CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the concept of borrowing and studies related to it. It discusses studies on the influence of borrowing on languages in contact. The review is set out in three broad sections.

The first section deals with what the major authorities have said about the field of borrowing. The review begins with Weinreich (1953), Haugen's (1950) and Bloomfield's (1963) definition of borrowing. Borrowing and lexical transfer by Ringbom (1913) on borrowing has special significance. Haugen in The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing gives a brief description to the terms 'mixture' and 'borrowing'.

Bloomfield discusses the types of borrowing in his article 'Cultural Borrowing'. Sapir (1921) adds that there is a chance to borrow associated words in cultural borrowing.

Haugen, Stene (1945) and Bloomfield state that the effects of borrowing are felt in these following areas and discusses them under the following headings; language contact and communication, cross-cultural borrowing, the media, trade, education and status of the language.

Stene and Haugen’s articles are next on the different approaches towards the study of loanwords and lexical borrowings. These studies helped the researcher obtain a better understanding of approaches towards the subject of borrowing. Stene describes the formal approach, synchronic approach and Haugen on the other hand looks at the
diachronic approach. These studies enabled the researcher to devise a suitable methodology to assess and analyse the findings in this dissertation. Haugen (1950) gives a classification of borrowed items.

The second broad section reviews works and studies on borrowing from other native languages in Malaysia into English and vice versa. It also discusses the borrowings from Malay language into Tamil.

Lowenberg (1986) carried out a study on sociocultural context and second-language acquisition: acculturation and creativity in ME; in another study Lowenberg (in Chesire, 1991) looks at variation in Malaysian English where he analyses lexical borrowings from Malay into English; Wong (1981) looked at some features of varieties of ME: vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation; Dako (2002) made an observation of the English used by Ghanaians who have had at least some formal education and are able to use English in some registers; English in Hebrew newspapers is a study carried out by Ronen, Seckbach and Cooper (in Fishman, Cooper and Conrad, 1977); Heah (1989) examines the whole range of the resultant lexical expansion of Bahasa Malaysia (Haugen, 1950), based on the nature of the borrowing process; Wong (1992) studies English borrowings into Malay short stories. Thilagawathi Kanagaretnam (1971) has attempted to portray the linguistic nature of Malay loanwords in Tamil.

The final and third broad section of the literature review looks at how English in Malaysia has been viewed and portrayed.
2.1 An Introduction to the Concept of Borrowing

2.1.1 Definition of Borrowing

According to Weinreich (1963:1) "two or more languages will be said to be in contact if they are used alternately by the same persons" during a conversation or writing. He further points out that when two languages come into contact, one or both of these languages may deviate from the rules of either language. He calls this interference phenomena interlingual influence where one language influences directly or indirectly another language. While there are many kinds of interference phenomena (interlingual influence), this study is concerned with only one and that is borrowings.

Haugen (1950 in Firchow et. al. 1972) points out that "linguistic diffusion" can be used, as "this would suggest the spread of the language itself rather than of elements from it" (1950:163). Therefore, borrowing refers to the process in which elements from one language are taken over and used in the context of another. Haugen very aptly defines borrowing as "the attempted reproduction in one language of pattern previously found in another" (1950:163). Bloomfield further posits that use of the word 'reproduction' does not imply that a 'mechanical imitation has taken place. In fact, "the nature of the reproduction may vary widely from the original" (Bloomfield in Haugen, 1950:163). This would reflect on the new meaning the word takes in another language.

Both Haugen (1950) and Hockett (1958) acknowledge the inherent absurdity of the use of this term borrowing for a process which takes place without the consent or, even, awareness of the lender. The item borrowed, however, is not returned, because it never left the source language and in any case changed in the transfer (Internet, 2002). However, as there is no suitable description for this term it continues to be used. As
Haugen points out, "the real advantage of the term borrowing is the fact that it is not applied to language by laymen. It has, therefore, remained comparatively unambiguous in linguistic discussion (163)" and is, in consequence, the most suitable word, at present, to describe the process discussed in the first paragraph. He compares the process of borrowing to a term used by anthropologists' i.e. cultural diffusion (cultural items are spread in a similar process) and suggests the use of linguistic diffusion to describe this process.

2.1.2 Borrowing and Lexical Transfer

To look at lexical transfer Ringbom (1913) suggests that borrowing may be better understood if it is compared and contrasted with related but different concepts. In borrowing, an item from another language is taken into the second language changed or unchanged, irrespective of there being an equivalent or not. The bilingual may be fluent or only have a superficial knowledge of that language. Ringbom claims that borrowing is a "mechanical" phenomenon, however; Bloomfield is of the view that a reproduction does not imply that a mechanical imitation has taken place. The researcher strongly agrees with Bloomfield (in Haugen, 1950) as a reproduction could be planned and unlike what has been claimed by Ringbom that it is a mechanical process. In speech, it could be accepted as being mechanical but in writing, which is seen in newspapers, the borrowing is most probably intentional as some thought is given before pen is put to paper.

Lexical transfer can occur in dialect borrowing, cultural borrowing (discussed 2.1.5) and intimate borrowing. Hence, it cannot be said that borrowing is mechanical because it
involves only the transfer or search of lexical items by the user. The user draws on his schema to use a word according to its appropriate need.

Ringbom (1913) however states that lexical transfer involves more complex linguistic processing. It uses analogical creative element in taking over semantic features and in combining different lexical items. Formal similarity need not be the criteria for transfer to occur frequently, but the user’s fluency in the language from which he transfers is paramount. To achieve a near native language use, Ringbom posits that the user has to have a high degree of fluency in the language.

Borrowing from the first language into the second language is as an identity tool and does not occur because of ignorance or being poor in the language. According to Ringbom, in his time an active interest in the field of second language was a recent phenomenon. In speaking or writing he points out a learner may activate his knowledge of other languages and the extent to which a learner does this unknown. He adds that this depends on two variables:

a. The learner’s proficiency in the languages concerned and
b. The distance (real and perceived) between or among the languages concerned.

The learner’s need to define ownership / identity (cultural) with the borrowing language. Largely the donor language, first language or official language in this case is considered of lower prestige and the second language is a dominant, global language (Crystal, 1997).
In conclusion borrowing and lexical transfer generally refer to the same aspects of transfer from a language into another to express meaning and to communicate. This is largely evident in multilingual communities. Why does this phenomenon occur? It has been found that there are conditions of borrowing that influence the nature of borrowing.

2.1.3 Conditions of Borrowing

When two or more languages come into contact, lexical or phrasal borrowings are bound to occur. Hockett (1958) claims that for language borrowings to happen, the users have to have some degree of bilingualism or semi bilingualism. That is to say, the idiolect in which occurs the model is called the donor; the idiolect (or language), which acquires something new in the process, is the borrowing idiolect (or language). Hockett (1958) further states that in this “borrowing”, that which is borrowed does not have to be paid back, the donor makes no sacrifice and does not have to be asked for permission. What takes place is the borrower’s speech is altered although nothing changes hands and the donor goes on speaking as before. It could be summarized here as follows, “the conditions for borrowing are present constantly, as a natural accompaniment of every use of language except genuine soliloquy” (Hockett, 1958:402). He says borrowing will only occur if there is a difference in the “degree of similarity” between the two speakers.

Both Haugen and Weinrich (1953 in Parwathy, 1993), claim that the informal learning of another language should be involved as a condition for borrowing. In this process, the language he is learning influences the language of the learner.
The need to 'fill the gap' (Hockett, 1958: 405) is another reason for the occurrence of interlingual borrowing as the borrowing becomes necessary in order to express ideas and concepts for which the borrowing language has no equivalents. This refers to what Hockett calls the Need-Filling Motive i.e. the donor language serves to give names to new experiences, new objects and practices in the borrowing language.

Prestige Motive is where the borrowing occurs because people admire the user of a language and want to be like them. Another reason forwarded by Hockett (1958) is the borrower's wish to be identified or accepted in a particular group and not necessarily that he admires or likes the other language. The borrowing language is normally of a lower prestige than the donor language. He claims that generally, the prestige factor accounts for a large number of words which are borrowed from the dominant language into the lower. In this study however, this is not entirely true as English has a high status as an international language in many countries around the world.

Convenience (Parwathy, 1993) is yet another factor, which contributes to borrowing. Certain words at times are more easily found or identifiable in the donor language than in the borrowing language. For example, the word 'kampung' is widely used in spoken and written English even though there is an equivalent in the word 'village'. This is because 'kampung' is more recognisable or identifiable than 'village' and, therefore, more convenient to use. Other words, which may be used for these reasons, are words such as cane (rotan), custom (adat), garden (taman) etc.

The Prestige and Need-Filling Motives usually overlap and to say one is more important than the other is not practical.
According to Haugen (1972 in Firchow et. al.), Weinreich (1953) and Hockett (1958) borrowing can be a mechanical process. A word is usually used with no prior planning and just to fills a gap in a language. However, in the researcher's opinion the borrowing may be planned and intentional as in the written form there is time to think of what one wants to put down in black and white as mentioned earlier. This convenience factor is thus used and borrowing may occur from a dominant language of the country for example from Bahasa Malaysia into English. Examples are Malaysia Boleh, and rakyat. It portrays identification with the masses and creates a sense of belonging among the users. Sapir (1921) further posits that in cultural borrowing there is a possibility of associated words to be borrowed. Hence, this is in the researcher's opinion done intentionally. Achebe (1965) quoted in Malachi (1996) puts forth the idea that to describe one's experience one should use the English language according to the place, time and need of the people. In Malaysia, this is definitely to depict the Malaysian experience. Today, the world has moved into a scientific and technological era and so has the use of language in Malaysia.

Encompassing the sphere of borrowing, we have “dialect borrowing” where the borrowed features come from within the same speech area or dialect. On the other hand, in the case of “cultural borrowing”, the borrowed features come from a different language. To better understand these concepts an analysis of linguistic borrowing will be appropriate. Therefore, the analysis of linguistic borrowing will be the next topic of discussion.
2.1.4 The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing

The term ‘borrowing’ according to Haugen (1950:163) is more appropriate than “mixture” which portrays that some languages are pure. In the end, the term ‘mixture’ proved inadequate as difficulties emerged, therefore Sapir and Bloomfield abandoned it.

Haugen (1950) provides the most apt definition of borrowing as mentioned earlier in 2.1.1, “The attempted reproduction in one language pattern previously found in another” (163). Haugen looks at the types of borrowing and the activities involved, such as importation and substitution and terminology of borrowing such as, loanwords, loan translation, loan blends and loan shifts. Reborrowing as discussed by Haugen (1950) occurs when there is continual interference from the model in the other language. This happens when the older and younger speakers use different forms of the same loanwords.

Haugen (1950) discusses the scales of adoptability and receptivity when analysing structural resistance to borrowing. He also studies the structural effects of borrowing, identifies loans primarily from a historical point of view. Furthermore, he studies loans from the period of inter-language contact, historical problems, immigration, international words and interlingual coincidences. The structural effects of borrowing and the identification of loans are also briefly discussed. Bloomfield (1963), however looks at borrowing from three aspects: cultural, intimate and dialect. He describes “cultural” borrowing with reference to linguistic community with respect to geographical and political spheres. The use of two languages within the same political domain is termed “intimate” (461). The adoption of linguistic features from within the same speech-area is referred to as “dialect borrowing” (476).
2.1.5 Cultural Borrowing

Language features are adopted throughout the life of a speaker from other speakers, which Bloomfield (1963: 444) posits as copious, and come from all manner of sources. Borrowing is an inevitable process in linguistics hence the adoption of features, which differ from those of the main tradition, of linguistic borrowing.

Bloomfield claims that within the sphere of borrowing there are two aspects of borrowing which have been distinguished, namely, dialect borrowing, 'where the borrowed features come from within the same speech-area', and cultural borrowing, 'where the borrowed features come from a different language' (444). The latter is the point of interest in this dissertation. Ethnologists study the spread of things and habits and they termed this process "cultural diffusion" (445). Bloomfield in his study discusses his findings, where he says that each speech community learns from its neighbours. The language learned include, objects, both natural and manufactured, passed from one community to the other and so do patterns of action, such as 'technical procedures, warlike practices, religious rites, or fashions of individual conduct' (445). Ethnologists who study the spread of things and habits call this phenomenon cultural diffusion.

According to Bloomfield (1963) over time, the assimilation of foreign words becomes tolerable as familiarity breeds among the groups of speakers. English speakers have a tendency to adapt forms from French along these lines. In the study of phonetic development, this adaptive factor is allowed. Here the borrowed forms often show us the phonetic form at the time of borrowing and accordingly the approximate date of various sound-changes. Bloomfield explains that cultural loans show us what one
nation has taught another. Sapir (1921) adds that when there is cultural borrowing there is always the likelihood that the associated words may be borrowed too.

Sapir (1921) also looks at grammatical aspects where the borrowed form is subjected to the system of the borrowing language in terms of syntax, inflections and word-formation. He further explains that when many forms are borrowed from one language, the foreign forms may exhibit their own grammatical relations. If many loans have made their way from the same one language, the foreign structure may even attract native words by way of adaptation. The speakers who introduce foreign things may call them by the native name of some related object. If there is no closely equivalent native term, one may yet describe the foreign object in native words. Cultural loans may spread over a vast territory, from language to language, along with articles of commerce (Bloomfield, 1963). These words may undergo a certain process mentioned in section 2.1.3 on conditions for borrowing. To identify these borrowed items two approaches are discussed in the next section.

2.1.6 Identification of Borrowed Items
There are two approaches to the identification of borrowing and they are the Synchronic Approach and the Diachronic Approach.

2.1.6.1 The Synchronic Approach
Stene (1945) suggests a formal approach, which only takes the present state of the language into account. This formal approach is referred to as the “synchronic approach”. He looks into how “foreign” words are different from native ones by analysing “the orthography, phonology, musical accent, stress, flexion, word-formation,
and syntax” of the native language that do not follow closely to the ‘foreign’ words (Stene, 1945:5).

In this study, however, the borrowings were easy to detect, as they did not go through any change. This method was quite extensively used since the researcher was looking for non-English influence and it was quite possible to find many examples of direct borrowing which were different from the English model. For example, the word ‘gasing’ is easily identified as a borrowing since the English model ‘top’ is very clearly different.

According to Stene (1945) sometimes the integration of a loanword is so completely changed either because of orthographical changes that even the linguist has difficulty in detecting it. Such borrowings are only identified if one has some knowledge of the earlier stages of the language, as well as the languages that it came into contact during the process.

2.1.6.2 The Diachronic Approach

Another most effective approach in identifying borrowing is the diachronic approach. In order to identify possible borrowed items it compares the earlier and later stages in a language. The item is identified and then compared and analysed with languages the recipient language which it has come into contact. Semantic criteria are used to group all borrowed words.

Stene (1945) claims that there are times when it is difficult to detect borrowings and therefore a suitable approach has to be devised. Therefore, it has been found that this
approach helps in the identification of borrowings that have become completed assimilated with the borrowing language and difficult to perceive (Heah, 1989).

There are times we come across words, which are present in both languages, and it is not possible to know which way the borrowing has taken place. A Diachronic Approach would be practical even in this case.

Attempts to classify the corpus in the study under both formal and semantic criteria, however, seemed to be a very tedious task. As the formal criteria proved unsuitable, it was abandoned except for the unassimilated loanword category. It is more suitable for borrowings from the English language into Malay (Heah, 1989). Generally, all the words fall into the unassimilated loanword category and this is discussed in the dissertation to show the manner of borrowing in our English language newspapers. On the other hand, it was found that all words in the corpus could be classified under the semantic criteria. Hence, the total number of borrowings, 377.

2.1.7 Classification of Borrowed Items

According to Haugen (1950:163), the process of borrowing involves the reproduction of a word from the original pattern model into the borrowing language. As the process of borrowing has been defined as 'a process involving reproduction', there needs to be a comparison of the original word or pattern and the borrowed version has to be made. The borrowing may vary from a form known to the native speaker to one that has changed until it becomes so unrecognisable that it differs from the model.
Haugen (1950) has identified two distinct kinds of reproduction which are importation and substitution. Importation refers to the borrowings, which are close to the original whereas substitution describes the loan that has modified its 'constituent patterns' (Haugen, 1950:164) as well, since different parts of the pattern may be treated differently; namely none, partial or complete. Both importation and substitution can occur together. Attempts were made to classify the items using both formal and semantic criteria. However, the system using semantic criteria was found to be much more effective as it classifies the items according to the type of borrowing in each semantic domain. This is a much effective means of classification than using the formal criteria which poses many problems in deciding the number of categories to use and where, exactly, each item belongs. Therefore, the formal criteria (using Haugen's scheme of classification) were abandoned but the semantic criterion has been used as the means of classification of data in this study. The semantic criteria helped in categorising the semantic domains to which all loanwords fall and this gives a picture of as to why this phenomenon occurs. The sub-domains are most significant as it gives reasons and implications of borrowings and a better understanding of the loanwords and its context of use.

Haugen (1950) classifies the loans into three main divisions according to the relationship between morphemic and phonemic substitution that has occurred. These divisions will not be discussed except for Loanwords. However, it was found that all words fall into the unassimilated loanword category and the process of importation was used to borrow these words.
Loanwords as pointed out by Haugen (1950) occur through morphemic importation without substitution. Loanwords can be further classified according to the degree of phonemic substitution: none, partial or complete.

According to Haugen (1950), importation is the only process of borrowing where loanwords are taken directly into a language. These words do not go through any morphemic substitution when borrowed into the language. They can be recognised as borrowed words as their general morphemic shape are retained.

According to Haugen (1950), this form of classification is not adequate for classifying borrowings in the written form but is more appropriate for oral borrowings. As the phonology of the word needs to be taken into consideration for this kind of borrowing therefore, the criteria for classification has to be orthographical. The degree of assimilation of the borrowed word into the borrowing language has to be considered before it can be categorized. The formal category of classification by Heah (1989) is subdivided into nine categories, however, proved unsuitable as all the words fall only into the unassimilated loanword category. Moreover, this unassimilated loanword category is discussed to show that this maybe the beginning stage of borrowing into English in Malaysia.

Unassimilated loanwords are foreign words, which have been taken intact into the borrowing language and have not gone through any orthographical change. As Heah (1989) observes, some linguists such as Haugen (1953) and Trager (1972) do not consider unassimilated loan words applicable, because absolutely no change has taken place, syntactically, morphemically or phonologically. Heah argues that this is the case
since they mark "the initial stage" of the borrowing process before the words undergo the changes necessary to show assimilation into the borrowing language. In studies of 'borrowing as an ongoing process' (Heah, 1989:100) all the stages of borrowing are considered. Here, as Heah (1989) points out that it indicates the part played by the donor language in the contemporary use of English in the country. This category has great significance to the borrowings in English newspapers in Malaysia as all the words fall in this unassimilated loanword category. The other classification of loanwords was deemed unsuitable and unnecessary, as the borrowings in this study did not fall into any other category. Therefore, they are not discussed below.

2.1.8 Implications of Borrowing

Borrowing is a vital process in our social-cultural environment. Haugen (1950) claims that it is a process of "linguistic diffusion" which is an important factor in which linguistic resources grow and adapt themselves to accept the needs of a growing society. Borrowing acts as a vehicle to make social distinctions acceptable and seen. The effects of borrowing are felt in the following areas.

a. Language Contact/ Communication

Weinreich (1953) posits that when two or more languages come into contact there are bound to be words borrowed to facilitate communication. Thus, in this way the vocabulary of the borrowing language indirectly gets wider (Wong, 1992).

b. Cross-Cultural Borrowing

According to Stene (1945), many of the English words borrowed are words referring to the names of things, material objects or specific activities introduced from the English-speaking world and they mostly have a connection with material culture. He further
claims that these words are usually found among sport-words, food, drink, music, dancing, inventions and imported goods. This is similar to the borrowings found in Malaysia from other languages into English. For instance, ‘roti canai’, ‘naandri’ (thank you in Tamil) are widely used by other native speakers in Malaysia in their daily communication. In another familiar scenario, one raises one’s eyebrow when a Malay hawker asks her Indian customer if she would like to ‘ta pau’ (Chinese) her food.

c. The Media

Most foreign words, according to Stene (1945) make their way into the language through print. Therefore, newspapers, magazines, billboards, and brochures play a vital role in the diffusion and imparting of news and information to the public. The radio and television are as important and do so well in disseminating information. Without the incorporation of new terms and words in reporting of foreign news, places, people and situations will not be realistic, accurate and up-to-date. In introducing new inventions and concepts, these greatly help to lend a local flavour to the incidents reported (Wong, 1992).

d. Trade

For communication around the globe, which will enable its people to participate actively, linguistic borrowing is essential. Indirectly or directly, it aids the growth of the language (Wong, 1992).
e. Education

To enable students to have access to knowledge, to study and do research locally or abroad and to participate in seminars and conferences, borrowing is important. The borrowing of new lexical items or (elements) ideas in a language will open opportunities for the acquisition of knowledge. In advancement of science and technology, it is vital that a language keeps abreast with newly coined terminology.

f. Status of the language

Here language is not seen as the upper or lower (Bloomfield, 1965) prestige language, where borrowings occur from the dominant language. Generally, linguistic borrowing leads to language enrichment as the language expands in usage, purpose and bulk. In the process of borrowing, the language becomes a flexible, viable and durable tool of communication and its survival and expansion will attest to the resilience of its people (Wong, 1992).

Linguistic borrowing as Wong (1992:49) posits ‘is an inevitable phenomenon that has to be reckoned with, accepted and recognised as a universal asset and it points to the fact that it keeps language alive’.

The next section looks at studies carried out between languages in contact and special attention is given to English and other languages in contact.

2.2 Related Studies

Many studies have been carried out on borrowing between two or more languages. The additions or extensions to the lexicon of the borrowing language have been analysed
according to phonological, morphological, semantic and other adaptations. The following studies, which deal with these adaptations, provide interesting comparisons with the findings in this study.

2.2.1 Languages in Contact

As mentioned earlier two or more languages when used alternately by the same persons are said to be in contact (Weinreich, 1953). There are varied and crucial circumstances leading to languages being in contact. Languages have been brought into contact from the limited verbal exchanges that take place between barter traders and aboriginal natives to the eloquent modern businesspersons with their carefully worded contracts. Sapir (1921) posits that the conquests of nations, spread of religions, diffusion of sciences and the intermarriage of people of different cultures have brought into play the contact of languages and the incidence of linguistic borrowing.

Linguistic borrowing is extensive if we compare languages across the world. In earlier times, many Latin words have been borrowed into the English language. Examples are 'wine' and 'street'. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries when French influence was strongly felt in England, the English borrowed words like 'beef', 'veal' and 'pork' from the French. Social levels have also been affected by borrowings. Anderson (1973) claims that certain Latin words, which have been borrowed into the Spanish language, underwent some changes and has subsequently been adopted by the Spanish upper class. When immigrants sailed to America, they picked up some American words from sailors on board. These various European and Scandinavian immigrants adopted American terms to express new concepts and things upon arrival and settling down in the New World.
The above-mentioned instances of linguistic borrowing are by no means a comprehensive account. They are merely intended to give a picture of the extensiveness of borrowing and that borrowing is a worldwide phenomenon. English in contact with other languages in Malaysia is looked at in the next section.

2.2.2 English and Foreign Loanwords in Contact in Malaysia

Lowenberg (1986) in his paper "Sociocultural Context and Second-Language Acquisition: Acculturation and Creativity in ME" presents evidence for the differences in output of one such process namely lexical transfer, in the nativization of ME. Analysed within the sociocultural context of ME, data presented from English language newspapers and ESL textbooks demonstrate that transfer from Malay to standard ME does not result from "interference" leading to fossilization. It is a creative process reflecting a high degree of bilingual proficiency in Malay and English by which English is acculturated in a sociocultural context unique to Malaysia (for example; ethnicity, identity and status).

In another study, Lowenberg (in Cheshire, 1991) looks at variation in ME where he analyses lexical borrowings from Malay into English. This sociolinguistic perspective has helped improve our understanding of variation in contemporary ME. Lowenberg (1991) claims that these borrowed terms refer to institutions unique to Malay-speaking Southeast Asia. These are discussed below.

a. Denotatively no equivalent terms

Lowenberg (1986) stated that certain lexical items are transferred into English from other languages in Malaysia to fill lexical gaps because there are no pre-existing words.
in English. His study has also focussed on examples of lexical transfer at the level that most noticeably reflects the sociocultural context of Malaysia to which English is being acculturated. This study looks at these four domains to see if there are any equivalents in the English language:

i. Words related to Islam
ii. Malaysian Titles
iii. Malaysian Culture and Tradition
iv. Food and Drinks

b. Lexical Shifts and Banner words

The impact on English of the ascending status of Bahasa Melayu is more evident in 'lexical shifts' (Richards, 1979:14), where Malay words replace English words or phrases which are denotatively, but not connotatively, equivalent. The most striking of these lexical shifts are what Paine (1981:14) has called 'banner words': 'single words or phrase that are likely to induce a proposition by inference.' Examples of such words in Malaysian English are Malaysia Boleh, Jalur Gemilang and others, which trigger in most Malaysians a complex set of values and associations that call for determination and identity for a progressive Malaysia.

c. Extension of Semantic Range

Previous and current research has also been investigating the acculturative functions of transferred features from Malay to English at other levels including phonology, morphosyntax, semantics, pragmatics and discourse. Two linguistic processes that the native-speaking Malaysian has extended are shifting the semantic range of particular English words and creating new lexical compounds. For example, compound, single storey bungalow, outstation and others.
Paine (1981) concluded that nativization in ME and other non-native varieties is a
dynamic, innovative and acculturative process, which is continually expressed through
English in the diverse cultures and societies in which it is used. It demands the attention
of linguists and educators involved in the development of English into a true world
language.

Lowenberg (1992) stated that standard English is operationally defined as the linguistic
forms of that variety that are normally used in formal speaking and writing by speakers
who have received the highest level of education available in that variety. However, at
the level of standard ME, transfer from other languages has been primarily lexical.
Borrowing of Malay words can be used to foreground or to neutralize particular
identities, statuses and privileges. In colloquial English, most speakers make use of
code mixing and code switching. In the more colloquial sub-varieties of ME, transfer
from other languages expands from lexical borrowing to extensive code alternations,
and the pragmatic function of transfer becomes more affective and interpersonal.

2.2.3 Features of Malaysian English

Wong (1981) is of the opinion that in ME vocabulary is characterised by a large number
of words, which may be borrowings from the multilingual, multicultural environment or
coinages. Venugopal (1994) claims that this is because the trend of English in Malaysia
is only the transfer of lexical items and these usually reflect the use of Malay words.

In another study, Tan (1998) looks at Malay loanwords across different dialects of
English. Baskaran (1987) on the other hand, has looked at indigenisation features
where the Substrate Language Referents play a vital role in semantic relationships. She
posits that the various characteristics that warrant the use of local terms can be considered from the following points:

i. Institutionalised concepts
   Some of the local words that have been borrowed into ME really have no equivalent in Standard English.

ii. Emotional and cultural loading
    Some of the borrowings are culturally and emotionally loaded.

iii. Semantic restriction
     These are local words with possible English translation but used in a semantically restricted field.

iv. Cultural/culinary terms
    These are native (local) culinary and domestic referents specifically akin to a characteristic of local origin and ecology.

v. Hyponymous collocations
    The presence of local words collocated with the English superordinate term is yet another type of lexical indigenisation.

vi. Campus/student coinages
    These are few words that have recently come into currency – being transported from Bahasa Malaysia due to the change in medium of instruction in education and the subsequent strong influence of this language.

This phenomenon of borrowing from local languages into English also occurs in foreign countries, for instance, in Ghana (Dako, 2002). Now we turn to English and Ghanaianism in Contact to look at what Dako (2002) has found in her study.

2.2.4 English and Ghanaianism in Contact

Dako (2002) observed the English used by Ghanaians who have had at least some formal education and are able to use English in some registers. She collected data over ten years and in her paper looks at some of the prevailing problems in attempting to define the transference phenomena widely identified as code-switching on the one hand and lexical borrowing on the other. She then deals with how Ghanaians deal with the phenomenon of borrowing into English at the text level.
Her study has similarities to this study about lexical borrowing of foreign elements, specifically the local languages into English. She wonders how one determines if any local item used in spoken or written English is code-switched or is a lexical borrowing. Dako (2002) argues here that Ghanaians are fully aware and in a dilemma as to how to deal with the local 'foreign' element on the page when they are writing English, even if the item is deeply integrated in daily discourse. She posits that, 'as bilinguals, they seek to maintain the morphological integrity of both the host or matrix language on the one hand and the transferred elements or embedded language on the other' (54). In her study, she discovers that it is hard to know whether the 'Ghanaian writer makes a distinction between code-switching and lexical borrowing, or is particularly aware of or interested in such subtleties' (54). She points out that the 'West African examination council discourages the use of non-English items on the page unless the item is underlined or put in inverted commas and often accompanied by an explanation' (54).

The question of whether borrowings be discussed or not is another issue as such items exist in considerable numbers. She feels that they could at least be authoritatively listed, defined and exemplified so that they may later be recognised and adequately dealt with in the school system. Dako (2002:54) states 'after all, such everyday Ghanaianisms exist, and they will not go away, however much we might wish to eat rice and beans rather than waakye'. This aspect fits the Malaysian scenario and this is something we have to give thought to, as we need to relate to our culture and social stance when we speak English. It is our English to express our feelings and experience as put forth by Achebe (1965). This trend is also evident in the Hebrew language, which we deliberate on in the next section.
2.2.5 English and Hebrew in Contact

Borrowing of Foreign Words in Hebrew Newspapers is a study carried out by Ronen, Seckbach and Cooper (1975 in Fishman, Cooper and Conrad, 1977). The study examines the influence of communication media especially from English sources and the extent to which this influence actually is integrated into everyday life. This study aimed at determining

1. The frequency of foreign terms in two newspapers
2. Their domain, and
3. Whether Hebrew equivalents are available.

It was found that the domain with the foreign words was politics. The importance of English as an international vehicle of scientific and technical discourse may account for the presence of the other domains represented by the fifteen most commonly found loanwords in 1950 and 1974: science, economics, and the military. In the study they found that, a substantial proportion of the loanwords they observed had Hebrew equivalents. They tried to explain this phenomenon of borrowing by citing the writers who have not comfortably adopted newer Hebrew words as a possible reason. If viewed in Hockett’s (1958) perspective it may even be linked with prestige motive associated with knowledge of English and other foreign languages; it is often directly associated with education and socio-economic status. However, Ronen et. al. do not place negative value on the high percentage for foreign terms, as it is only a descriptive approach. They claim it could also be instrumental in nature, where one would find satisfaction that modern Hebrew is being partially Europeanised. Thus, guaranteeing no parochial development at a time when European languages are clearly associated with major political and economic trends all over the world, and when Israelis are seeking to
participate in these trends as actively as possible (Ronen et. al., 1975 in Fishman et. al., 1977). Hence, lexical expansion is an inevitable process, which takes place when languages come into contact. The next topic for discussion is the lexical expansion of the Malay language through English.

2.2.6 Lexical Expansion through English in the Malay Language

Heah (1989) examines the whole range of the resultant lexical expansion of Bahasa Malaysia, which she divides broadly into importation, substitution and native creation (Haugen, 1950), based on the nature of the borrowing process. She investigates how lexical expansion through English, whether planned or spontaneous, is related to terminology development in Bahasa Malaysia. At different stages of her study Heah has dealt with how the phenomenon of lexical expansion can affect the overall structure of Bahasa Malaysia. Heah (1989) claims that there are three phases in the terminology development of Bahasa Malaysia. The first phase was characterised by conservatism and concern for language purity. The second was marked by the awareness that the outright rejection of borrowing resulted in native terms that obscured the actual meaning of the terms borrowed. The third stage saw the standardisation of terminology development, which set the grounds for adaptation, and adoption of foreign lexical terms. Research related to the subject area in recent years include Tan Joo Seng’s work which investigates features of phonological adaptation of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia (Tan Joo Seng, 1991); Aishah Mahdi’s study on the semantic integration of pure loanwords in English into Bahasa Malaysia (Aishah Mahdi, 1991); Nicole Wong’s analysis of English loanwords in selected Malay short stories (Wong, 1992). All of these studies focus on the nature and circumstances of loanword use either in specific
linguistic areas for example, semantics and phonology or specific genres such as in short stories. Now, we turn to the Malay and Tamil languages in contact.

2.2.7 Malay and Tamil in Contact

In her study, Thilagawathi Kanagaretnam (1971) has attempted to portray the linguistic nature of Malay loanwords in Tamil. She looks at language contact whereby it has been found that Malay words have gained entrance into the speech and writing of the Tamil speakers. The study is concerned only with those Malay words and phrases which are integrated into strings of Tamil utterances. From her analysis of the lexical aspect of language contact, the Tamil language seems to have given a greater impact on the ML.

2.2.8 Lexical Borrowings in English Newspapers in Malaysia

a. Malaysian English 1987

Lee (1987) discussed some lexical items that are used in newspapers. He identified, categorised and analysed some lexical items and syntactic features in selected columns of the Malay Mail with a view to describe some features of ME. He divided the lexical items into three categories:

1) Borrowed words

2) Words related to standard British English but which are used differently

3) Lexical innovations

Borrowed words were used either for the sake of economy to refer to things for which there is no general English word. For example, the words that he found were ‘dhoby’, ‘kung-fu’, ‘tallang’, ‘saree’, ‘pasar malam’, and ‘satay’. In words related to SBE, their
usage in ME differs from SBE usage and some words seem to have acquired extensions of meaning. For instance, the word 'compound'. In SBE, the word 'compound' means an enclosure contained within a group of buildings-residences or factories. In ME, any land outside the house that is fenced in is called compound, whatever its size. For lexical innovations, the meaning of the words may be clear if one is to work on the basis of knowledge of component parts but as collocation they are “local” and part of ME. An example cited was fishball which is a food item. It is a direct translation from the Chinese expression and does not exist in SBE. The most interesting feature about the lexical items is probably not the use of local words for local things, but the use of the latter two categories- English words used with meanings somewhat different from SBE and news expressions created in response to the local environment. Generally, the examples of usage listed and discussed appear to illustrate and confirm the literature on ME. In this study, the researcher only looks at borrowed words. In the following section, contemporary studies on ME are discussed. Now, fourteen years later, how is Malaysian English viewed?

b. Malaysian English 2001

Andrew Preshous (2001) studies the features, which make ME a distinctive variety of English. Firstly, he discusses its origins and development before briefly writing on different types of ME. He looks at the linguistic characteristics and analyses them with a particular emphasis on lexical features. Finally, the status of ME is assessed in relation to its possible position and role in future.

He finds that 'English still maintains a strong presence in certain domains of Malaysian society. The educated elite have retained a firm foothold in the media and to some
extent dictate the standard version of ME’ (52). There is rising concern about the proficiency and use of English especially amongst the older, English-educated generation ‘the traditional prestige attached to English still exists’ (Crystal, 1995 in Preshous 2001). This concern has gone nationwide with major debates occurring in the Malaysian press (Lowenberg, 1982). Headlines such as the following have appeared ‘Decline and fall of the English language’ (New Straits Times, 5 Nov. 1985 in Preshous 2001). He also states in his findings that the use of Bahasa Malaysia has increased significantly in the rural and as well as urban areas. Therefore, he foresees that the use of English might decline because of this new finding. Asmah (1979:65 in Preshous, 2001:52) also stated that ‘Malaysians might one day use the national language as the main form of communication, as the people of Indonesia or Thailand do’. However, today the language scenario has changed a little since the time of her study. If there was to be only one medium school or if everyone has to learn each subject in Bahasa Malaysia, then it may occur. Moreover, this is not the norm in the Malaysian education system. Recently the call to teach science and mathematics in English has definitely paved a way for English to gain a stronger foothold as a language of communication. In line with this move, it is hoped that our future generation will not lack in the latest scientific and technological knowledge hence English will not die out and become a foreign language altogether as observed by Platt, Weber & Ho (1984) and Crystal (1997). English language is here to stay for the betterment of the people of Malaysia (Pennycook, 1994 in Preshous, 2001) so we should not have doubts whether ‘Islamization’ of Malaysia may cause further linguistic tension. Malaysians overall have rationalised and accepted that for a better Malaysia, the English language is the key to new knowledge. Accordingly, this is seen in the embracement of Multimedia.
Super Corridor, which is a step towards a developed nation status. Subsequently, making ME intelligible around the globe will be fulfilling objectives of Vision 2020.

Language is constantly changing in terms of ‘the adaptation of the norms of English to the political, economical and sociocultural contexts of contemporary Malaysia’ (Lowenberg, 1991:367 in Preshous, 2001). However, today English has proved to be a world language and is rightfully accepted as so in all these contexts mentioned above by Lowenberg. He further states that ‘the English language of the older generation is likely to attain a more elitist position unlike the more colloquial variety of ME, which is rapidly becoming more dominant among the speakers of the English language’ (53). Hopefully this move to have science and mathematics in English will enable this younger generation Malaysians to master the language better now with an instrumental need if not an integrative one (Gardener and Lambert, 1959, 1972 in Skehan, 1991). According to Preshous (2001), the educated Malay younger generation is influencing this change as they draw on their bilingual and multilingual resources to communicate. The future of English looks brighter in the Malaysian language scene with more subjects in English. Preshous posits further that for many young people ME is highly valued as an expression of cultural identity. He points out that, ‘in fact, it is not hard to detect a certain pride in this informal variety’ (53). In the near future hopefully this informal variety will be closer to the acrolectal (Baskaran, 1987) variety. It may than be considered to be accorded official status as a recognised variety like Indian English, Nigerian English and others, once it is codified.
2.3 Conclusion

There is definite resurgence in interest in the English language in Malaysia. More Malaysians have become appreciative of the value of being at least bilingual in the Malay and English language. However, many Malaysians feel the need to identify with ME and appreciate that it is a distinct non-native variety, which is equal in standing with other varieties of the English language.

Political and economic forces have largely determined the development of ME. Its evolution from a foreign language into a second language was the result of government policies, first on the part of the colonial powers and later the Malaysian government. It was the Malaysian government's language policies which were responsible for the restriction of its use, but now it has given ME new scope for development by allowing it to be used in domains where it was once forbidden (Pennycook, 1994). The presence of the English language in the education system and its use in the media especially in the newspapers should ensure its continued development.