

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ РОМАНО-ГЕРМАНСЬКИХ  
МОВ У ПОЛЛІНГВАЛЬНОМУ  
ПРОСТОРИ**

УДК 81'276(4)

**О.М. Byndas**

**LANGUAGES MIXTURE PROBLEM WITHIN EUROPEAN  
COUNTRIES**

**Introduction.** According to modern ideas, to master the language means not only knowledge of the lexical and grammatical constructions of this language, but also the ability to apply it in various social and cultural contexts. In such a complex linguistic situation, one of the important tasks in the language teaching is the formation of sociolinguistic orientation among students, that is, the understanding that a modern language is a heterogeneous system in which numerous variants and forms coexist. People can estimate that the disappearance of languages is the dominant trend, interesting new dialects have been emerging in cities worldwide, and especially the children of immigrants are driving the trend. One of the surprising consequences of the current wave of mass migration within European countries is, in fact, the development of new ways of speaking in the nearest future.

**Theoretical Framework.** In connection with the integration processes in Europe, the research is conducted in various directions: the development of quantitative sociolinguistics owes a lot to research on English by W. Labov. Numerous publications in English Speech, Language in Society, and Language Variation and Change reflect this. There are also several surveys of creolistics. J. Holm, R. Arends, P. Mühlhäusler, T. Crowley, D. Crystal, P. Patrick, H. Schuchart, V. Vicente, A. Knapik, N. Vakhtin, K. Kuznetsova and O. Selivanova are just some of the references, which vary both in adequacy and in geographical areas of focus.

**The aim** of the proposed paper is to analyze the contemporary speaking continuum and characterize typical language differences between the most prestigious variants of modern English and languages mixture in general within European countries.

**Discussion (Results).** Linguistics often identifies the concepts of variant and form of the language. In our analysis we start from the following definitions for these terms.

In English, as in other modern Indo-European languages, all forms existing in its system are divided into standard and non-standard.

*The standard form* is a literary language that is studied in educational establishments, used by the state media and is used in a formal setting by the educated part of the population.

*Non-standard forms* of the language are realized in regional and social dialects. Regional dialects are typical for the speech of the poorly educated part of the rural population. Social dialects are forms of the language that are used in an informal setting by representatives of different social groups of the urban population.

Worldwide transplantation of the English language has led to the formation of its numerous regional variants, each of which is characterized by the presence of specific linguistic phenomena.

In relation to the source of transplantation (English, formed in England) regional variants of the English language are divided into two groups [Kashru 1992: 36]. The first group includes the so-called “old” variants (old Englishes), which include: Australian English; American English; British English; Irish English; Canadian English; New Zealand English and new Englishes.

The relationship between traditional dialectology and sociolinguistics differs in terms of the social role. Regional language variation provides a definition for people’s localization in the English-speaking world, whereas the social language variation provides information about “who you are” in the eyes of the English-speaking world [Crystal 2005: 364].

J. Chambers [2004: 7] says that while speaking we are not only showing some personal qualities but also a whole configuration of characteristics from the place in the society we are inserted in. This is an unconscious process, and it occurs in the same way we dress and act. He considers our speech as much emblematic as our daily appearance. Certain aspects of social variation, such as age, sex, education, socio-economic class and migration bring some particular linguistic consequence. Sociolinguistics is considered to be divided in two sub-areas: macro- and micro-sociolinguistics.

Macro-sociolinguistics starts from the society and deals with the language as a central factor in the organization of communities, whereas micro-sociolinguistics begins with the language and considers the influence of social factors in the structure of languages. This linguist sub-field is closely connected with the social sciences, such as Sociology, Anthropology, Social Psychology, and Education. And it enlarges, among other questions, studies of multilingualism, social dialects, conversational interaction, attitudes to language, language variation, and language contact [Vicente 2007: 4].

Thus, contact is an important concept in sociolinguistics. Actually, languages do not get in contact; it is always the speakers of different languages who get in it. And it is their attitude toward each other that will affect the way they speak. Language contact occurs when speakers of different languages interact and their languages gradually accumulate internal differences, resulting in language change. According to Vicente, despite the increasing interest of anthropologists in contact problems, studies of language contact and culture contact have not walked together and the relation between the two fields has not been properly defined.

Scientists' reflections on the analysis of language contact are prerequisites for sociolinguistic investigations of the correlation of linguistic characteristics with extra linguistic factors which lead to linguistic interference. Some forms of interference of one language in another considered by Sociolinguistics are *borrowing of vocabulary, borrowing of other language features, language shift, substrate influence and crystallization of new languages*.

According to K. Kuzmina's definition [2011: 411], a mixed language is a language that "arose as a result of the non-genetic development of the two languages, and it arose not as an intermediary language necessary for communication but as a means of group self-identification for intra-group communication". Scientists note that "from the very beginning the members of the group are bilinguals who speak both languages", but itself a mixed language was formed on the basis of the vocabulary of one "source language" and on the basis of grammar of another "source language".

In scientific literature, a mixed language is distinguished from pidgins on the basis that the latter arise / arose with the existence of a language barrier between, for example, the European civilizations and, accordingly, to overcome the language barrier (mostly for commercial transactions), and not for isolation, "self-identification" of a certain group, which at a certain stage of its social development for facilitating communication between its members, decided to move away from the simultaneous use of two separate languages and to create a new language on their basis (examples are the Medonian language and mychief). In the electronic dictionaries the category of mixed languages is also the Ukrainian-Russian surzhyk and Belarusian-Russian triasanka indicating that the latter is a part of the dialect continuum (Mixed language, Surzhyk). But on the assumption of the author of the article surzhyk is a narrower notion, because most likely it relates to closely related languages, whereas a mixed language is formed regardless of the level of language affinity (as in the case of the Medonian language, which is a mixture of the Aleutian and Russian languages, and which appeared for servicing a new ethnic group – creoles, formed from the marriage of Russian industrialists with Aleutians [Vakhtin 2004: 153]). Therefore, as the author suggests further, conditions for the occurrence of a surzhyr are much simpler, to be more exact, passive bilingualism is in the case of its occurrence, that is, when the members of the group do not speak obligatory involved in the language, but only understand each other, and, taking into account the relation of their own languages, they make little effort to do this and make it subconsciously.

Moreover, the representatives of the surzhyk, according to the author's observations, do not distinguish themselves into a separate group, but they attribute themselves to the Ukrainian-speaking population (there is such data), distinguishing those, who speak a pure Russian language. One can explain the self-identification of the surzhyk representatives in the way the surzhyk is mostly spoken by ordinary people who do not have higher education and neglect the difference between the literary Ukrainian language and its

Ukrainian-Russian dialect. The formation of surzhyk instead of pure Ukrainian can be explained by poor philological education of the Ukrainian population, and the easiness and speed, with which it appeared, by the close kinship of languages that functioned in a limited area with a common history. As indicated in the electronic encyclopedia, a surzhyk is not sufficiently investigated phenomenon. Further, it also states that a surzhyk can be called a mixed language, which, the author agrees with it, was formed through the combination of the Russian vocabulary and the Ukrainian grammar and pronunciation [surzhyk]. The latter, probably, just explains why representatives of the surzhyk think that they speak Ukrainian.

The told above also leads us to believe that multilingualism or languages mixture is a natural phenomenon for a person. Moreover, the very opportunity of storing in the human brain simultaneously various communication tools that belong to different language systems, and the person's subconscious propensity to operate with all the means at the same time (for instance, two communicants who are fluent in English, but at some point they speak Ukrainian, can insert English words in their own dialogue from time to time) is another proof of the existence of the original language (old one), containing elements of all modern languages [Kuzmina 2011: 412].

Thus, in our point of view, a mixed language is any combination of communication means that belong to different language systems and, if available, are formed and stored in the human brain.

According to Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, between 11% and 22% of the population of Ukraine consort with surzhik (in Western Ukraine it is 11.6%, in the regions of the Left Bank of Ukraine – 22%, in the southern regions it is 14.5%) [Selivanova 2010: 658].

While considering other European languages and countries, let's consider Germany, which has as many as 1.5 million asylum applications from Syria and which also has a large and well-established population of Turkish immigrants. If an adult immigrates to Germany, chances are that his or her German will always be imperfect. A language that, like German, forces you to remember that forks are feminine, spoons are masculine, and knives are neuter seems designed to resist anyone speaking it well if they learn it after adolescence. On the other hand, that immigrant's children, growing up amid native German-speakers, will likely be able to speak perfect German [Mcwhorter 2015].

In Mcwhorter's opinion, in Germany a young person whose parents are Arabic- or Turkish-speaking immigrants will also speak a kind of German that sounds peculiar coming from someone who grew up speaking the language. In Standard German, "Tomorrow I'm going to the movies" is *Morgen gehe ich ins Kino*—"tomorrow go I in the movies." However, inner-city immigrants' kids will often say among themselves *Morgen ich geh Kino*—"tomorrow I go movies"—almost as if they were English-speakers, quietly ironing out that kink in Standard German that forces you to say "tomorrow go I" instead of "tomorrow I go," and just saying "movies" instead of "to the movies." The

result is something called *Kiezdeutsch*, which is the same whether the speaker's parents communicate in Turkish, Arabic, Somali, or another language—the new dialect has gelled into something of its own.

Especially considering that *Kiezdeutsch* also allows you to omit the verb “to be” at times and includes a lively slang, it's reminiscent of America's own English. The two dialects emerged in similar ways. After all, speech can communicate identity as well as ideas: How people talk reflects how they perceive themselves within a society.

*Kiezdeutsch* is the same response among a relatively new community in Germany today. *Kiezdeutsch* is not a mixture of Arabic and Turkish and German in terms of how you put a sentence together. “I go movies” has nothing to do with how Arabic or Turkish work. Rather, people who are perfectly capable of speaking Standard German use a different kind among themselves that shaves off some unnecessary complexities in the way that their parents' version of German does. Languages are, as a rule, much more elaborate than they need to be, so the streamlining doesn't deprive the speaker of expressive power. At the same time, speakers of many languages worldwide, including Ukrainian, get along just fine without regularly using a word expressing the concept of being. The equivalent of “she my sister” would be good Ukrainian.

The dialects like *Kiezdeutsch* are not a product of conditions specific to Germany. Analogous varieties have emerged in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Holland. Specialists call these new variants of old languages in Europe “multiethnolects,” but the concept applies equally well outside of Europe. The development of multiethnolects is almost predictable in cities with large immigrant populations. Multiethnolects are not pidgin or creole languages, in which people take vocabulary from a colonial language, and grammar from their native languages, and fashion first a makeshift lingo to get by (a pidgin) and then expand that into a new language entirely (a creole). Here, the gulf between the original and the new is broader than in the multiethnolects. Haitian Creole, for example, has none of French's arbitrary gender marking, lists of verb conjugational endings and their irregularities, or nettlesome features like the “y” and “en” adverbial pronouns that torture learners worldwide, and its grammar owes a great deal to Africa. A French-speaker would have to learn Haitian as a separate language entirely. One would need no Rosetta Stone to master a multiethnolect version of one's own language. Still, multiethnolects are the most fertile source of linguistic innovation in our times. Plausibly, in 50 years there will be gray-haired Europeans of immigrant ancestry using multiethnolect varieties as their casual speech.

More to the point, the heavy immigration that countries like Italy are experiencing will almost certainly birth new kinds of Italian that are rich with slang, somewhat less elaborate than the standard, and, like *Kiezdeutsch*, and other multiethnolects, widely considered signs of linguistic deterioration, heralding a future where the “original” standard language no longer exists. As

more countries in Europe take in large numbers of immigrants, we can expect new dialects, pidgins, creoles and languages mixture.

But P. Patrick [2004] says that *pidgin* does not mean contact between two languages – or it would result in bilingualism and borrowing – but the contact between three or more languages linguistically different from each other, in a situation of extreme necessity of communication between the speakers, resulting in a rapid language change.

T. Crowley [2008: 75] writes of the term pidgin as being “fraught” and states that “Languages designated as pidgins range from extremely rudimentary short-term contact languages used only in a very narrow range of contexts to structurally and lexically far more expanded varieties which have been in use over an extended period and for a much broader range of functions, even though in each case there may be a shared lack of native speakers”.

Pidgins and creoles are important not only for a common historical origin, but for shared circumstances of socio-historical development and use. In addition, they present many challenges to the model of variation. Coming from different processes and influences at the moment of language contact, speakers of different languages have to find a way of communication by “creating” a new language. This language variation is a result of different sources such as mixing, first and second language acquisition, and universals [Crowley 2008: 76].

More than that, the neogrammarians were a group of Indo-European linguists working at the University of Leipzig (Leipzig School) during the last decades of the nineteenth century, who were credited with claiming about the nature of language change. They considered certain universal aspects of language itself to rule the language development, and attributed to the phonetic evolution some psychological and physiologic mechanic action, which is out of human control. The neogrammarians claimed that, in the phonological level, language change is ruled by the principle of regularity of sound change, for what they state that the direction in which a sound changes is the same for all members of the speech community. It means, according to them that “sound change is conditioned only by phonetic environments and not by grammatical or semantic factors” [Labov 1981: 268].

Opposing to the *family-tree* model of language adopted by neogrammarians, H. Schuchardt [1980: 51] could find evidences that some *creoles* have changed their affiliation (e.g. from Portuguese to Dutch), and others are so mixed as to defy classification. For this reason, he is considered as a leader of the opposition to the Leipzig school of neogrammarians. H. Schuchardt associated the language mixture (*mischsprache*) to *pidgincreoles*; however it was misunderstood as a rough mixture with no real structure of its own. Actually, what he and other linguists who followed him (e.g. Weinreich) tried to say is that every language we know is impure. We cannot only think about language mixture as a European superstrate vocabulary combined with an African substrate grammar. We can consider that there are three

possibilities for language mixture. Firstly, there is the possibility for a language to have as much grammar as vocabulary influenced by more than one language. In the English language, for example, there is a huge amount of French vocabulary and a grammar that is different from Germanic languages. Secondly, it is possible for a language to show only its grammar as influenced by another language.

It is important at this point to make a clear distinction between pidgins and mixed languages. Pidgins are sometimes called *mixed languages*, but there is a clear-cut distinction between these two. A. Knapic [2009: 4] enumerates three characteristic features of mixed languages: 1) they are the result of contact between two languages; 2) have native speakers of their own; 3) are grammatically as complex as their source languages.

Pidgins are the result of three or more language contacts, and their grammar is said to be of simplified structure, whereas grammatical structures of mixed languages are as complex as the two languages from which the new variety emerged. Having the above in mind, A. Knapic can observe that “we therefore must not think of a pidgin representing a simple bilateral fusion; it is, rather, a development of a single language (usually European language, in modern times) with strong influences from one or more others, sometimes a great many, and usually non-European”.

**Conclusions.** At this stage of development, English and other languages are a multi-level linguistic-sociocultural system, the components of which are various national, regional and social variations and forms. Within European countries language contact occurs when speakers of different languages interact and their languages gradually accumulate internal differences, resulting in language change. Some situations of language contact have resulted in a new language, while others have not. In the contact between groups that are ethnically and linguistically different from each other, with an urgency of communication, we can face a situation where a new *emergency language* arises. In this context we have the *pidgin, surzhyk or Kiezdeutsch* language formation. When the usage of these *pidgins, surzhyk or Kiezdeutsch* becomes systematic within a multicultural community, and the children begin to use it as a mother tongue, then we have *creole* languages.

Despite the numerous inconsistencies in phonological, spelling, grammatical and lexical-semantic levels in the varieties of languages, the nature of these inconsistencies does not affect the system of any language as a whole, which makes it possible to consider dialects and varieties of the language as language variants, and not two different languages.

### **References**

- Chambers, J.** et al. (2004). *The handbook of language variation and change*. USA: Blakwell publishers; 3-16;
- Crowley, T.** (2008). “Pidgin and Creole Morphology”. [In:] Silvia Kouwenberg, John Victor Singler (eds.) *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies*. Malden, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell; 74-98;

- Crystal, D.** (2005). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 364;
- Kashru, B.** (1992). *Models for Non-native Englishes*. In B. Kashru (Ed.) *The Other Tongue: English across cultures*; Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press; 36;
- Knapic, A.** (2009). *On the Origins of Pidgin and Creole Languages: An Outline*. Wrocław, Poland; STYLES OF COMMUNICATION; No. 1; 1-12;
- Labov, W.** (1981). *The Study of Language in its Social Context* // Fishman J. A. *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 1; The Hague: Mouton; 153;
- Mcwhorter, J.** (2015). *How Immigration Changes Language*. Retrieved in March 2018 from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/.../2015/.../language-immigrants>;
- Patrick, P.** (2006). *Pidgin and creole languages: origins and relationships*. Retrieved in March 2018 from: <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~patrick/Courses/PCs/IntroPidginsCreoles.htm>;
- Schuchard, H.** (1980). *Pidgin and creole languages*. Glenn G. Gilbert ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 51;
- Vicente, V.** (2007). *English-based pidgins and creoles: from social to cognitive hypotheses of acquisition*. *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem – ReVEL*. Vol. 5, n. 9; 34;
- Вахтин, Н., & Головко, Е.** (2004). *Социолінгвістика и соціологія язика: учебное пособие*. СПб.: Издательский центр “Гуманитарная академия”; 388 [Vakhtin, N., & Golovko, Ye. (2004). *Sociolinguistics and Language Sociology: textbook*. SPb: Publishing Center “Humanitarian Academy”; 388];
- Кузьміна, К.** (2011). *Деякі роздуми стосовно явища змішаної мови*. *Studia Linguistica*. Випуск 5; 409-414 [Kuzmina, K. (2011). *Some Thoughts according to Phenomenon of a Mixed Language*. *Studia Linguistica*. Issue 5; 409-414];
- Селіванова, О.** (2010). *Лінгвістична енциклопедія* // О. О. Селіванова. Полтава : Довкілля-К; 844 [Selivanova, O. (2010). *Linguistic Encyclopedia* // О. О. Selivanova. Poltava: Dovkilla-K; 844].

#### **Биндас О. М. Проблема міксації мов у європейських країнах.**

Автор висвітлює зовнішні соціальні чинники, що мають величезний вплив на розвиток мови; зазначає, що існує певна природна здатність, спільна для всіх людей, пов'язаних з вивченням мови та її розвитком. Особливий випадок, який показує взаємозв'язок між цими двома аспектами, – це вивчення суржиків, кіцдойчів, піджинів та креолів. У статті об'єднуються такі поняття, як змішані мови, суржик, кіцдойч, піджини, креольські мови під спільною назвою “змішана мова”. За нашим визначенням, змішана мова – це “суміш” будь-яких засобів комунікації, які належать до різних мовних систем і які за наявності відповідного багатомовного середовища формуються в мозку людини, причому сам факт їх природної наявності у мозку є більш важливим, ніж факт їх використання в реальному спілкуванні. У даній роботі розглядаються джерела суржиків, кіцдойчів, піджинів та креолів, а також досліджуються деякі причини їх



невикористання у формальній освіті. У статті йдеться про те, як спікери суржиків, кіцдойчів, піджинів та креолів частіше набувають грамотності в стандартних європейських мовах європейських країн. Автор робить висновок, що природа деяких невідповідностей не впливає на систему будь-якої мови в цілому, що дає змогу розглядати діалекти та різновиди мови як варіанти мови, а не дві різні мови.

*Ключові слова:* змішана мова, суржик, кіцдойч, піджин, креол.

#### **Биндас Е. Н. Проблема смешания языков в европейских странах.**

Автор выделяет внешние социальные факторы, которые оказывают огромное влияние на развитие языка; указывает, что есть некоторые врожденные возможности, общие для всех людей, связанные с приобретением и развитием языка. Частный случай, который показывает взаимосвязь между этими двумя аспектами, – изучение суржиков, кицдойчей, пиджинов и креолов. В статье объединяются такие понятия, как смешанные языки, суржик, кицдойч, пиджины, креольские языки под общим названием “смешанный язык”, который рассматривается нами с психолингвистической точки зрения. Согласно нашему определению, смешанный язык – это “смесь” любых средств общения, принадлежащих различным языковым системам, которые при наличии соответствующей многоязыковой среды формируются в мозгу человека, причем сам факт их естественного наличия в мозгу является более важным, нежели факт их использования в реальном общении. В этой работе рассматриваются истоки суржиков, кицдойчей, пиджинов и креолов, а также исследуются некоторые причины их отсутствия в формальном образовании. В статье обсуждается вопрос о том, как ораторы суржиков, кицдойчей, пиджинов и креолов чаще приобретают грамотность на стандартных европейских языках в европейских странах. Автор приходит к выводу, что характер некоторых несоответствий не влияет на систему любого языка в целом, что позволяет рассматривать диалекты и разновидности языка как языковые варианты, а не два разных языка.

*Ключевые слова:* смешанный язык, суржик, кицдойч, пиджин, креол.

#### **Byndas O. M. Languages Mixture Problem within European Countries.**

The author highlights external social factors that have huge influence in language development and that there is some innate capability common to all human beings related to language acquisition and development. A particular case which shows the relationship between these two aspects is the study of surzhyk, Kiezdeutsch, pidgins and creoles. The article's content combines such notions as mixed languages, pidgins, creole languages, surzhyk, Kiezdeutsch under one common name of a mixed language which is studied from a psycholinguistic point of view. According to the author's approaches a mixed language is a mixture of different means of communication belonging to different language systems which form in the brain of a human being due to relevant multilanguage environment. Moreover, the very fact of their natural existence in the brain is more important than that of their mere usage in the real communication. This paper looks at the origins of surzhyk, Kiezdeutsch, pidgins and creoles and explores some of the reasons for their lack of use in formal education. It goes on to discuss how speakers of surzhyk, Kiezdeutsch, pidgins and creoles more commonly acquire literacy in the

standard European languages within European countries. The author concludes that the nature of some inconsistencies does not affect the system of any language as a whole, which makes it possible to consider dialects and varieties of the language as language variants, and not two different languages.

*Key words:* mixed language, surzhyk, Kiezddeutsch, pidgin, creole.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 21.03.2018 р.

Стаття прийнята до друку 23.03.2018 р.

Рецензент – к.філол.н., доц. Савельєва Н.О.

УДК [811.133.1+811.135.1]<sup>3</sup>73.7

**Д.А Князєва**

### **СПОЛУЧНИКОВІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНІ ОДИНИЦІ У ФРАНЦУЗЬКІЙ ТА РУМУНСЬКІЙ МОВАХ**

Французька та румунська мови, будучи належними до романської групи, мають багато спільного в силі своєї генетичності. Але слід підкреслити, що румунська мова, відрізняється від французької мови тим, що вона вагомо зазнала слов'янського впливу. Свого часу деякі дослідники (С. Пушкаріу, Ф. Міклошич та ін.) намагалися піддати сумніву романський характер румунської мови у зв'язку з численними слов'янськими запозиченнями. Вони підкреслювали її мішаний характер. Однак “належність румунської мови до групи романських є безперечною й неспростовною істиною”, – підкреслює відомий український романіст С. Семчинський [Семчинський, 1974: 115].

Потрібні нові дослідження, які б переглядали, уточнювали, вносили нове у наші знання про історію мов, в цьому є актуальність нашого дослідження.

Для того, щоб виявити спільні риси на рівні синтаксису, слід звернути увагу на вивчення способів вираження зв'язку між реченнями. Саме тому метою нашого дослідження є висвітлення становлення форм та вживання сполучникових фразеологічних одиниць у французькій та румунській мовах.

Важливим фактором є виявлення системного характеру змін, які сталися у ході розвитку романських мов і аналіз взаємозв'язків з мовними явищами у зв'язку з взаємодією різноманітних факторів розвитку мови. Вивчаючи спільні або властиві обома мовам запозичення, можна встановити зміни у латинських елементах, які вони зазнали з початку романізації і до створення національних мов. Аналіз сполучників дає можливість показати їхні принципи вживання а також зрозуміти і пояснити їхню еволюцію та встановлення у мові.