simple consonants and 16 vowel sounds, (Monier-Williams, 1970, p. xxviii) and quoted by Sir William Jones to be “more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin”, (Wilkins, 2011) it would be difficult to integrate the Sanskrit words into Malay and hence to ME using Roman letters, thus requiring morphosyntatic modifications.

2.3.2 Spelling in the written form

A further and noteworthy source of interference in the borrowing process is “SPELLINGS” which according to Haugen (1950) are present in the written words of a community. This one factor has been a major cause of Malay loanwords with multiple spellings in Malaysia since the country adopted the *Sistem Ejaan Baru* “New Spelling System” in the 1970s and Tan (2009) refers to them as “spelling assimilation” in her research on Malaysian English. Her assumption is that it happens when the source language is not characterized using the Roman alphabets and variant spellings are inevitable with words of Arabic origin. Some of the examples cited in her research as difficult to represent in Roman letters are *Alhamdulillah* which is often spelt as *alhamdullilah* or *Alhamdullillah* while *Insyallah* is also spelt as *Insyallah*, *Insyallah*, or even *insyallah*, leading to the same words having multiple spellings (Tan, 2009, p. 21). In this case it is trying to achieve the best possible pronunciation of the Arabic words using English alphabets thus not affecting the vocabulary in ME and Haugen (1950) opinions that the entire word is not usually affected by the spelling pronunciation.

2.4 Vocabulary in borrowing

The vocabulary of a language then is never static and constantly changing due to linguistic and extra-linguistic moves that are often an outcome of the social nature of language, and words react immediately to “changes in social life, to whatever happens in the life of the speech community in question” (Ginzburg, Khidekel, Knyazeva, & Sankin, 1966) This supposition is also shared by Durkin (2012) who perceives new words to be an index of social and cultural change and quotes words of the year (or decade), words like “bromance, chillax, globalization” (p. 4) that frequently draw the attention of the media, who can also be a force for new words being added to the dictionaries. Language, according to Traugott (2012), is always in a state of flux, thus changing rapidly. And typically, the major source of new words are lexical borrowings consisting mainly of

loanwords, semantic loans or loanblends, which Durkin (2012) claims as “pervasive, especially in the contexts of bilingualism or multilingualism that is the norm for many English speakers.”(p. 4). His research also draws from the fieldwork done by Jonnie Robinson in contemporary Southall in West London about Punjabi words reported as either loanwords or code switching. This norm for English speakers is undeniably persistent in the generic bilingual or multilingual societies in Malaysia. Conversely, when words are borrowed from Malay to ME there is not much orthographic adaptation as the bilingual speakers are more or less fluent in Malay, the source language they acquire in school from an early age. And as Haugen (1950) retorts that “there is a growing tendency to import rather than substitute as the bilingual command of the languages grows more adequate” (p. 213).

2.5 Milestones of history

Ginzburg (1966) observes that the amount and character of borrowed words reveal the relations and culture of the people and are often called the “milestones of history”. These milestones of history are like a diachronic approach revealing the vocabulary in the making that cannot but contribute to the understanding of its workings in its present synchronic state. Every loanword currently in use must have at some time in the past been borrowed as an innovation, as Haugen (1950) explains, and only by “isolating this initial leap of the pattern” can borrowing be clarified (p. 212). These loanwords now appear as the “uncontroversial example” as it usually takes a gap of several decades before the word is completely merged into the vocabulary of the language, (Traugott, 2017, p. 3). The importance and the difficulty of teasing apart synchronic from diachronic issues was initially identified by Haugen (1950) when he commented that “The difficulty, as elsewhere, is that the historical and the synchronic problem have not been clearly distinguished by those who have written about it” (p. 216).

2.6 The borrowing phenomena of Old Malay

Irresistibly, the borrowing spectacle has been immense in the Malayan archipelago initiated by Sanskrit long before any other languages like the Arabic, Portuguese, Chinese, Dutch or even the western influence arrived, and evidence abounds in the inscriptions of Old Malay or traditional Malay during the Sriwijaya Empire around the seventh century A.D. (de Casparis, 1997). More recently, evidence from studies by Azirah & Leitner's (2011) mention Malay to have had three scripts, the Indian influence from the 7th to the 14th century, the Arabic till the 17th century followed by Latin, quoting the region to be "so exposed to traffic and migration" (Azirah Hashim & Leitner, 2011). Edifying however, is Poedjosoedarmo's (1982) belief that around the same period Javanese and Malay which bear close resemblance to each other were one language in the past and were separated when the speakers physically moved to other lands and became "mutually unintelligible" (p. 1). The Malayan "Malay" became commonly used in Malaysia and the Javanese Malay was termed "Indonesian" but both were tremendously influenced by Sanskrit in the past. Most of the borrowings are in the area of literary, religious and bureaucratic vocabularies which were utilized during the Sriwijaya Empire followed by common everyday usage words.

2.6.1 Spelling change impacting meaning change of loanwords in Old Malay

Poedjosoedarmo's (1982) study is among the most detail and fundamental research done of Sanskrit influence through borrowing in Old Malay and Javanese which provides vital evidence to this study on meaning change. And though his research deals mainly with Javanese influence on the Indonesian language in the usual linguistic areas of phonology, morphology, syntax and the extra linguistic outcomes of contact like vocabulary, many of the words discussed are of Sanskrit origin borrowed to Old Malay. Poedjosoedarmo's (1982) erudition is exceptional as he deals with each of these linguistic areas with examples to explain the processes of change and also provide useful insights

into the analysis of the Sanskrit loanwords, their original spellings and affixes in Old Malay. In his scrutiny of spelling and meaning change Poedjosoedarmo (1982) accentuates Old Malay as not having the /u / or /o/ contrast, and the principal allophone of /aw/ as (a o), thus the plausible borrowing of the Sanskrit word *atho* ‘and also’ as *ataw* ‘or’, and *kuta* ‘fort’ having the new form *kota* ‘town’. Also absent from the Old Malay inventory was the /w/ and /v/ thus the Sanskrit word *vamsa* ‘lineage’, ‘family’, ‘race’ was borrowed as *bangsa* ‘nation’, ‘group’, ‘noble family’ and *vicaksana* ‘far seeing’ was borrowed as *bijaksana* ‘wise’ while *vac*, *uvaca* ‘to speak’, ‘utter’ were borrowed as *baca* ‘read’.

2.6.2 Variations in production of Old Malay

He also highlights in his study that the /e/ and /r/ were regularly metathesized so the Sanskrit words with *pra-* were borrowed as *per-* in Old Malay. As such Sanskrit *Prathama* ‘the first’ borrowed to Javanese as *pratomo*, became *pertama* in Malay and *prakara* ‘matter, case’ was borrowed as *prakoro* in Javanese became *perkara* in Malay. The regularly metathesized /e/ and /r/ in Poedjosoedarmo’ study according to Hume (2001), is the process which takes place in some languages when certain sounds switch positions, meaning the traditional linear ordering of xy- is switched to yx- (Hume, 2001, p. 1). And although he believes metathesis is less common than assimilation and sound deletion, it still occurs as a consistent synchronic phonological process in most languages, driven by the linguistically natural constraints on the sound system due to social and communicative factors involved in shaping the language sound structure which other speakers can identify with and accept. Some hyper-formations were also created such as the Sanskrit word *divasa* ‘time’ borrowed as *dewasa* meaning ‘adulthood, time’ (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982, p. 32). Scores of such examples are painstakingly examined providing the basis to understanding that Sanskrit loanwords required substantial changes to be integrated into Old Malay thus affecting the meanings of the loanwords in the process of assimilation.

2.6.3 Semantic distinctions in gender marking forms of ancient Malay

Another study done by Hoogervorst (2016) in the role the Middle-Indo-Aryan (MIA) languages or “Prakrits” played on influencing the Malayo-Polynesian languages in Maritime Southeast Asia specifically deals with the directionality of lexical transmission. He provides the example of the creation of secondary “i-forms” in stems ending with /a/, quoting the example of the Malay word *gergaji* ‘a saw’ borrowed from Sanskrit *krakaca* ‘a saw (Hoogervorst, 2016, p. 302). He also highlights the different semantic variations brought about through this process, particularly in the ancient phonologies of Malay and Javanese. Of particular interest to this study is the lexicalized gender-specification lacking in Javanese and Old Malay as the nouns with /a/ stems in Sanskrit refer to masculine or the neuter gender while the /i / ending stems display feminine forms. This was originally attested by the prodigious scholars like Gonda (1973) and De Casparis (1988) in their pioneering research on Sanskrit when compiling the annotated list of loanwords from Sanskrit to Malay. Some examples given by Hoogervorst (2016) on these “gender marking forms” borrowed from Sanskrit are words like *Putra* ‘son’ and *Putri* ‘daughter’ and *sahodara* ‘uterine brother’ and *sahodari* ‘uterine sister’ with the same meaning in Malay (pp. 302-304). However some “unexpected semantic distinctions” became obvious in forms such as Sanskrit *kala* ‘time’ for male and *kali* ‘time’ for female apparently borrowed to Malay as *kala* ‘time, period’ and *kali* ‘time’, ‘occasion’, ‘instance’. While *nagara* (male) and *nagari* (female) ‘city town’ in Sanskrit became *negara* ‘state, government, nation’ and *negeri* ‘land, country’ in Malay, regardless of the fact that the variations were gender related (Hoogervorst, 2016, p. 302) . In some forms only the female attributes were borrowed, words like Sanskrit *parapati* ‘female pigeon’ reduced to the Malay word *merpati* ‘dove, pigeon’ without any discernment for gender. In even more cases the meanings are remotely related. For example, the Sanskrit word *roga* ‘illness, disease’ was borrowed as *rugi* that acquired the meaning of ‘loss, injury, and

‘tort’ in Malay (p. 304). These examples show that gender distinctions in the source language posed a problem in Old Malay, the recipient language but overall it created new vocabulary.

2.6.4 Vocabulary of Sanskrit loanwords in Old Malay

The Indonesian etymological dictionary is proof of the increase in the vocabulary of words and the enquiry into attesting and confirming the process of assimilation of some of these loanwords was done by de Casparis (1997). While recognizing the services of the brilliant researcher J. Gonda (1952) on Sanskrit in Indonesia and his own unrivalled authority on the subject, they provided the extremely useful annotated list of loanwords from Sanskrit to Indonesian and traditional Malay. The main aim of his research was to attest the modern Indonesian and the earlier forms in Malay borrowed from Sanskrit and other Indian languages to compile an Indonesian etymological dictionary, taking into consideration the resemblance in form and meaning and whether there were similar forms in any Austronesian languages. In his study, de Casparis (1997) classified the words borrowed from Sanskrit into three categories. Firstly, the literary, religious and bureaucratic words belonging to fields of culture which predominate the borrowing phenomena and secondly, the common every-day use words and thirdly, neologisms; the newly coined words or innovations. He too lamented on the “less distributed phonemic inventory” of modern Indonesian which does not have long vowels, no aspirates and only few consonant clusters and no geminated consonants, meaning the language does not have long consonants with a long duration of sound thus the Sanskrit words needed substantial adaptation in the course of being borrowed. And due to the social factors involving the great differences between the ancient Indian society and modern Indonesian communities, the meanings were subjected to substantial change in the course of history. Compounds of some well-known original Sanskrit words were used with new special meanings which de Casparis (1997) elaborates, consists partly of a Sanskrit word with a

Malay prefix, as in the case of *sanka* ‘suspicion’ with the prefix *pra-* ‘before, forward’ which he postulates was influenced by the English equivalent *pre-*, just like *prasejarah* ‘prehistory’ (p. 2).

2.6.5 The case of a less distributed phonemic inventory of Old Malay

The phonological and orthographical differences cited by Barrs (2015) of a recipient language having a phonological system with a “smaller and less distributed phonemic inventory” (pp. 30-31) seem to contribute to the remarkable characteristics in Poedjosoedarmo’s (1982) and de Casparis’s (1997) analysis of Old Malay and Javanese. Here the spelling change is not due to the “spelling assimilation” mentioned by Tan (2009) in her study on Malaysian English where she quotes the same words as having multiple spellings but no meaning change. Nor are they similar to the interference in lexical borrowing which Haugen (1950) commented was due to the spelling pronunciation which did not usually affect the whole word. This is easily the matter of a system with a less “distributed phonemic inventory” highlighted by Barrs (2015) in his study on what seemed to be the erroneous of English in Japan. But the overall surmise in the case of Sanskrit to Old Malay is that spelling change did bring about meaning change.

The detailed analysis provided by Poedjosoedarmo (1982) and de Casparis are immensely pertinent to this present study and provide crucial information on variations in form which result in meaning change. The unexpected semantic distinctions and lexicalized gender-specification investigated by Hoogervorst (2016) provide this study with a synchronic reappraisal of a diachronic past. Insufficiently studies on Sanskrit influence in Malay are scarce and due to this paucity of research not many recent studies can be found as Durkin (2012) relented, that researchers tend to steer clear of variations in loanwords due to methodological difficulties in explaining certain changes related to lexis. Some of the research on lexical modifications in borrowing from the local languages to ME is deliberated in the next few topics.

2.7 Borrowing of Malay lexis in Malaysian English

Instances of lexical borrowing from the major ethnic language groups; the Malay, Chinese and Tamil languages in Malaysian English are done to fulfill specific functions like referring to local products or some cultural practices that have no equaling English words or even for stylistic purposes by the younger generation. The profound influence of these languages in Malaysian English have often been elucidated in numerous studies but the “overriding influence of Malay” in ME by Morais (2001) has been the dominating topic, and rightfully so, as Hashim & Leitner (2011) quote Malay to be a “widely spoken language far beyond its current region of Malaysia, Indonesia and border areas in Thailand and elsewhere.....a major trade language from the 15th to 17th centuries – the so-called ‘Age of Commerce’ in Southeast Asia (p. 552). And being a key player in a commercial and cultural network, the Malay language has been in constant contact with languages from afar. Tan (2013) affirms that the rise of Melaka as a “global entrepôt” and the “Age of Commerce” in Southeast Asia “vaulted the Malay language into prominence” (p. 22) and this influence has been pervasive throughout the history of the region (Tan 2009).

The earliest contact with languages from afar was from the Indian continent around the 7th to the 14th century during the reign of the Indian Srivijayaan Empire in the Malayan peninsula and its neighboring countries of Sumatra and Java (Azirah Hashim & Leitner, 2011). Relations between the local Malays, Chinese and Indians were well-established then before the arrival of the English native speakers, who landed at the British trading port established in Penang in 1786 (Tan, 2009). And while Malay words have been enriching the ME lexicon more than any other local languages, she acknowledges that some of the Malay words have “non-Malay roots”, words which have originated from Hindustani, Arabic, Tamil, Javanese and even the Baba Malay languages (Tan, 2009, p. 19).

2.7.1 Meaning change of Malay loanwords in Malaysian English

Tan (2009) in her research on the influence of Malay in ME using the fine-grained approach that a corpus study allows to contextual data she quotes the word *kampung* which originally means “a small village” has multiple entries in her corpus with “attributive adjectives” attached to it, which clearly relate the word to being of Malay ethnicity. Words like *kampung* house the ‘traditional (Malay) house’ built on stilts and *kampung* favourites ‘Malay cuisine’ (Tan, 2009, p. 33) clearly add new meanings to the word *kampung*. And though the word itself does not give any clue as to the “Malayness” attached to its meaning, it is a shared assumption among the Malaysian speakers to associate the word with folks of Malay ethnicity. The speakers even use the plural form *kampungs* as a count noun applying the “property of countability” to the loanword, so it integrates well as an English word into Malaysian English (Tan, 2009, p. 34).

2.7.2 Variations in meaning change of Malay loanwords in ME

Variations in meaning change of Malay loanwords were also pondered upon by Tan (2013) deliberating on words from her corpus that display semantic restriction where only a specific meaning is expressed in ME. She examines words like *gatal* which means “itchy” a sensation but figuratively it also applies to flirtatious men and only this sense seems to be expressed in ME. She also observes in her corpus that sometimes only the “cultural specificity” is evident like the Malay word *rotan* which carries several meanings of “a long slender creeping plant” or “a cane”, but the meaning “judicially-sanctioned caning” is a cultural specificity (Tan, 2013, p. 76). Similarly the word *rakyat* in Malay means “citizens” belonging to a state or country, but in ME it specifically refers to the commoners or the general public in relation to the government officials or nobles (p. 75). These shared assumptions, mainly sociocultural are easily understood by the community of speakers and are generally words that become more specialized in their usage with specific meaning as they undergo semantic restriction (Crystal, 1987).

2.7.3 Vocabulary of loanwords in Malaysian English

Most creative however, are the morphosyntactic adaptations of Malay words by the multilingual speakers of ME when new grammatical categories are created by the inserting English inflectional and derivational morphemes. Tan (2013) perceives the plural -s affix used to indicate plurality in count nouns to be the most productive and quotes examples like *bomoh* meaning a ‘Malay traditional medicine practitioner’ which carries the plural *bomohs* and the count noun *pondok* ‘a hut’ has the plural form as *pondoks*. Also noteworthy from her corpus is the employing of derivational morphemes to create new words in ME by using the prefix “non” to Malay words to indicate negation such as non-*halal* for not *halal*. *Halal* is an Arabic word meaning permissible food according to Islamic laws. Tan (2013) recalls the existence of redundancies in ME, which she refers to as tautologies that sometimes reveal the source of words in the borrowing phenomena quoting the example of the compound blend *briyani* borrowed to Malay as *nasi biriyani*. The word *briyani* of Hindi/Urdu origin already contains the rice component, in fact the word itself refers to “a spicy meat and rice dish” and subsequent borrowing into ME referred to as “borrowed borrowings” in this study has led to the repetition of the word “rice” arising from the addition of the Malay morpheme *nasi* ‘rice’.

The overall increase in the vocabulary of ME is the result of the multilingual speakers’ diverse ancestral languages and the need to preserve their multi-religious cultures and traditions. These loan expressions, Hashim & Leitner (2011) perceive, could signal an over-arching “Malaysian English-ness” or the “existence of ethnic lines of division”, but are noteworthy steps towards “endonormativity” and the “establishment of New Englishes” (Hashim & Leitner, 2011, p. 552). Perhaps, when we reflect on how these forms carry the local cultural identities and allow the language to evolve, maintaining a variety of English characteristic to them (Tan, 2013), it can also be referred to as the “double-edged power of language, to bind and to divide” (Lim, 2015, p. 19).

2.8 The phenomena of “Borrowed Borrowings”

The phenomena of “borrowed borrowings” has been given little attention and just obscure as in the case of “Re-borrowing” and risen from the notion that borrowing has taken an extraordinary route. The loanwords were typically not borrowed as a result of direct contact with speakers of a particular language but secondarily through contact and trade with speakers of other languages involved in the process. Researching this phenomenon Haugen J.D. (2009) discerns it to be particularly interesting as the English loanwords from Nahuatl language, also known as Mexicano spoken by the Aztecs and natives of Central Mexico in the 16th century, were typically not borrowed from the Nahuatl speakers themselves but secondarily through other European languages such as Spanish, French or Latin. This shows that the loanwords have taken an extraordinary route then normal borrowings from one language to another for there has been a third intermediary language in-between. Haugen J.D. (2009) in his study cataloged words of Nahuatl origin attested in the Oxford English Dictionary under chronological as well as semantic classifications. He found that the Nahuatl native terms for previously unknown indigenous concepts for plants, animals, and cultural items were typically borrowed by the Spanish-speaking colonizers who were in direct contact with the Nahuatl speakers and eventually borrowed from Spanish to other European languages like English. He quotes words like “-chocolate-” and “-tomato-” borrowed in the 16th century through the intermediary languages such as Spanish or French and claims they are now so frequently used that probably no one recognizes them as borrowings anymore.

2.8.1 Spelling in the written forms of Nahuatl and Spanish

Furthermore, striking phonological adaptations took place in the process of borrowing like replacing non-Spanish phonemes of Nahuatl origin /tl/ and /tz/ and this led to reanalysis or as he accurately refers to as the “non-analysis” of certain Nahuatl morphological structure. So, the word “tomato” in English in a non-processed Nahuatl

form should be *tomatl* but the non-Spanish phoneme /*tl*/ was displaced (Haugen J. D., 2009, p. 75). Of particular interest to the present study are the morphological adaptations of Nahuatl grammar where the Nahuatl derived compounds were made into new simple Spanish roots like *chipotle* which consist of the Nahuatl word *chil-* meaning “chili” and *poctli* meaning “smoke” (Haugen J. D., 2009, p. 75). He also attests that the word *cacao* which referred to edible and preparable seeds in Nahuatl, has been corrupted to form “cocoa” which now refers to both the seeds as well as concoctions made from these seeds and the word is found in multiple languages worldwide.

2.8.2 Non-analysis and orthographical differences

Hence, the Nahuatl origin words “-chocolate-” and “-tomato-” are no longer recognized as borrowings in English due to the fact that they have probably become the “uncontroversial” words of the language. Traugott (2017) claims that it usually takes a gap of several decades before the uncontroversial words are completely merged into the vocabulary of that language. And the replacing of the Nahuatl phonemes or their “non-analysis” in Spanish is due to the fact that the language does not have the suffix *-tl* which marks the end of non-processed nominals in Nahuatl. This could be regarded as a case of phonological and orthographical differences cited by Barrs (2015), and it happens when words are borrowed from a language having an elaborate sound system to a language with a much smaller phonemic inventory. The extraordinary route taken by the Nahuatl loanwords found in English through a third intermediary language known as the phenomena of borrowed borrowings is also explicated in this present study where words borrowed from Sanskrit to Malay and hence to ME were examined for the change in form and meanings. The next chapter will outline the method that was employed to trace the relevant factors that impact the forms and functions of the words in borrowed borrowings.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The main aim of this study was to examine the phenomena of borrowed borrowings, more precisely, the process in which the Malay loanwords of Sanskrit origin are used in the Malay dailies and their subsequent occurrence and usage in the English dailies. Below the research questions of this study are stated again to show how the borrowed borrowings were investigated.

1. What are the forms and functions of Sanskrit loanwords found in the selected Malay and English Newspapers in Malaysia?
2. What are the linguistic constraints in adapting the loanwords for the various functions they serve in the Malay and ME dailies?

This study works within a linguistic framework but, the importance of socio-cultural factors was taken into account as the changes in form and function that appeared over a period time are examined through linguistic modifications and the method applied was mostly synchronic. The study of the loanwords reveal the development and innovation of these loanwords as well as meaning change in the context of the multilingual community of speakers, who share the common repertoire of experiences and knowledge, usually disseminated in the Malaysian newspapers. A qualitative approach using an exploratory and descriptive design provides a detailed investigation of the loanwords based on the Haugen's (1950) framework. The method that was used to collect and analyze the data is clearly expounded in this section, in line with Creswell approach to a qualitative study (Creswell, 2012).

3.2 Main concepts of the study

The main concepts of this study include the notion that the loanwords in question have taken an extraordinary route than the normal lexical borrowing from one language to another as there has been a third intermediary language in-between. Kaufman's (1988)

remark of “the idea that monolingualism is the human norm is a myth” (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p. 31) ratifies that people are at the very least bilingual, as such Haugen’s (1950) introductory premise that “for any large-scale borrowing a considerable group of bilinguals has to be assumed” (p. 210), sets the backdrop for this study. Haugen’s (1950) groundbreaking framework was used in this study and the definition of borrowing and the usefulness of his terms were deciphered to show their relevance and practicality to the borrowing processes in the bilingual if not multilingual society in Malaysia. The features borrowed from the native languages to ME are just an alteration of the second language and not a mixture, as Haugen’s (1950) explains “Mixture implies the creation of an entirely new entity and the disappearance of both constituents; it also suggests a jumbling of a more or less haphazard nature” (p. 211). But the acrolectal variety of ME used in the media is recognized as the most prestigious form of English spoken in Malaysia, and this standardized form is quoted as “internationally intelligible” (Baskaran 1987; Butler 1996; Vethamani 1996).

3.3 Factors leading to Haugen’s framework of Lexical borrowing

While various researchers like Greavu (2014) and Gomex (1997) appraise Haugen (1950) for initiating a long and enduring discourse on the topology of borrowing types and a hierarchy of borrowed lexical categories, Treffers-Daller (2010) perceives his approach is innovative as he also discusses the structural constraints on borrowing as well as the structural effects on the borrowing language. The framework initiated by Haugen (1950) has been constantly refined by him from his fieldwork in 1936 to 1948 and his work is noted as “one of the most comprehensive taxonomies of borrowing” (Greavu, 2014, p. 95) that is used by researchers even to this day. The formal classifications are based on the degree of modification of the lexical units in the source or model language and lead to the classical distinction between "loanword" and "loan translation/calque". This distinction Gomex (1997) believes was used by the German scholars such as Werner

Betz (1939, 1949) in the early 19th century and was later refined by American descriptivist Einar Haugen (1950) and Uriel Weinreich (1953, 1968) who distinguish "importation" (straight loanword), "substitution" (loan-translation, loanshift), and "loanblends/hybrids" is a mixture of both, and this simple distinction embraces all the related factors of a particular socio-linguistic situation where bilingualism operates (Gomez Capuz, 1997, p. 83).

3.3.1 The direction of borrowing

Overall, Haugen's (1950) theoretical framework is sound but as Van Coetsem (1988) pointed out the directionality of the influence is not indicated thus it fails to bring out the "agent of the action" (p. 2). And according to him in cases of borrowing there is a source or donor language (SL) and a recipient language (RL) and he refers to the direction of borrowing as from the SL to the RL, while the agent of the transfer can either be the RL speaker referred to as "RL agentivity" or the SL speaker "SL agentivity". This concept led Winford (2005) to rectify the inconsistencies which were likely to pose a problem for the classification and analysis of the outcomes in his adaptation of Haugen's model and concisely summarized the processes for brevity sake in a table. Winford's (2005) table is further adapted to achieve the objectives in this present study as the borrowed borrowing phenomena traces the influence from Sanskrit as the main Source Language (SL) to the First Recipient Language, Malay known as (RL1) and subsequently to ME known as the Second Recipient Language (RL2). Henceforth, while Haugen's (1950) theoretical framework for lexical borrowing is used in this study, Winford's (2005) terminology is adapted to distinguish the "agent of the action" and his table is used for concision and brevity.

3.4 Haugen's theoretical framework of Lexical borrowing

Borrowing has been defined by Haugen (1950) as "the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another" and since reproduction is the key

concept, it is essential that the analysis must involve comparing the original pattern with the imitation (p. 212) . This is a fairly basic presentiment as the current loanwords in this study must have been borrowed as a novelty in the beginning and comparing them is the initial step to deciphering the borrowing processes involved

3.4.1 Importation and substitution

In the main tenet of his theoretical framework, the two mechanisms “**importation**” and “**substitution**” are executed as such that; if the loanword resembles the model to the native speaker’s acceptance, then the borrower has **imported** the model as a novelty into his language, which means that the loanword can be unmistakably traced back to the model. However if the model is inadequately produced by replacing it with a pattern from his own language then he only **substituted** the model (Haugen, 1950, p. 212). This then means that some morphemes have been replaced in the model to integrate it into the recipient language by the borrower while roughly carrying out a linguistic comparison between the two languages.

3.4.2 Loanwords, loanblends and loanshifts

As such, based on the relationship between the morphemic and phonemic substitution, Haugen (1950) established three main categories of loans namely “Loanwords”, “Loanblends” and “Loanshifts”. In the first main category the “Loanwords” display morphemic importation without any substitution; meaning total morphemic importation of single or compound words without any alteration but various degrees of phonemic substitution, perhaps none, partial, or complete takes place with probable meaning change. The second main category are “Loanblends” which display morphemic substitution as well as importation, meaning further adaptation in the phonemic and morphemic structure is possible leading to the subcategories “Blended stems” “Derivational blends” as well as “Compound blends”. These can further be segregated depending on the inflections and combination of the source and recipient language. In the

third main category of “Loanshifts” a complete substitution of the native morphemes is likely with two resultant categories of “Semantic loans” and “Loan translations” which can also be divided further based on the shift in the semantics of the recipient word influenced by the source language or by adding a new shade of meaning.

Overall Haugen’s (1950) framework modified by Winford (2005) using the terminology proposed by Van Coetsem (1988) to clearly exhibit the “agent of the action” and is adapted for this study. The categories are explicated further in a table with columns for the related process involved that clearly differentiate the processes in simple terms and the examples to explain how the processes executed are extracted from Haugen’s (1950) study. A more concise illustration of these categories is shown in the table on the page below.

University of Malaya

Table 3.1: A simplified classification of Haugen's (1950) framework

| Categories | Related processes | Haugen's (1950) examples |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Loanwords | Morphemic importation without any substitution classified by degrees of phonemic substitution such as none, partial, or complete | AmE <i>shivaree</i> meaning "An uninvited serenade of newlyweds" from Fr. <i>charivari</i> (Direct transfer of lexeme, imported meaning & sound) |
| 2. Loanblends | Morphemic substitution as well as importation | |
| a) Blended stem | Native morpheme substituted for some part of the foreign word | AmN. <i>karrna</i> meaning "corner" from E. corner + N. <i>hyrrna</i> |
| b) Derivational blends | Native suffixes are substituted for the foreign ones | PaG. <i>bassig</i> meaning "bossy" from E. boss + G. <i>-ig</i> |
| c) Compound blends | Substitution of one part or both parts. | PaG. <i>blaumepie</i> From AmE. plum pie |
| 3. Loanshifts | Morphemic substitution without importation. | |
| a) Loan translations | Compounds show complete native substitution. | N. <i>korn</i> meaning "grain" + <i>krubba</i> meaning "fodder-rack"-substituted for corncrib |
| b) Semantic loans | Complete substitution with semantic shift <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Loan Homonym (new unrelated meaning) ii. Loan Synonym (overlapping meaning) | AmPort. <i>grosseria</i> meaning "a rude remark" for E. grocery a. Semantic Displacement AmPort. <i>peso</i> "weight" from S. <i>peso</i> to mean "dollar" b. Semantic Confusions AmPort <i>livraria</i> meaning home "library" (E. library) |

Abbreviations: AmE. American English, AmN. American Norwegian, AmPort. American Portuguese, PaG. Pennsylvania German, E. English, Fr. French, G. German, N. Norwegian, S. Spanish

3.5 The research instruments

There were two research instruments utilized in this study, the first was the annotated list of Sanskrit loanwords created by de Casparis (1997) and J. Gonda (1952) for the Indonesian Etymological dictionary in which each entry contains references to corresponding pages in the Monier-Williams's Sanskrit-English dictionary. This is a thoroughly researched and comprehensive annotated checklist confirmed by Mahdi (2000) in his review and this list was used in the present study to establish the Sanskrit words borrowed to Old Malay with the meaning conveyed during the Sriwijaya Empire around the seventh century A.D (de Casparis, 1997).

The second research instrument was the online versions of Malay and English newspapers used to trace and analyze the usage and meaning of the established loanwords. Primarily the online versions of the Malay newspapers; the Utusan Online and BH online (Berita Harian) were scrutinized to establish the usage of loanwords and the intended meaning conveyed. Subsequently, in the second phase the online versions of the English Newspapers; the Star online and NST online (New Straits Times) were fundamental in tracing the same Malay loanwords as well as the meaning now being transmitted to Malaysian English by the modern day multilingual speakers.

3.6 The research data

The research data found in the Malaysian dailies consists of the latest news covering the home events in the country associated with the administrative policies, local news and foreign news. And though the Malaysian newspaper English is a subset of Malaysian English, it is a written discourse of multifarious genre by proficient multilingual speakers covering a wide variety of topics (Tan, 2009). Some of the news she observes from her fine-grained corpus study, deliberately contains localized features for stylistic and perhaps for a humorous effect. But as Rademann (1998) recounts, the most important advantage of using newspapers is that they offer a host of linguistically distinctive

varieties providing a much more representative sample of the language (Crystal, 1994, p. 388) as quoted in Rademann (1998).

3.7 The research method

The words of Sanskrit origin with their equivalent in Old Malay were extracted from the annotated list of established Sanskrit loanwords created by de Casparis (1997) and J. Gonda (1952), mentioned in the research instruments section above. This list also provides the meaning of the word in Sanskrit as well as the correlated meaning in Old Malay and with this information at hand the generation of the data began

3.7.1 Data collection of loanwords from Sanskrit to Old Malay

The Sanskrit loanword was entered into the search column (known as *carian* in Malay) available in the online versions of the chosen Malay newspaper to look for the related news where these loanwords have been used. Most dailies show headlines with snippets related to the word in question so each news snippet has to be expanded and scanned for the related Malay word. The news events are arranged with the most recent regressing to the older news which can be retrieved by scrolling to each page from the headlines with the snippets. There are only a certain amount of the snippets per page and it is like searching for articles in databases and a total of about a hundred snippets were retrieved. When the Malay word of Sanskrit origin was found in the news, the associated sentences along with the date, time and place of the event were copied to show usage in the context of the word. This context provides the fundamental information of the word regarding the word class assigned, the degree of morphemic importation or substitution based on Haugen's classification of categories in lexical borrowing and the related meaning of the word as used in this particular context. The Malay news were translated to English and the above procedures were repeated for the next Malay newspaper. Evidence from both the Utusan Online and BH online will reinforce the assumption that these loanwords are prevalent and used in numerous contexts.

3.7.2 Data collection of loanwords from Malay to Malaysian English

The loanwords from Malay to ME are the main object of inquiry in this study, so the same loanwords of Sanskrit origin traced in the Malay newspapers were entered in the search column of the English newspapers chosen for this study. And the same procedure as above was repeated to retrieve the information of the word regarding the word class assigned, the degree of morphemic importation or substitution based on Haugen's classification of categories in lexical borrowing and the related meaning of the word as used in this particular context. The only difference was that no glossing was necessary as the news could be copied directly.

3.7.3 Data entry of Sanskrit loanwords from Malay to Malaysian English

The Sanskrit loanwords with the related meanings from the annotated list (de Casparis, 1997) were entered in the first column of the table created while their usage in Malay retrieved from the Malay dailies was entered into the second column and hence their usage in the English dailies into the third column. Haugen's classification of categories for lexical borrowing provided the base for the morphemic importation and substitution while the examples were extracted from the context of the news dailies copied to below the table to prove their usage.

An example of the table is shown on the page below with the loanword *Mantri* "counselor", "adviser" or "minister" with partly the same meaning in Malay.

Table 3.2: Borrowed borrowings - Haugen's categories & Winford's terminology

| SL word <i>mantri</i> 'counselor', 'adviser', 'minister' | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Categories | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1.Loanwords | <i>menteri /mentri</i> | minister | | |
| 2.Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Derivational Blend | <i>ke-menteri-an</i> <i>menteri-nya</i> | the ministry its minister | | |
| b. Compound Blends | <i>menteri menteri</i> <i>menteri besar</i> <i>perdana menteri</i> <i>timbangan Perdana menteri</i> <i>ketua menteri</i> <i>menteri pendidikan</i> | ministers (plural) head of state prime minister deputy prime minister minister chief minister minister of education | <i>mentri/menteri besar</i> | head of state |

The sentences with the word in question which appear in any of the selected dailies in the context of usage provide essential information which will help establish the morphological variations; the derived and inflected forms as well as word classes in ME and the subsequent meanings assigned by the ME speakers. Overall this chapter has described the research methodology employed using Haugen's (1950) theoretical framework for lexical borrowing. The data was collected from the Malaysian online dailies chosen for this study and the Sanskrit words that were borrowed into Malay and hence to ME were garnered from the annotated list of Sanskrit words to Old Malay by de Casparis (1997). The analysis of data is discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The Malaysian English is a variety of English as it bears the influences of the ancestral languages of the local population namely the Malays, Chinese and Indians. This influence has been well researched in various studies, but the influence of the minority groups has received lesser deliberation. In fact the influence of the Indian community speaking Indic languages like Punjabi, Hindi, Gujerati, Sindhi and Bengali under the Sanskrit umbrella, of whom the Malaysian Sikh Punjabis form the largest number, has rarely been researched. Ironically, this elusive manifestation existed all along in the Malay language which is famed for its preponderant influence referred to as the “overriding influence” in ME (Morais, 2001, p. 35), and is the object of inquiry known as the phenomena of “**borrowed borrowings**” in this study. The analysis of data was based on Haugen’s (1950) framework for lexical borrowing and it consists of the attested Malay loans of Sanskrit origin garnered from the online versions of the Malay dailies namely Utusan Online and BH Online and the online versions of the English Newspapers, that is The Star Online and NST Online.

4.2 The analysis of data

The data was analyzed following Haugen’s (1950) lexical categories applicable to borrowing transmitted in the written form only, as the data is from the Malaysian dailies mentioned above. This analysis was assisted by the table which displays the Sanskrit (SL) loanword with the meaning as the heading and was divided below into columns for the languages involved, Malay (RL1) and Malaysian English (RL2) with the forms created and associated meanings conveyed from RL1 and to RL2. Haugen’s (1950) classification of categories divided the rows to differentiate the loans based on their degree of modification, substitution and meaning change. This segregation was vital to answer the questions raised in chapter one and an illustration using the SL word Maharddhika shows

the example of the forms of the loanword developed in selected local Malay and English Newspapers in Malaysia and the news snippets inferring the meanings conveyed in each context.

The table 4.1 below shows the process of ‘borrowed borrowing’ using Haugen’s (1950) categories with the processes involved in each category and the loanwords segregation accordingly with the inferred meaning from the context of the data used in this study.

Table 4.1: The process of borrowed borrowings traced from SL to RL1 to RL2

| SL word: <i>Maharddhika</i> ‘prosperous’ | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>merdeka</i> | independence | <i>merdeka</i> | Independence |
| 2. Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | <i>kemerdekaan</i> | the independence | | |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>era merdeka</i> | independence era | <i>merdeka</i> spirit | independence spirit |
| | <i>era kemerdekaan</i> | the independence era | <i>merdeka</i> cheer | independence cheer |
| | | | <i>merdeka</i> festival | independence festival |
| | | | <i>merdeka</i> day | independence day |
| | | | <i>merdeka</i> celebration | independence celebration |

The news Snippets from the Malaysian dailies, provide evidence of the loanword “*merdeka*” used in various forms and their related meanings in the context of the word. They corroborate the answers to the two questions raised in chapter one, as can be observed below:

1. “**MERDEKA! Merdeka! Merdeka!** Demikian laungan penuh semangat
‘Independence! Independence! Independence! This was uttered with full enthusiasm.....’
[BH online SELASA, 28 OGOS 2018 - 10:59AM]
2. KUALA TERENGGANU: Fifty elderly men and women got some **Merdeka cheer** when the Lions Club showered them with goodies.
[NST online September 7, 2018 @ 5:41pm]
3. KUALA TERENGGANU: Kuala Ibai comes alive for **Merdeka Festival**
[NST online September 3, 2018 @ 9:43am]
4. GEORGE TOWN: Rain fails to dampen high spirits at Penang's **Merdeka celebration**
[NST online August 31, 2018 @ 4:42pm]
5. Restoran Nasi Malaya nostalgia **era merdeka** (HEADLINES)
‘Restaurant Nasi Malaya reminiscences the independence era’
[Utusan online 10 Disember 2017 4:00 PM]
6. KUALA LUMPUR: The **Merdeka spirit** was palpable throughout the country, with people coming out in force to mark the 60th National Day at the respective state-level celebrations [STAR online 1 Sep 2017 | 7:00 AM]

4.3 Categories of loanwords

The categories of loanwords found in the written data featured in the Malay and ME dallies were mostly pure loanwords, loan blends of which only the derivational and compound blends were applicable and loan shifts where only the semantic loans prevailed. Illuminating were the processes employed by the users of ME in the attempt to not lose their cultural heritage and yet coin various derivational and compound blends using the loanwords to express themselves distinctively in the educated variety of English. An elaborate explanation follows on these forms and the plausible reasons for meaning

change based on evidence and sound reasoning from previous studies by renowned scholars to support the claims made in this study.

4.3.1 Loanwords

Loanwords constitute the largest category, quoted by Haugen (1950) to be vaguest of the group, as the word in general applies to all categories of loans. Finer classification of the related processes like derivational and compound blends that the loanword undergoes, segregates these categories as can be seen from the word “merdeka” in the table above. And true to its overriding influence, single and compound Malay loanwords still precede in enriching the lexicon of ME and comprise the largest category found in the data file. Nonetheless, some of these words have Sanskrit roots to begin with, as has been established in the literature and are rightfully referred to as “borrowed borrowings” in this study.

In loanwords, morphemic importation without any substitution takes place and Malay words such as *merdeka* ‘freedom’, *raja* ‘king’, *permaisuri* ‘queen’, *puteri* ‘princess’ and *putera* ‘prince’ found in the analysis are a direct transfer of lexeme with imported meaning and sound to ME, but perhaps with spelling variations. They are easily understood by the community at large and have become the “uncontroversial words” of a language (Traugott, 2017, p. 3). And rightfully, by virtue of being used repeatedly in multiple contexts they have gained currency and now contribute to their present indisputable use in Malay and are now borrowed as loanwords to ME. Borrowers familiar with the source language, Haugen (1950) ratifies, have a growing tendency to import the loanwords instead of substituting them as their bilingual command grows more adequate (p. 213). An example of such a loanword imported to RL1 and subsequently to RL2 without any substitution is displayed in the table below.

Table 4.2: Loanword with exactly the same meaning without any substitution

| SL word: <i>Paramesvari</i> 'queen' | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>Permaisuri</i> | Queen | <i>Permaisuri</i> | Queen |
| 2. Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | | | | |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>Permaisuri Selangor /Johor Tengku Permaisuri Raja Permaisuri</i> | Queen consort Selangor/Johor Queen consort Queen consort | <i>Permaisuri Selangor/ Johor Tengku Permaisuri Raja Permaisuri</i> | Queen consort Selangor/Johor Queen consort Queen consort |

The news snippets below provide a glimpse of the different contexts of the loanword.

7. JOHOR BAHRU: **Permaisuri Johor**, Raja Zarith Sofiah Sultan Idris Shah, hari ini, berangkat ke Makkah..... [BH online Isnin, 19 Februari 2018 | 4:24pm]

The queen consort of Johor, Raja Zarith Sofiah Sultan Idris Shah, departed to Mecca today

8. SHAH ALAM: Sultan Selangor, Sultan Sharafuddin Idris Shah bersama **Permaisuri Selangor**, Tengku Permaisuri Norashikin [Utusan online 16 Disember 2017 1:08 PM]

'The Sultan of Selangor, Sultan Sharafuddin Idris Shah with the queen consort of Selangor, Tengku Permaisuri Norashikin.....'

9. JOHOR BARU:The wedding today also fell on the birthday of Tunku Tun Aminah's mother **Permaisuri Johor** Raja Zarith Sofiah Sultan Idris Shah.

[NST online August 14, 2017 @ 11:52pm]

10. PUTRAJAYA: Also present were the Sultan of Perak, Sultan Nazrin Shah and the **Raja Permaisuri of Perak**, Tuanku Zara Salim, the Sultan of Selangor, Sultan Sharafuddin Idris Shah and the **Tengku Permaisuri of Selangor**, Tengku Permaisuri Norashikin. [NST online December 3, 2017 @ 10:29pm]

4.3.2 Loans blends

The next category of loanwords found in data were loan blends which have morphemic substitution with importation and the derivational and compound blends were most apparent in this category. In the blended derivatives the stem was found to be of the SL while the affixes used were of the RL, while the compound blends showed a compound of one part SL word with another part RL word. Every effort is made to accommodate these loan blends into ME as the uncontroversial example in the language and Haugen (1950) considers the bilingual speakers making these first substitutions as roughly conducting the process of comparative linguistics and assures that the overall pattern is quite reasonable. Moreover as related by Tan (2013) the development of these borrowed and created features involving both cultural and linguistic interaction offers the ME users the “resources to maintain the use of English within a complex multilingual, multicultural society” (p. 60). Since the compound blends are the most apparent category in ME they are discussed first to show their developments in Malay and ME and the news snippets that express the meaning in the context of the word.

4.3.2.1 Compound blends

An example of an interesting compound blend created by these bilingual speakers was found in the data from the SL word *akasa* “sky” which was borrowed as *angkasa* to Malay then developed into *angkasawan* “astronaut” using the Sanskrit suffix “-vant”. The word is based on the structure of the Sanskrit word for astronaut, *antariksavant*; which is construed from the derivational blend *antariksa* ‘sky’ and the possessive suffix –vant in Sanskrit. This derivational blend is borrowed and further formulated in ME as a

compound blend using the RL2 numerical values such as the “first *angkasawan*” and “second *angkasawan*”, similar to the English equivalent of the first or second astronaut. The overall structure is quite reasonable as the numerical value is added in front of the word *angkasawan* just like a count noun in English. In Malay however, the numerical value is inserted at the back of the word as *Angkasawan pertama* literally meaning “astronaut first” and so forth. This clearly shows the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the bilingual or more so the multilingual speakers in Malaysia and their attempts to incorporate the borrowed words into the acrolect variety of ME so that it is internationally intelligible.

The table 4.3 below illustrates one such example showing the processes involved and the forms created.

Table 4.3: Using Sanskrit suffix "vant" & assigning numerical value

| SL word: <i>akasa</i> ‘sky’ antariksavant ‘astronaut’ (sky + possess suffix- <i>vant</i>) | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>angkasa</i> | sky | | |
| 1. Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | <i>angkasawan</i> <i>angkasa + wan</i> (from Sanskrit suffix <i>-vant</i>) | astronaut | <i>angkasawan</i> | astronaut |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>angkasawan pertama</i> <i>angkasawan kedua</i> | first astronaut second astronaut | first <i>angkasawan</i> second <i>angkasawan</i> | first astronaut second astronaut |

News snippets with the usage of the word *angkasawan*

11. M'sia to send **second angkasawan** to ISS by end 2016 (headlines)

SEREMBAN: The Malaysian Government intends to send a second astronaut to the International Space Station to conduct scientific research by next year-end.

[NST online October 30, 2015 @ 4:15pm]

12. Space voyager reunited with his spacesuit (headlines)

Nine years after his journey to space, Malaysia's **first angkasawan** finally holds the memory of his space exploration in his hands.

[STAR online 22 Jan 2016 | 7:00 AM]

13. **Angkasawan** to be honorary Rela member as a colonel (headlines)

PUTRAJAYA: **Angkasawan** Datuk Dr Sheikh Muszaphar Shukor will soon be wearing another hat - that of an honorary Rela member

[STAR online 23 Jan 2011 | 12:00 AM]

14. KUALA LUMPUR: **Angkasawan Negara**, Datuk Dr Sheikh Muszaphar Shukor Sheikh Mustapha, menyambut ulang tahunnya

[BH online JUMAAT, 28 JULAI 2017 - 1:52PM]

'The country's astronaut, Dr Sheikh Muszaphar Shukor Sheikh Mustapha, celebrated his birthday.....'

15. Beg **angkasawan** Neil Armstrong dibida RM7.72j (headlines)

[BH online JUMAAT, 21 JULAI 2017 - 2:23PM]

'Astronaut Neil Armstrong's Bag was bid for RM7.72 million'

Another example of compound blend in ME is the loanword *menteri* borrowed as “minister” to Malay from the various meanings of “Counselor”, “Adviser” or “Minister” in Sanskrit but only the compound blend *Mentri/Menteri besar* “head of state” is borrowed to ME and not the pure loanword *menteri* found in Malay. The word *Menteri*

Besar applies to the post of “Chief Minister” of any of these Malay states namely Johor, Kedah, Kelantan, Pahang, Perak, Perlis, Negeri Sembilan, Selangor and Terengganu, while the English word “Chief Minister” is used for the remaining states of Penang, Melaka, Sabah and Sarawak. Tan (2009) adds that using the word *Menteri Besar* in ME portrays the “singularity of the Malaysian system of government” and the tendency to move away from the system used by the British colonial government (p.36), and reinstates the function of the national language as the “language of government and administration of Malaysia” (p. 32). This differentiation between the two terms *Menteri Besar* or Chief Minister is a shared assumption among the speech community in Malaysia and understood by the local speakers and identifying the correct word is resolved in the context of the word. Aptly applicable to this scenario is the notion in frame semantics proposed by Fillmore (1992) that the meaning of a word is understood "with reference to a structured background of experience, beliefs, and practices" (Fillmore & Atkins, 1992, p. 4). But this shared assumption of using two different terms for the chief minister may not be easily understood by the non-specialist audience, presumably they are the speakers who do not share the common repertoire of experiences or knowledge of the community (Durkin, 2012).

The loanword *menteri* or *mentri* has multiple spellings as can be seen from the table 4.4 below and this spelling variation also exists in the compound blend in ME. The table is revisited to illustrate the cultural specialty borrowed to ME (Tan, 2013, p. 76)

Table 4.4: Borrowed borrowing showing a compound blend in ME

| SL word <i>mantri</i> ‘counselor’, ‘adviser’, ‘minister’ | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------|
| Categories | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1.Loanwords | <i>menteri /mentri</i> | minister | | |
| 2.Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational blend | <i>ke-menteri-an</i> <i>menteri-nya</i> | the ministry its minister | | |
| c. Compound blend | <i>menteri menteri</i> <i>menteri besar</i> <i>perdana menteri</i> <i>timbangan Perdana menteri</i> <i>ketua Menteri</i> <i>menteri pendidikan</i> | ministers (plural) head of state prime minister deputy prime minister minister chief minister education minister | <i>mentri/</i> <i>menteri besar</i> | head of state |

News snippets showing the loanword *menteri* with the forms developed and their related meaning in the context of the word.

16. PUTRAJAYA:**Perdana Menteri** diiringi isterinya, Datin Seri Rosmah Mansor; **Menteri Luar**, Datuk Seri Anifah Aman; pegawai-pegawai Pejabat **Perdana Menteri, Kementerian Luar dan Kementerian Dalam Negeri** [Utusan online 17 Mac 2018 3:00]

*‘Prime **minister** was accompanied by his wife..., foreign **minister**..., officers from the prime **minister’s** office, external and internal **ministries**’*

17. PUTRAJAYA: **Perdana Menteri**, Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad hari ini mempengerusikan mesyuarat **Menteri Besar dan Ketua Menteri** yang ke-132 di Perdana Putra di sini. [BH online 16 Oktober 2018 - 11:37AM]

‘Prime minister Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad chaired the heads of state and chief ministers’ 132nd meeting at Perdana Putra here’

18. SHAH ALAM: **Menteri Besar** Selangor Datuk Seri Mohamed Azmin Ali and Strategic communications director from the Selangor **Mentri Besar's** Office Yin Shao Loong had failed to clear the air on the Ijok land controversy. [NST online Feb 16, 2018 @11:43pm]
19. KUALA LUMPUR: Yang di-Pertuan Agong Al-Sultan Abdullah Ri'ayatuddin Al-Mustafa Billah Shah attended the 253rd meeting of the Conference of Rulers at Istana Negara yesterday.The Malay Rulers were accompanied by the respective **Mentris Besar** while the Yang di-Pertua Negri by the respective **Chief Ministers**
[Star Online Friday, 1 Mar 2019]
20. PUTRAJAYA 1 Mac - **Kementerian** Pendidikan menyarankan pihak sekolah menghentikan aktiviti luar kelas berikutan fenomena cuaca panas yang melanda ketika ini.....**Menterinya**, Dr. Maszlee Malik berkata....[Utusan Online 02 Mar 2019 3:00 AM]
*'The **ministry** of Education advised the school authorities to stop the activities outside of the classroom due to the phenomenon of hot weather that hit this time ...its **minister** Maszlee Malik said'*

As can be seen from the contexts above the loanword *menteri* is widely used in Malay but not imported to ME as the English word “minister” is used in all categories of ministers like the Minister of Education, Minister in the Prime Minister’s department, Finance Minister and so forth. But the word *menteri/mentri besar* is used in ME related to what Crystal (1987) refers to as a loanword becoming more specialized in its usage with restricted meaning. Other compound blends which has become specialized in its usage with restricted meaning are coined from the loanwords *bumi* and *bumiputra* borrowed into Malay from Sanskrit words *bhumi* ‘earth’ and *bhumiputra* ‘native’. The word *bumi* is borrowed as a loanword to Malay showing morphemic importation with

spelling alteration by removing the alphabet “h”, while the partial meaning of earth remains the same as the model.

The extended word combination using two complete constituent morphemes *bhumi* + *putra* ‘earth’ + ‘son’ in Sanskrit is borrowed as a loanword with spelling alteration and a slightly extended meaning of native is used. The spelling alteration could be due to “The Sistem Ejaan Baru”, a new spelling system in Malaysia used to standardize the official Malay language. The loanword *bumi* ‘earth’ has been used widely as compound blends in Malay such as *gempa bumi* ‘earthquake’ and *bumi tercinta* ‘beloved land’, where the words have gained currency and now contribute to the multiple compound blends coined in ME. Here the combined word *bumiputera* is then further supplemented with a multiple of English words to become innovations of compound blends which carry an array of different meanings like *Bumiputera* agenda, *Bumiputera* lots, *Bumiputera* status.

Furthermore, a shorter version is coined by the competent bilinguals/multilinguals like *Bumi* firms, *Bumi* quota, *Bumi* vendors, *Bumi* certificate, *Bumi* concerns, *Bumi* power, *Bumi* discount and these words are explained in the table 4.5 below. The short forms have been construed into compound blends using English words so they function just like a nominal English phrase to overcome any linguistic constraints in ME. Another new feature is the negation status of *non bumiputera* ‘non-natives’ who are born in the country but do not acquire the native status. The word *bumi* in ME is specialized in its usage with restricted meaning but this meaning is a shared assumption among the speech community in Malaysia and easily understood by the local speakers. As proposed by Fillmore (1992) that the meaning of a word is understood "with reference to a structured background of experience, beliefs, and practices" (Fillmore & Atkins, 1992, p. 4).

These multiple compound blends found in the newspapers could be assumed to be “characteristic of the respective period and society” and since the major newspapers tend

to have a large target audiences they provide a typical sample of language used in the local society (Rademann, 1998, p. 49).

The table 4.5 below illustrates the forms and functions of the loanword.

Table 4.5: Borrowed borrowings in derivational and compound blends

| SL word: <i>bhu-mi</i> 'earth' and <i>Bhu-mi-putra</i> 'native' | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>bumi</i> <i>bumiputera</i> | earth native | | |
| 2. Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | <i>mengkebumikan</i> <i>dikebumikan</i> | was buried was buried | <i>non-bumiputera</i> | non-native |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>gempa bumi</i> <i>bumi tercinta</i> | earthquake beloved land | <i>bumiputera</i> agenda <i>bumiputera</i> lots <i>bumiputera</i> status <i>bumi</i> companies <i>bumi</i> firms <i>bumi</i> quota <i>bumi</i> vendors <i>bumi</i> certificate <i>bumi</i> concerns <i>bumi</i> power <i>bumi</i> discount | native agenda native lots native status native companies native firms native quota native vendors native certificate native concerns native power native discount |

The news snippets below exhibit the contexts in which this specialized word is utilized

21. JOHOR BARU: Johor currently has 88,000 unsold properties reserved as **Bumiputera lots**. [NST online May 1, 2017 @ 2:18pm]
22. 50pct allocation for **Bumi companies** should be emulated in future mega projects
23. SHAH ALAM: The 50 per cent allocation of Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) contracts to qualified **Bumiputera companies** should be emulated in future mega projects by the Federal government. [NST online December 16, 2016 @ 4:27pm]

24. TOKYO: Satu **gempa bumi** 6.0 magnitud menggegarkan pantai Fukushima, Jepun hari ini..... [BH online Jumaat, 6 Oktober 2017 | 7:54pm]
'An earthquake measuring 6.0 magnitude shook Fukushima beach in Japan today.....'
25. Perbanyak kontrak kerja **bumiputera** (headlines) [Utusan online 25 Dis 2015]
'Increase work contracts for natives'
26. Insiden itu mencetuskan rasa tidak puas hati..... sehingga mereka enggan **mengkebumikan** jenazah Asif. [Utusan online 17 Disember 2017 9:46 PM]
'The incident raised dissatisfaction...till they refused to bury the dead body of Asif'
27. RM300m Teras Fund a success in helping **Bumi firms** (Headlines) [NST online July 25, 2016 @ 11:01am]
28. Currently, the state imposes a **bumi quota** of 60 per cent for residential units...[NST online April 12, 2017 @ 10:03am]
29. UEM to develop 40 **Bumi vendors** in next 4 years (Headlines) [NST online February 16, 2017 @ 11:31pm]
30. In order to empower **Bumis**, power must remain in right hands: PM Najib (Headlines) [NST online May 3, 2016 @ 6:50pm]
31. KUALA PILAH: There is no need to increase the enrolment of **non-Bumiputra** students into government residential schools
[Star Online Saturday, 3 May 2008 12:00 AM MYT]

4.3.2.2 Derivational blends

The next set of loanwords were derivational blends found in the data and developed in ME from the stem of the source word and the prefix –non indicating “not”. This prefix is attached to the loanwords to imply the non-native status such as non-*bumiputera* or non-*bumis* thus creating the new forms found in the data as can be seen in the table 4.5 above and the news snippet 4.30 exhibits these plural forms. However this category is most applicable to words borrowed from Sanskrit to Malay and not many borrowed borrowings

in ME exhibit the derivational blends found in Malay. Perhaps this is due to the fact pointed out by Haugen (1950) “that the more structural a feature is, the less likely it is to be borrowed” (p. 225).

But interestingly there were some grammatical categories created in ME from the stem of the source word and inflectional morphemes of the RL2 to overcome the linguistic constraints in denoting the plural form or to show possession. The plural –s affix inflectional morpheme is noticeable in the word *mentris besar* used as a plural form where the word is *mentri* + s, so that it behaves like a normal count noun in ME. The news snippet 4.19 show the word *mentris besar*, the plural form used in the context of the word. A further inflection to show possession encountered in the data was *mentri besar’s* from the word *mentri besar* +’s and is evident in the news snippet 4.18. Similar inflectional morphemes were quoted by Tan (2013) as most productive in ME, “regularly utilized to indicate plurality in count nouns” (p. 77), and structurally they comprise of a Malay stem inflected by an English bound morpheme. But the Malay stem was initially a loanword based on the Sanskrit word *mantra*.

4.3.3 Loanshifts

In the area of loanshifts, semantic loans were studied following the classification of semantic change explicated by Traugott (2017) such as the semantic widening (broadening), semantic narrowing (restriction) which coincides with the adaption of semantic change of ME in this study. The borrowed borrowings in ME often display semantic restriction when only a certain meaning is retained or semantic widening when a cultural specificity not present in the original meanings is unveiled or when the specific sense cannot be precisely expressed using English.

The table 4.6 below illustrates the loanword *upavasa* “fast” borrowed as *puasa* “fast” in Malay but the multiple compound blends created in ME show semantic widening or

broadening with the meanings related to breaking of fast. They include events and promotions such as *buka puasa* event, *buka puasa* feast, *buka puasa* buffet and so on.

Table 4.6: Semantic widening or broadening in borrowed borrowing

| SL word: <i>upavasa</i> – “fast” | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>puasa</i> | fast | | |
| 2. Loan blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | <i>berpuasa</i> | is fasting | | |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>buka puasa majlis buka puasa</i> | breaking fast breaking fast reception | <i>buka puasa</i> <i>buka puasa</i> buffets <i>buka puasa</i> reception <i>buka puasa</i> event <i>buka puasa</i> feast <i>buka puasa</i> do <i>buka puasa</i> buffet | breaking fast breaking fast buffet + s (plural form) breaking fast reception breaking fast event breaking fast feast breaking fast ado breaking fast buffet |

News snippets showing the usage of the loanword *puasa* in the online newspapers

32. JOHOR BARU: The Sultan of Johor Sultan Ibrahim Sultan Iskandar today joined the congregation at the Tunku Laksamana Abdul Jalil Mosque at the state police eadquarters for a **buka puasa event** organised by the Johor police contingent. [NST online June 22, 2017 @ 9:47pm]
33. Hishammuddin joins KD Lekiu crew for **buka puasa** off Tanjung Gelang (headlines)
[NST online June 13, 2017 @ 9:33pm]
34. KUANTAN: Some hotel and restaurants in the state capital are cashing in on the fasting month by promoting **buka puasa buffets** for Ramadan despite not obtaining the "halal" certificates. [NST Online June 28, 2015 @ 5:55pm]

35. SEREMBAN: A total of 38 orphans from Darul Asnaf Seri Tanjung Kuala Pilah were treated with a **buka puasa do** this evening. [NST online June 20, 2017 @ 11:16pm]
36. KUALA LUMPUR: A total of 71 underprivileged children from Rumah Aman were treated to a **buka puasa feast** organised by Glomac Bhd today[NST online June 19, 2017: 11:30pm]
37. THE iconic Masjid Abidin, popularly known as Masjid Putih or White Mosque, organised a **buka puasa reception** for 50 non-Muslims here on Thursday.
[NST online June 10, 2017 @ 4:21pm]
38. KUALA LUMPUR, 15 Jun 2017 - Janna Nick pada **Majlis Berbuka Puasa** (headlines) [Utusan online 15 Jun 2017]
*'Janna Nick at **breaking fast** reception'*
39. SELEPAS sebulan **berpuasa**, kini umat Islam meraikan kehadiran Syawal
[Utusan online 04 Julai 2017 3:00 AM]
*'After a month of **fasting**, the Muslims now celebrate the arrival of Syawal'*

As can be seen from data the loanword *puasa* is borrowed into ME pertaining mostly to *buka puasa* events and buffets perhaps for promotional purposes expressing a cultural specificity not found in the original loanword of *puasa*. These compound blends of the loanword *puasa* show semantic widening or broadening. Nonetheless, the process of incorporating the loanword in ME involves the reversal of the basic Malay nominal phrase of head + modifier like *majlis buka puasa* “reception open fast” to the *buka puasa* reception and *buka puasa* events following the structure of the nominal English phrase of modifier + head. The bilingual speakers are roughly conducting the process of comparative linguistics to assure that the overall pattern is quite reasonable (Haugen, 1950).

The loanword borrowed with partly the same meaning or semantic restriction is *simhasana* “lion throne” from Sanskrit in which *simha* means ‘lion’ and is used in Malay as *singgahsana* for the ‘royal throne’. It is also borrowed into ME as *singgahsana* ‘royal throne’ and used as a loanword as well as compound blends *bilik singgahsana* ‘royal throne room’ and *bilik singgahsana kecil* ‘smaller royal throne room’ just like in Malay. Other loanwords that show semantic restriction where only a certain meaning is retained to make finer distinctions include *mentri besar* ‘head of state’ and *bumiputra* ‘native’. These words have been discussed in the compound blend category in tables 4.4 and 4.5 respectively.

The loanword *singgahsana* ‘royal throne’ with the restricted meaning is illustrated in the table 4.7 below with the inferred meaning drawn from the context of the word.

Table 4.7: Borrowed borrowings with restricted meaning in ME

| SL word: <i>simhasana</i> ‘lion throne’; <i>simha</i> ‘lion’ & <i>hasana</i> ‘throne’ | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>singgahsana</i> | royal throne | <i>singgahsana</i> | royal throne |
| 2. Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | | | | |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>bilik singgahsana</i> <i>bilik singgahsana kecil</i> | room royal throne room royal throne small | <i>bilik singgahsana</i> <i>bilik singgahsana kecil</i> | royal throne room smaller royal throne room |

News snippets in Malay and ME showing the usage of the loanword *singgahsana*

40. ALOR SETAR 12 Sept. - Raja Muda Kedah, menghadap Tunku Sallehuddin untuk mengiringi baginda ke **singgahsana** [Utusan online 12 Sept 2017]
*'The Raja Muda Kedah.....faced Tunku Sallehuddin to accompany his majesty to the **royal throne**'*
41. JOHOR BAHRU 14 Ogos - Istiadat Persandingan Puteri tunggal Sultan Johor,....Tun Aminah, 31, dan Dennis Muhammad, 28.... kemudian masuk ke **Bilik Singgahsana** Istana Besar untuk istiadat itu.[Utusan Online 14 Ogos 2017 11:13 PM]
*'For the wedding ceremony.....Tun Aminah 31 and Dennis Muhammad 28....later entered the **throne room** of the main palace for the ceremony'*
42. KLANG: An investiture ceremony held in conjunction with the 72nd birthday of the Sultan of Selangor Sultan Sharafuddin Idris Shah....Members of the royal family...stood to welcome the royal couple as they took their seats on the **singgahsana throne**.....
[NST Online December 11, 2017 @ 6:17pm]
43. The prince's coffin, draped with the Jalur Gemilang, police cap and a sword, was placed in the palace's **Bilik Singgahsana** [Star Online Sunday, 6 Dec 2015]
44. KUALA LUMPUR: Domestic Trade, Cooperatives and Consumerism Minister Datuk Hamzah Zainuddin led the line-up of new ministers and deputy ministers..... The swearing-in took place at the **Bilik Singgahsana Kecil** (Small Throne Room) at the Istana Negara, beginning at 10 am.[NST Online July 29, 2015 @ 11:36am]

Other than the semantic widening and restriction, the categories proposed by Haugen (1950) do not really apply in this phenomena of borrowed borrowing where words have travelled through an intermediary language in the written form. Though

Tan (2013) discuss the semantic modifications that take place in words like *dadah* ‘drugs’, *gatal* ‘itchy’ and *kacang* ‘peas, lentils’ (p. 75), but these loanwords were borrowed directly from Malay to ME

4.4 Discussion of forms and meanings of loanwords

It can be seen from the analysis above that the classification of semantic change somewhat followed the terms of semantic widening (broadening), semantic narrowing (restriction) which coincided with the criteria found in the data. In semantic widening also known as broadening, the meaning of the borrowed word is extended beyond the original meaning of the word and according to Fromkin (2003) the borrowed concepts may change by broadening its semantic representation. While in semantic restriction the meaning is restrained and Crystal (1987) relates this to the word becoming more specialized in its usage with specific meaning. When semantic loans undergone these changes the meaning too is restricted, extended or there is a complete shift from the original meaning of the loanword in question.

This semantic modification of loanwords from Sanskrit to Malay to ME is quite noticeable in the loanword *menteri* borrowed as “minister” to Malay from the various meanings of “Counselor”, “Adviser” or “Minister” in Sanskrit but only the compound blend *Mentri/Menteri besar* ‘head of state’ is borrowed to ME with the word becoming more specialized in its usage with specific meaning (Crystal, 1987). However the loanword *upavasa* ‘fast’ borrowed as *puasa* ‘fast’ in Malay has multiple compound blends created in ME which show semantic widening or broadening with new meanings related to the breaking of fast such as *buka puasa* event, *buka puasa* feast, *buka puasa* buffet and so on. Loanwords with partly the same meaning included *simhasana* ‘lion throne’ in Sanskrit borrowed as *singgahsana* ‘royal throne’ to Malay and subsequently to ME, while *Maharddhika* ‘prosperous’ was borrowed as *merdeka* ‘independence’ to Malay and ME. Loans with exactly the same meaning found in the data were *akasa* ‘sky’

borrowed as *angkasa* to Malay while the word *angkasawan* ‘astronaut’ is borrowed to Malay and hence to ME. The loanword *Paramesvari* ‘queen’ becomes *permaisuri* in Malay and ME with spelling variation but with no meaning change and these are some of the examples shown in the analysis and appendixes. The words like *bangsa* and *merdeka* are especially interesting as they capture “strong connotations of loyalty, subordination, inclusivity” that the local speakers apprehend and the “ideological reason behind their use is undeniable” (Rahim, 2006, p. 17).

Tan (2013) in her corpus study quoted some Malay words that did not retain their original meanings or only a single sense was imported to ME conveying a cultural specificity that did not exist in the original meanings and defined it as a sense that could not be concisely expressed using English words. Words like *kampung* house, the “traditional (Malay) house” built on stilts and *kampung* favorites the ‘Malay cuisine’ clearly added new meanings to the word *kampung* (Tan, 2009, p. 33). Though the word itself does not carry any implications to the “Malayness” attached to its meaning, but it is a shared assumption among the Malaysian speakers to associate the word with folks of Malay ethnicity. These shared assumptions reveal the assimilation of the traditions of the various ethnic groups residing in Malaysia and are subtly perceptible in the loanwords *menteri/mentri besar* and *bumiputera/bumi*. The implied meanings are understood "with reference to a structured background of experience, beliefs, and practices" (Fillmore & Atkins, 1992, p. 4) and further explains “how attitudes to semantic change can be bound up and influenced by attitudes to social change”, (Durkin, 2012, p. 4).

When words are borrowed from Malay to Malaysian English there is not much orthographic adaptation as the multilingual speakers are more or less fluent in Malay, the source language they acquire in school from an early age and Haugen (1950) ascertains that borrowers’ familiar with the source language did not need to modify the loanwords, but it was not the same when the words were initially borrowed from Sanskrit. According

to de Casparis (1997) the social factors involving the great differences between the ancient Indian society and modern Indonesian communities led to the meanings being subjected to substantial change in the course of history. Nonetheless the Sanskrit words were incorporated into Malay from a very early stage around the fourth or fifth century A.D. in parts of the Malay Peninsula and were not treated as foreign words since they corresponded phonologically and morphologically and structurally to Austronesian words (de Casparis, 1997). He gives the example of *kata* “word” in Malay from the Sanskrit *kath* ‘story’ which looks and sounds like the Austronesian words *mata* and *kita*, and has numerous derivatives such as *perkataan* “the word” *berkata* “to say” and even passives such as *dikatakan*. There are even prepositions and conjunctions borrowed from Sanskrit such as *antara* ‘between’ and *kerana* ‘because’ from *karana* ‘cause’ (de Casparis, 1997, p. 5). Some Sanskrit prefixes are also found in Malay words such as *maha* ‘great’ in the word *mahasiswa*, where the word *siswa* is also from Sanskrit *sisya* for pupil and these words were found in the data in ME. The Malay word *antarabangsa* is from *antara* ‘between’ and *bangsa* ‘race’ from Sanskrit *vamsa* discussed in the table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: Borrowed borrowings of partly the same meaning in ME

| SL word: <i>vamsa</i> ‘nation’ ‘tribe’ | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Categories & processes | RL1 (Malay) | Meaning | RL2 (ME) | Meaning |
| 1. Loanwords | <i>bangsa</i> | nation, group, race | <i>bangsa</i> | group, race |
| 2. Loan-blends | | | | |
| a. Blended Stem | | | | |
| b. Derivational Blend | <i>bangsawan</i> <i>bangsa + wan</i> (from Sanskrit suffix “-vant”) <i>kebangsaan</i> | nobles national | <i>bangsawan</i> | nobles |
| c. Compound Blends | <i>bangsa bangsa</i> <i>bangsa Melayu</i> <i>bangsa Cina</i> <i>bangsa Tamil</i> | nations (plural) Malay race Chinese race Tamil race | <i>Bangsa Johor</i> <i>Bangsa</i> <i>Malaysia</i> | Johoreans Malaysians |

News snippets below exemplify the forms and meanings

45. KUALA TERENGGANU 6 Dis kedudukan agama dan **bangsa Melayu** yang menaungi semua **bangsa bangsa**....[Utusan online 06 Disember 2017 12:46 PM]
'..... the standing of the Malay race and religion which protects all races'
46. ARAU 28 Nov. Jumlah itu melebihi paras **kebangsaan** iaitu 22 kematian berbanding jumlah penduduk sama.[Utusan online 28 November 2017 12:05 PM]
'The amount exceeds the national level that is 22 deaths compared to the total population'
47. DPM: Unity among various races is **Bangsa Malaysia's** strength and uniqueness [Star online 25 Jun 2017 | 7:00 AM]
48. A modern community hall equipped with various recreational and community-based amenities catering to every **Bangsa Johor** [NST online December 1, 2017 @ 8:12pm]
49. KUALA LUMPUR: Religious tolerance is the cornerstone of **Bangsa Malaysia**, says Deputy Prime Minister Datuk Seri Ahmad Zahid Hamidi [NST online December 28, 2016 @ 10:19pm]
50. Pat Ibrahim's vision of the traditional art of **bangsawan** (headlines) [NST online October 26, 2017 @ 9:05am]

The word *bangsa* is imported as a loanword to Malay showing morphemic importation with substitution where the spelling has been altered from the model and with meaning change. The word *bangsa* is based on the word *vamsa* 'tribe', 'nation' and the meaning is somewhat similar in Malay but in ME it stands for the people of a state or country as in *bangsa Johore* and *bangsa Malaysia* as can be seen in the news snippets 4.47 and 4.48. The plural form of count nouns in Malay *bangsa-bangsa* is used to signify an inflection morpheme of the bound type –s. The word is also used with affixes, the prefix *ke* and suffix *an* as *kebangsaan* to indicate the national level. The word *bangsawan* stands for a

type of Malay opera about royalty and while the suffix *-wan* comes from the Sanskrit suffix *-vant*, there is no word equivalent to *bangsawan* meaning opera in Sanskrit.

Another interesting form found in ME is created from *bhagya* + austronesian suffix *-(n)da* used as the direct loanword *baginda* ‘majesty’ from Sanskrit *bhagya* ‘part of’ + ‘good fortune’ carrying an entirely different meaning. The word *bhagya* has two meanings in Sanskrit ‘be part of’ and ‘good fortune’. The meaning ‘part of’ is also used in Malay as *bahagian* which is not found in ME. Other affixes found in the English dailies are nouns used as Malay names of schools and universities and national organizations, such as “Sekolah Kebangsaan”, “Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia” and “Pertubuhan bangsa bangsa bersatu”.

4.5 Variations in spellings from Sanskrit to Malay and ME

Poedjosoedarmo (1982) accentuates the Old Malay inventory did not have the /w/ and /v/ consonants thus the Sanskrit word *vamsa* was borrowed as *bangsa* just like *vicaksana* “far seeing” was borrowed as *bijaksana* ‘wise’ while *vac*, *uvaca* ‘speak’, ‘utter’ were borrowed as *baca* ‘read’. The many such variations in spelling are perhaps the matter of a system with “a smaller and less distributed phonemic inventory” (Barrs, 2015, p. 30). The spelling variation came about when the loanwords were borrowed from Sanskrit to Malay as Poedjosoedarmo (1982) reveals, certain words were regularly metathesized in Old Malay leading to variations in the spelling. He quotes words with *pra-* were borrowed as *per-* and as such, Sanskrit *Prathama* ‘the first’ borrowed to Javanese as *pratomo*, became *pertama* in Malay and *prakara* ‘matter’, ‘case’ borrowed as *prakoro* in Javanese became *perkara* in Malay. Based on the same reasoning it is plausibly why the Sanskrit loanword *maharddhika* was borrowed as *merdeka* and *mantri* now appears in Malay as *mentri* or *menteri*. This is also supported by the fact that “*man-*” in words of Old Javanese cognates with Indonesian “*men-*” and has analogous functions (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982). The loanword *putra* for prince is alternatively spelt as *putra/putera* while *putri* is

constantly referred to as *puteri* the princess. These spelling variations of *Mentri/Menteri besar*, *putra/putera* are also found in ME as the speakers now have a growing tendency to import since their bilingual command has become more adequate.

In some forms only the female attributes were borrowed and words like Sanskrit *parapati* 'female pigeon' was reduced to *merpati* 'dove', 'pigeon' without any discernment for gender. But the human attributes of *putra* and *putri* however, do apply to prince and princess in Malay just like *mahasiswa* is for male and *mahasiswa* is for female student respectively. These forms still persist in Malay and have not lost their lexicalized gender-specification mentioned by Hoogervorst (2016). He had lamented that Javanese and Old Malay lacked the nouns with /a/ stems in Sanskrit which refer to masculine or the neuter gender while the /i/ ending stems display feminine forms. However in some cases the meanings are remotely related to the source language like the Sanskrit word *roga* 'illness', 'disease' was borrowed as *rugi* 'loss', 'injury' and 'tort' in Malay (Hoogervorst, 2016, p. 304). Thus, in such processes of these semantic distinctions and accommodating the Sanskrit words into the Old Malay inventory many new words got created in Malay vocabulary.

Lastly the loss of the initial *u* in *puasa* 'fast' from Sanskrit *upavasa* follows the initial-vowel deletion rule of Malay but it is retained in loanwords borrowed into languages which do not share the initial-vowel deletion rule of Malay. The reflection of such particularities of the Malay historical phonology cognates with other languages of Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, and Thailand demonstrating the mediating role of Malay in the distribution of Sanskrit vocabulary over this region. Moreover, Malay has often been quoted to have been a "widely spoken language far beyond its current region of Malaysia, Indonesia and border areas in Thailand and elsewhere" and undoubtedly as it was "a major trade language from the 15th to 17th centuries – the so-called 'Age of Commerce' in Southeast Asia" (Azirah Hashim & Leitner, 2011, p. 552).

This chapter has dealt with some of the linguistic constraints encountered when the Sanskrit words were first borrowed into Malay outlining the adaptations that were necessary due to the smaller or less distributed phonemic inventory of the language. Overall the linguistic constraints were adapted quite efficiently considering the intermediary Javanese language mentioned. (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982). The forms were further construed to realize the function they serve in Malay and ME showing the dynamic structure of language. The next chapter summarizes what this research had ventured to accomplish, that is to retract the borrowed borrowing phenomena.

University of Malaya

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The title of this study is “Borrowed Borrowings traced from Sanskrit to Malay to Malaysian English” which was molded to investigate the influence of the minority groups speaking Indic languages in Malaysia. The term “borrowed borrowings” was an attempt to encapsulate this borrowing spectacle which began in yesteryears; from Sanskrit (SL) to Malay (RL1) and hence to ME (RL2) and reconnoiter the influence in the process of transcending the paths taken through the different social strata of each community that play a crucial role in the forms and functions they serve in ME. This epic journey framed the purpose of the study with the two simple questions that delved the entire research scope as stated below.

1. What are the forms and functions of Sanskrit loanwords found in the selected Malay and English Newspapers in Malaysia?
2. What are the linguistic constraints in adapting the loanwords for the various functions they serve in the Malay and ME dallies?

5.2 Addressing research question one

Question one was devised to investigate the forms created using Haugen’s (1950) categories for lexical borrowing in ME from the Sanskrit loanwords that were borrowed into Old Malay which was the language spoken by the inhabitants of “powerful kingdoms who enjoyed advanced cultures” (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982, p. 1). Firstly, the loanwords found in the data would have been borrowed as a novelty to Malay where they had gained currency and now appear as the uncontroversial words in the language. Secondly, the relative status of the loan-giving language as a prestige language would have been important as scholarly words belonging to the literary, religious and bureaucratic domains were some of the first words borrowed. Words like *merdeka* ‘independence’, *maharaja* ‘king’, *permaisuri* ‘queen’, *puteri* ‘princess’, and *putera* ‘prince’ are still being used till

this day but inescapably, they now appear in the acrolectal variety of ME. Then, the common everyday words which are not treated as foreign words as they have forms developed from them which were traced based on the categories in Haugen's (1950) framework and segregated according to the degree of morphemic substitution and importation. It was found that loanwords and loan blends of which the derivational and compound blends were most profound in the data. The derivational blends however, were more prominent in Malay than in ME and the only prefix found in the data was *non-* used to imply 'not' as in *non-bumis*. In loanshifts, only the semantic loan category was applicable and this category was further investigated based on whether the word had conjured a specific sense (semantic restriction) or if the meaning was extended beyond the original sense (semantic broadening) to exhibit some cultural specificity. The words with restricted meanings found in the analysis were coined due to socio-political reasons while broadening of meaning occurred when compound blends attached to the words extended the meanings. The cultural constraints involved in these processes are part of the shared assumptions among the speech community in Malaysia which may not be easily understood by the non-specialist audience who are not part of the society. But one piece of striking evidence that surfaced is that most compound blends created in ME are often coined to address certain needs applicable to a certain period and representative of the respective society.

Moreover, Kachru's deficit hypothesis presupposed that borrowing of lexical items is done to fill linguistic "gaps" (Kachru, 1994). While this may be true for the borrowing from Sanskrit as accentuated by Daulton (2013) that "they resorted to Sanskrit to express concepts not found in Malay, such as *tata* ('rules')" (p. 2), but it is definitely not true for the way the loanwords have been fashioned in Malay and rerouted to ME. So question one traced this classic journey from Sanskrit, the Source Language (SL) to Malay, the

Recipient Language one (RL1) and hence to ME, the Recipient Language two (RL2), based on their usage in the selected dallies chosen.

5.3 Addressing research question two

In the second question the linguistic constraints encountered to structure the forms in Malay were perhaps due to its “smaller and less distributed phonemic inventory” (Barrs, 2015, pp. 30-31) but in ME it required assimilating them reasonably well into the language. The use of inflectional morphemes to construe the plural forms of loanwords by simply adding the “s” to the loanwords like *bumi* + “s” and *mentri* + “s” is the most functional and well-designed approach to overcome the linguistic constraints so that the forms behave like normal count nouns in ME. Similarly, the other inflection used to show procession such as *mentri besar*’s could easily blend into a sentence in ME without any doubt of it being a loanword. These forms aptly serve the functions required by the context to deliver the intended message but such inflections are few and not many examples could be found in the data.

The tables designed to answer question one and two clearly illustrate the various forms developed with the meanings conveyed quite concisely, and at a glance readers can get all the information on the loanword while the news snippets that follow provide the evidence to support the claims made in this study. Overall it was established that the developed forms of Sanskrit loanwords profoundly increased the current vocabulary of Malay and ME in local newspapers in Malaysia. These news snippets also illustrate the particular loanword as used in the context of the word and according to Traugott (2017), with language being a communicative activity it is largely dependent on context. So the actual meanings of a words are highly dependent on the forms and functions they play in the context of the word.

5.4 Implications of the study

The general implication is that this study expresses some of the subtle characteristics of ME and the gap in the literature has been apprehended to a certain degree on the influence of the minority groups in Malaysia. The ME users go to great lengths intentionally or otherwise to improve and maintain the communicative functions of ME as can be seen from the compound blends created to express their intentions. While the influence of the various cultures has been expounded in various papers quoting Malay as having the overriding effect in ME, yet the rebuffs remain about the acceptance of the English language for global advancement. Perhaps this major reservation would be made pliable if a standardized ME is accepted as a legitimate variety of English in Malaysia as it makes a difference to the overall acceptance of the language as a product of the different ethnicities in Malaysia, a made in Malaysia product.

The mechanisms ME users adopt, intentionally or subconsciously, in their efforts to improve the communicative and expressive functions of ME are commendable. Recently, the country in aspiring to be globally competitive has introduced bilingual proficiency as one of the key attributes in the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025, quoting to be “operationally proficient in Bahasa Malaysia as the national language and language of unity, and English as the international language of communication” Ministry of Education (2015). Perhaps the joint efforts of the Malaysian prodigies like Asmah Haji Omar, the revered authority on English in Malaysia and her team could be sought for the possibility of standardizing ME, just like when the development of Malay for minimizing geopolitical divergences was done (Asmah 2008).

5.5 Limitations of the study

A couple of limitations were encountered in this endeavor firstly, the present study is not at all an exhaustive investigation and only a small number of loanwords mostly the bureaucratic range of borrowed borrowings were analyzed based on the limited studies

done on Old Malay. There is apparently a grave paucity in this area of research of a language which has existed since yesteryears and was the lingua franca for trade of a people who had great kingdoms with advance cultures (Poedjosoedarmo, 1982). Notwithstanding, this analysis was detailed and thorough and an attempt was made to shed some light on the changes required in Old Malay when the lexical borrowing from Sanskrit was initiated. Only the written data was analyzed as this study was not designed to detect any possible phonemic substitution of borrowed borrowings, so the categories in Haugen's (1950) framework were only partly applicable. Moreover, as remarked by Haugen (1950) the modern languages are not so structurally simple that they can be exhaustively described by a single set of categories and more so embrace all the multiple factors involved in any socio-linguistic situation. Perhaps more of Haugen's (1950) categories are applicable to spoken data. Secondly, this is not a corpus study and the subtle changes which are visible in "tiny steps that are discoverable in "clouds" of textual shifts among collocates" (Traugott, 2017, p. 8) that are easily detectable from the concordance lines of a word showing the various forms, functions and meaning change were not easily traceable. And thirdly, due to paucity of research in this area, not many studies have been done in the area of the paths taken through the different social strata of each community which play a crucial role in the forms and functions they serve in ME. There may have been as Azirah and Lietner (2011) mention, "older layers of colonial loan expressions" (p. 552) entering general English, but not post-colonial loanwords as they are rarely borrowed directly into general English.

5.6 Conclusion and recommendations for future research

The borrowed borrowings traced from Sanskrit to Malay to ME is a unique phenomenon which does not take place in most post-colonial countries but, in Malaysia this is possible as the diverse local languages contribute to the rich tapestry of ME. And besides most of the speakers in Malaysia are at least bilingual if not multilingual as Malay,

“the king of all languages in the country” is the national cum official language and the medium of instruction in all the national schools and universities. This is just an inaugural research and every effort was taken to achieve the objectives of the study based on the research questions coined to study this phenomenon. The developed features showed changes in form and function leading to meaning change but this was not due to spelling or variations in production or even the regularly metathesized /e/ and /r/, but clearly related to the phonological and orthographical differences cited by Barrs (2015) of a recipient language having a phonological system with a less “distributed phonemic inventory” (Barrs, 2015, pp. 30-31). Even Poedjosoedarmo’s (1982) and de Casparis’s (1997) analysis of Old Malay showed the language lacked the /u / or /o/ contrast and the /w/ and /v/ were missing from the Malay inventory. Due to the phonological and orthographical differences Sanskrit loanwords required substantial changes to be integrated into Old Malay thus affecting the meanings of the loanwords in the process of assimilation. These meanings are then carried forward to ME while other reasons like incorporating the shared assumptions and innovations for promotional purposes like the *buka puasa* buffets are probable reasons. Part of it could be due to the linguistic capabilities of the ME to maintain the acrolectal variety of ME and yet perform the vital functions of expressing their individual identities. Perhaps, when we reflect on how these forms carry the local cultural identities and allow the language to evolve, maintaining a variety of English characteristic to them (Tan, 2013), referred to as the “double-edged power of language, to bind and to divide” (Lim, 2015, p. 19). But rather than segregate, these diverse cultural influences should be used to bind the possibility of standardizing ME for the sake of global advancement. Hopefully future research will provide a more detailed version of ‘borrowed borrowings’ using a corpus study.

REFERENCES

- Asmah Haji Omar. (1982). *Language and society in Malaysia*. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pelajaran, Malaysia.
- Asmah Haji Omar. (1985). Patterns of Language Communications in Malaysia. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 13(1), 19-28. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24490893>
- Asmah Haji Omar. (2000). Managing languages in conflict situation: A special reference to the implementation of the policy on Malay and English in Malaysia. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 10(2), 239-253.
- Asmah Haji Omar. (2008, March 26-28). MABBIM and the development of Malay minimizing geopolitical divergences. *Paper presentated at the Malay/Indonesian as a Language of Knowledge and Practical Communcation Appraisal, Challenges and the Future*. Leiden, the Netherlands. Retrieved from eprints.um.edu.my/8631/1/All.pdf
- Azirah Hashim. (2000). Culture and identity in the English discourses of Malaysians. *NOTE 311p.; Selected papers presented at the Annual South East Asia Conference* (p. 75). Perth, Western Australia, Australia: ERIC.
- Azirah Hashim. (2009). Not plain sailing: Malaysia's language choice in policy and education. *AILA Review*, 22(1), 36-51.
- Azirah Hashim. (2017). Crosslinguistic influence in the written English of Malay undergraduates. *Journal of Modern languages*, 12(1), 60-76.
- Azirah Hashim, & Leitner, G. (2011). Contact expressions in contemporary Malaysian English. *World Englishes*, 30(4), 551-568.
- Barrs, K. (2015). Errors in the use of English in the Japanese linguistic landscape; Understanding how erroneous uses of English in Japan are often more than just careless mistakes. *English Today*, 31(4), 30-33.
- Baskaran Loga Mahesan. (2005). *A Malaysian English Primer: Aspects of Malaysian English Features*. University of Malaya Press.
- Chambers, J. K., & Schilling, N. (2013). *The handbook of language variation and change* (Vol. 129). John Wiley & Sons.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston: MA: Person Education.
- Croft, W. (2000). *Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach*. Pearson Education.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge .
- Crystal, D. (1994). What is Standard English? . *The English language*. , 24-26. Retrieved from <http://www.davidcrystal.com/>

- David, M. K., Naji, I. M., & Sheena Kaur. (2003). Language maintenance or language shift among the Punjabi Sikh community in Malaysia? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 165(2516/03), 0161-0001., 1-161.
- de Casparis, J. G. (1997). Sanskrit loan-words in Indonesian: an annotated check-list of words from Sanskrit in Indonesian and traditional Malay. *Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya*.
- Durkin, P. (2012). Variation in the lexicon: the 'Cinderella' of sociolinguistics? : Why does variation in word forms and word meanings present such challenges for empirical research?. *English Today*, 28(4), 3-9.
- Fillmore, C. J., & Atkins, B. T. (1992). Toward a frame-based lexicon: The semantics of RISK and its neighbors. *Frames, fields, and contrasts: New essays in semantic and lexical organization*, 103, 75-102.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2003). In introduction to language 7th edition. *Boston, Mass.: Thomson and Heinle*.
- Ginzburg, R. S., Khidekel, S. S., Knyazeva, G. Y., & Sankin, A. A. (1966). *A course in modern English Lexicology*. Higher School Publishing House.
- Gomez Capuz, J. (1997). Towards a typological classification of linguistic borrowing. *Revistas - Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses - 1997, No. 10*, 81-94.
- Gonda, J. (1973). *Sanskrit in Indonesia* (Vol. 28). New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Greavu, A. (2014). A Classification of Borrowing: Observations from Romanian/English Contact. *Diversité et identité culturelle en Europe* , 95-104.
- Hajar Abdul Rahim. (2014). Postcolonial Malaysian English: realities and prospects. In Hajar Abdul Rahim & Shakila Abdul Manan, *English in Malaysia: Postcolonial and Beyond* (pp. 9-33). Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2014.
- Haugen, E. (1950). *The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing*. Retrieved from Language: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/410058>
- Hoogervorst, T. (2016). Lexical influence from North India to Maritime Southeast Asia; Some new directions. *Man in India*, 97(1).
- Hume, E. (2001). Metathesis: Formal and functional considerations.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9(1), 3-20.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25(1), 1-14.
- Kachru, B. B. (1994). Englishization and contact linguistics. *World Englishes*, 13(2), 135-154.

- Lehrer, A., Kittay, E. F., & Lehrer, R. (2012). *Frames, fields, and contrasts: New essays in semantic and lexical organization*. Routledge.
- Leitner, G. (n.d.). Malaysian English: Awareness and Knowledge of Loans Prof. Dr. Azirah Hashim. *Researchgate.net*.
- Lim, S. G.-L. (2015). English in Malaysia: Identity and the market place. *Asiatic: IIUM Journal of English Language and Literature*, 9(2), 1-25.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1986). Non-Native varieties of English: Nativization, Norms, And Implications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8(1), 1-18.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1986). Sociolinguistic context and second- language acquisition: acculturation and creativity in Malaysian English. *World Englishes*, 5(1), 71-83.
- Moag, R. F. (1992). The Life Cycle of Non-Native Englishes : A Case Study. *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*, 233-252.
- Monier-Williams, M. (1970). *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Рипол Классик.
- Morais, E. (2001). Lectal varieties of Malaysian English. *Evolving Identities: The English Language in Singapore and Malaysia*, 33-52.
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1982). *Javanese Influence On Indonesian*. Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.
- Prema Chalaya. (2007). Lexical borrowings from Malaysian substrate languages in local English dailies (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics University of Malaya Kuala Lumpur). Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from repository.um.edu.my.
- Rademann, T. (1998). Using online electronic newspapers in modern English-Language press corpora: Benefits and pitfalls. *ICAME JOURNAL*, 22, 49-72.
- Ray, H. P. (2011). Early Maritime Contacts Between South and Southeast Asia. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 20(1), 42-54.
- Robinson, J. A. (2010). Awesome insights into semantic variation. *Advances in cognitive sociolinguistics*, 45, 85-110.
- Saran Kaur Gill. (1993). Standards and pedagogical norms for teaching English in Malaysia. *World Englishes*, 12(2), 223-238.
- Saran Kaur Gill. (2013). *Language policy challenges in multi-ethnic Malaysia* (Vol. 8). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Schneider, E. W. (2003). The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79(2), 233-281.
- Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tan, S. I. (2009). Lexical borrowing from Chinese languages in Malaysian English. *World Englishes*, 28(4), 451-484.

- Tan, S. I. (2009). Lexical borrowing in Malaysian English: Influences of Malay. *Lexis [online] Journal in English Lexicology* 3/2009, 11-39.
- Tan, S. I. (2009). Lexical borrowing in Malaysian English: Influences of Malay. *Lexis. Journal in English Lexicology*, 3/2009, 11-39.
- Tan, S. I. (2013). *Malaysian English: Language Contact and Change*. Peter Lang Edition.
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press.
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1992). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Univ of California Press.
- Torstensson, B. (2014). Semantic Change in Words Loaned to Swedish. Retrieved from <http://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/4780697>
- Traugott, E. C. (2012). Pragmatics and language change. *The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics*, 549565.
- Traugott, E. C. (2017, 03). Constructions in grammaticalization. *The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics: A Handbook for Language Teaching*, 624-647. Retrieved from Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics: <http://linguistics.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-323>
- Traugott, E. C. (2017, March). *Historical Linguistics, Pragmatics, Semantics*. Retrieved from Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics: oxfordre.com/linguistics
- Traugott, E. C. (2017). *Semantic Change*. Oxford University Press.
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2010). Borrowing. *Centaur.reading.ac.uk*, 17-35.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1988). *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Wilkins, C. (2011). *Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Winford, D. (2005). Contact-induced changes Classification and process. *Diachronica*, 22(2), 373-427.
- Yamaguchi, T., & Deterding, D. (2016). English in Malaysia: Background, status and use. In *English in Malaysia: Current use and status*. (pp. 3-22).