

Patterns of Variation of Urdu Borrowed Words in English

Fauzia Janjua

Abstract

Contact of English with the languages of its colonized stocks has resulted in the occurrence of a modest number of lexical borrowings from all of them. More than 120 languages endowed towards the present vocabulary of English. Urdu being one of them is the donor of 173 lexical items to English language. Phonetic and semantic contents are borrowed from the donor language. Semantic content is more readily borrowed than phonetic structure. The borrowed semantic content is usually established on indigenous phonetic form. For Example: English word "School" borrowed in Urdu as "Ischool". Difference in words (donated and borrowed) mainly concern phonological aspect, but completely different lexical item expressing the same meaning also exists. The present study assumes that Urdu borrowed words in English are variants and therefore aims to evaluate Urdu lexical borrowings in English. The corpus of Urdu borrowed words developed from the Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary, eighth edition forms the sample of the study. The borrowed words are then categorized according to the taxonomy of borrowed items by Haugen (1950), who distinguishes between loanwords (form and meaning are copied completely), loanblends (words consisting of a copied part and a native part), and loanshifts, where only the meaning is copied. Then the grouped lexical items are analyzed for the patterns of variation. The analysis shows that there are three types of variations in the Urdu borrowed words in English. These are syntactical changes, structural changes and phonological changes. Each type also includes sub categories of variations.

Keywords: borrowed words, loanwords, loanblends, loanshifts

1. Introduction

Language borrowing is a prevalent sociolinguistic phenomenon in the growth of language. It is one of the most important ways of obtaining new words and adding to the lexical reserves of a language. Until the last quarter of 19th century, linguistic studies on language contact had dealt with historical linguistics and was based on a primary assumption that only vocabulary can be borrowed and grammatical structure cannot be transferred, therefore early scholars dealt with lexis and left the issue of syntax unsearched. Muller in 1871 claimed that there were no mixed languages but Schuchardt in 1884 (cited in Thomason and Kaufman 1988:1) countered the argument encouraging further studies on language contact beyond simple lexical borrowing. Haugen's article (1950) on borrowing has provided the rationale for the present study, because case studies of languages other than Urdu-English were available, but the studies on Urdu-English borrowing had dealt with the phonological and the morphological analyses separately. Moreover, the available studies on the topic lacked the investigation of the patterns underlying the phenomenon of lexical import from Urdu to English. Considering this as a gap, the present research gives a detailed analysis of language borrowings among two of the most frequently used and studied languages in Pakistan, namely Urdu and English.

2. Literature Review

Languages in contact influence each other and the most common means of influencing is the exchange of lexical items. The study of lexical aspects of languages in contact involves borrowing as a dominant process. Main stream flow of borrowing occurs from the languages of wider communication into the minority language. Whereas some of the examples evidently substantiate the concept of “substratum influence” by T&K (1988), for example a commonly used word “baba” by Urdu and Punjabi speakers is a Sanskrit word whereas familiarity with other Sanskrit words tends to be zero among the members of the communities using this word.

The linguistic outcomes of language contact falls under four broader domains. The phonological domain, the lexical domain, the morphological and syntactical domain and the semantic domain.

Bynon (1977) declares that every aspect of language can be borrowed from one language to another. Van Coetsem (1988) articulated a theory of “phonological borrowing” based on the concepts of “source language” and the “recipient language”, with agency as a primary factor. T&K’s (1988) concept of “borrowing” is almost analogous to Coetsem’s notion of “phonological borrowing”. However, T&K asserts that speakers themselves impose phonological patterns of their first language on their own use of the second language. Van Coetsem on the other hand alludes, “in our usage the term imposition does not carry negative connotations; it simply denotes an agent other than the recipient language speaker” (p.11). Pereira (1977) following the same concept of borrowing, while analyzing phonological adaptation of 300 English loan words into Brazilian Portuguese, noticed phonological changes across donor and borrowing languages.

The phenomenon of borrowing calls for linguistic changes to occur in the phonology, the syntax and the structure of the borrowed items. Tsujimura (1996) argues, “when a word is borrowed into another language, the pronunciation of the word is inevitably altered. This is because the sounds making up the word may not all exist in the language that borrows it” (p. 98). For example, Urdu lack plosive sounds therefore English lexical borrowings carrying plosives are altered in Urdu and same happens when English borrows such lexical items from Urdu. Same is the case with Urdu and Arabic, ‘P’ sound is absent in Arabic so words like ‘Pakistan’ will be pronounced as ‘Bakistan’. As reported by several researches, phonological adaptations of loan words retain some source pronunciations which bring about change in the phonology of the borrowed word. Davidson & Noyer (1997) notes that Spanish borrowings by Huave violate Huave stress rules, which they tried to explain through optimality framework. Tsuchida (1995), working in the same framework finds similar results for English borrowings in Japanese. Penalosa (1990) working with Spanish borrowings in Mayan languages reports phonological assimilation of the borrowed words. Paradis & Lacharité (1997) studied 545 French loanwords in Fula, spoken in Mauritania and Senegal, both countries that have been influenced by French for more than a century since initial French colonization. They found that French borrowed words in Fula breaking up French consonant clusters vowel insertion and simplification of the clusters, and nasal vowels are denasalized. Paradis (1995) traces the same for French borrowings in Moroccan Arabic and English borrowings in Quebec French. Therefore it can be assumed that the normal pattern of borrowed words’ pronunciation is expected to be nativized. However, there is a difference between borrowings by the bilinguals (who are able to pronounce the foreign sounds) and borrowings by monolinguals (who are unaware of the foreign sounds) where the phonological patterns of source language are imposed. Stenson (1993), in study of English borrowings into Irish

pointed out that there is a general tendency for adoption of foreign phonological patterns to bilingualism in English. Boberg (1997; 1999) explicates phonological assimilation in English words with “foreign a” by giving examples and said that the assimilation follows two patterns; assimilation to the short-a class (like fat and sat) and the broad -a class (like farmer and calm). Longer words according to him tend to merge into the “short a” which sometimes are taken as dialectal issues. Oswalt (1985) reports that English words in Kashaya are assimilated to English phonology whereas in Spanish these English borrowings are assimilated to Spanish.

Many borrowed words go through syntactical changes where nouns are transformed into adjectives and vice versa. Morphological changes also occur during the process of borrowing which are usually seen as inflectional changes. For example: Urdu borrowed words in English adopt morphological construction of English language rather than Urdu. The influence sets out to be more profound when grammatical and morphological exchanges occur. For example, Slavic languages have influenced Romanian vocabulary, phonology and morphology. English phrases have French adaptations in which the nouns are followed by the adjectives for example: Court-martial, Lake Superior. Nepalese, a Sino-Tibetan language has developed noun inflections due to its centuries long contact with Indo-Iranian languages, a trait rare in Sino-Tibetan languages. Diffusion of lexical items from donor to the recipient language apparently seems simple but the phenomenon is not straightforward.

Aronoff and Fudeman (2005) define morphology as a discipline that deals with the formation and the internal structure of the words. Morphology is also characterized as the study of the smallest meaningful units of language, formation of words from these units including inflection, derivation and composition. All these phenomena follow rules for example, English speakers follow the rules set for putting infixes, Affixes and Suffixes while dealing with different words. Similarly there are rules for assigning gender and plural formation in Urdu.

Morphologically, inflections provide the basis of categorization of words into Nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. It has been seen that bound morphemes and especially inflectional lexical items are rarely borrowed as compared to unbound morphemes. But in contact based language change situations functional roles are acquired by morphemic prototypes and the willingness of the bilingual speakers to allow morphological fusion. Borrowed words are usually morphological integrators rather than morphological replicates. Poplack, Sankoff & Miller (1988) view morphological integration as the basic indicator of borrowing, like English assigns its own derivations to the French borrowed words (Common-ly, care-fully). Maltese has added ‘ment’ in Italian borrowings (verament, speċjalment). Domari speakers borrow complete Arabic word-form for all degrees of adjectives (tilla ‘big’ and ákbar ‘bigger’) while borrowing adjectives. Therefore, the patterns of morphological borrowings vary across languages. Myers Scotton (2002) on the other hand views morphemes as resistant to borrowing. We usually come across morphological borrowing in syntactic domain like plurality markers on nouns, which according to Gardani (2012) are the most frequently used inflectional morphemes that are borrowed. The present study attempts to investigate the patterns of borrowing of Urdu words in English.

2.1 The Socio-Historical Context of the Study

History of language contact goes back to slavery, invasions, colonization, migrations, trade and otherwise. The British colonization of the sub-continent in 1765 brought English in contact with

the languages of the region. Contact of English with the languages of its colonized stocks has resulted in the occurrence of a modest number of lexical borrowings from all of them. More than 120 languages endowed towards the present vocabulary of English. Urdu being one of them is the donor of 109 lexical items to English language.

Urdu is a blend of different languages and it becomes difficult to determine if English has borrowed from Urdu or from the languages forming Urdu such as Turkish, Persian, Arabic or Hindi. To resolve this issue, the researchers relied on the implication given by Philip Durkin (2014). Hindi being an official language of the federal government of India contains a good amount of technical and formal lexis of Sanskrit. On the other hand, Urdu is the national language of Pakistan and contains a number of formal and technical lexis from Persian and Arabic. Therefore, for the present study, words that have an ultimate Sanskrit origin and have a distinct form and meaning of Hindi are not considered as Urdu words. Words that originate from Persian and Arabic and show mediation through Indic languages are considered as Urdu words.

3. Methodology

Field (2002) suggests two principles of borrowing. The first is the Principle of System Compatibility (PSC), which states “Any form or form-meaning set is borrowable from a donor language if it conforms to the morphological possibilities of the recipient language with regard to morphological structure”. The second is the Principle of System Incompatibility (PSI), which states “Any form or form-meaning set is borrowable from a donor language if it does not conform to the morphological possibilities of the recipient language with regard to morpheme types”. These principles indicate that languages can borrow new lexical or morphological forms by assigning these borrowed forms a more general class in the recipient language. This means that everything is borrowable. Haugen (1950) studied the phenomenon of lexical borrowing which is still one of the most cited works in the area because he has explained grammatical accommodation along with phonological accommodation. He has divided borrowed elements into different categories based on phonological and semantic characteristics. His division is:

1. Loan Words: Loan words he refers to the import of form and meaning with variable degrees of integration. There can be no integration, partial integration or all integration. Loan words are further classified into:
 - a. Addition: It refers to the new concepts and names for the objects.
 - b. Substitution: It is the selection of new forms for which there are forms already available in the recipient language.
2. Loan Blends: It is the mixing of foreign and native forms.
3. Loan Shifts: It is the representation of a foreign concept by a native form. These are further divided into:
 - a. Loan Transactions: clagues
 - b. Semantic Loans: It refers to semantic expansions where new semantic categories are added to already existing range of meanings for a native concept.

The data of the present study was categorized according to the afore mentioned criterion and then patterns were traced out.

Analysis of Urdu loanwords in English for the investigation of its patterns of variation goes through the following stages:

1. All the loanwords of Urdu listed in Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary Eighth edition were selected.
2. These Urdu loanwords were classified into three categories i.e. syntactic variations in Urdu loanwords, phonological variations in Urdu loanwords and structural variations in Urdu loanwords in English.
3. Syntactic variations were probed further into sub-categories as change from adjective to noun, adjective + noun to only noun, adjective + noun to adjective only and verb + noun to verb only.
4. Morphological variations were traced further and found patterns where English followed its own rules of making plural and second where English borrowed singular form for both singular and plural after borrowing.
5. Phonological variations were explored with reference to the categories and the sub-categories of loan words.

4. Analysis

4.1 Synactical changes

There are some significant syntactical changes which are observed in the borrowed words. These changes show the shift of class of borrowed words i.e. from noun to adjective, noun to verb and verb to adverb etc. The table below is reflective of these changes.

Table 4.1: **Word Category in Urdu and English**

Word Category in Urdu	Word Category in English after Borrowing
بدمعاش badmash (adjective)	badmash (noun)
دارچوڑی churidar (adjective)	churidar (noun)
سادھو sadhu (adjective)	sadhu (noun)
خاکی khaki (adjective/noun)	khaki (noun)
جوان jawan (adjective, noun)	jawan (noun)
حلال Halal (adjective, noun)	Halal (adjective)
پاجامہ pajama (noun)	pyjama (adjective)
دھرنا dharna (noun,verb)	dharna (noun)

4.1.1 Discussion

There are different patterns of Urdu loanwords in English at syntactical level. Loanwords change from adjectives to nouns as in first three examples. The words like بدمعاش 'badmash', سادھو sadhu and دارچوڑی 'churidar' are adjectives in Urdu but in English they are treated as nouns after borrowing. Moreover next two examples show that some words function as adjectives and as nouns in Urdu but function only as noun in English. Two words 'jawan' and 'khaki' in Urdu are noun and adjective respectively. On the contrary, English language considers both the words as 'nouns'. The word 'khaki' is uncountable in English and gets no inflections whereas the word 'jawan' is countable in English and gets inflection 's' of plurality. Next example shows dissimilar case where an adjective and noun changes into only an adjective in English. حلال Halal (adjective, noun) works as adjective and as a noun in Urdu but only as an adjective in English. Next example reveals that a noun changes its class in the process of borrowing and becomes an adjective. The

adjectives of Urdu language; 'sadhu' and 'badmaash' are treated as nouns after borrowing in English. In Urdu there are no inflections for these adjectives but in English after becoming noun they have inflections of plurality; 's' and 'es' respectively. In English there are two kinds of inflections for adjectives whereas in Urdu the inflections of adjectives are of number and gender. Six adjectives are treated same as Urdu in English language; 'halal', 'Islamic', 'Islamist', 'Koranic', 'Shiite' and 'tandoori' as they don't get inflections in both the languages. One adjective and one noun are treated as plural nouns with the addition of 's'; 'churidars' and 'pyjamas' respectively. The word 'churidar' doesn't have any inflection in Urdu but the word 'pyjama' has inflections of plurality and inflections of cases in Urdu language. The word 'mujahideen' which is an irregular plural of 'mujahid' is borrowed whereas its singular form is not borrowed and even singular form doesn't exist in English language. In English the word 'pyjama' is a noun which has been borrowed as an adjective. The word 'pyjama' has inflections in Urdu but it doesn't have inflections in English as an adjective. Last example shows that a lexical item works both as a noun and as a verb in Urdu but only as a noun in English. Whereas, the word like *دھرنا*-*dharna* is a verb in Urdu which after borrowing is treated as a noun.

2 verbs 'loot' and 'salaam' are Urdu borrowed words in English. English adds inflections according to its rules. Inflections for verb 's', 'es', 'ing' and 'ed' are added in these two verbs whereas in Urdu the verb 'loot' has 6 inflections and the verb 'salaam' does not have any inflection.

One gerund is made from Urdu verb 'loot' which is 'looting' whereas in Urdu it has masdar 'lootna'. In both languages these are uncountable and do not get any inflections. One borrowed noun 'sultana' gets inflection of plurality according to English rules. It gets an irregular morpheme; 'sultaness'. The countable word 'angrez' does not have any inflection of plurality in both the languages; however it has inflections for cases in Urdu. Two borrowed nouns add extra words to make their plurals in English. The word 'mung' makes its plural by adding the word 'beans'. Similarly the word 'mynah' adds 'birds' to make its plural form.

4.2 Morphological changes

Urdu vocabulary comprises of three sources i.e. native Urdu, Persian and Arabic and likewise morphology of the Urdu words is related to these three sources. Native Urdu morphemes behave in one way, the words borrowed from Persian language behave another way and the words borrowed from Arabic domains behave in yet another way. But if there is not any grammatical rules of making words in donor language, the words formation follow the native Urdu morphology. For example, Persian language does not follow grammatical gender as Megerdoomian (2000) states; there is no gender distinction in Persian language. In this type of situation, Persian loanwords in Urdu follow native Urdu grammatical patterns of gender.

Table 4.2: Patterns of morphological changes in Urdu borrowed words in English

Urdu (singular)	Urdu (plural)	English (Singular)	English (Plural)
ابایہ abaya (noun)	ابایہ, abaya+n	abaya (noun)	abaya+s
ابا abba (noun)	ابا, abba+y	abba (noun)	abba+s
اچکن ach'kan (noun)	achkan+ain	achkan (noun)	achkan+s
امیر emir (noun)	امراء umrah	emir (noun)	emir+s
بیگم begum (noun)	بیگمات Begmat	begum (noun)	begum+s
بھنگڑا bhangra (noun)	بھنگڑے, bhangra+y	bhangra (noun)	bhangra

چٹنی chutney (noun)	چٹنیاں, chutni+an	chutni (noun)	chutni
قلی coolie (noun)	قلی coolie	coolie (noun)	coolie+s
دیوان, divan (noun)	دیوان divan	divan (noun)	divan+s
درویش dervish (noun)	درویش dervish	dervish (noun)	dervish +es

4.2.1 Discussion

Above table shows the variations in Urdu words borrowed by English at morphological level. Three types of variations can be observed at this level. The first one is the difference in inflectional forms. Here English follows its own patterns of making plural forms of words. In making plural, Urdu follows the patterns of parent language of loanwords whereas English follows its own rules. For example in اباہ (abaya) Urdu follows the pattern of Arabic language to make it plural, in ابا (abba) pattern of Hindi language and in بیگم (begum) the pattern of its own. On the other hand, in all above cases English follows its own rules of making plural i.e. adding 's' or 'es' at the end of the words. The second type of variation is the situation where Urdu makes words plural by adding affixes but English has the same form for both singular and plural. The third type of variation that Urdu loanwords in English is that Urdu has same forms for both singular and plural whereas English adds 's' or 'es' to make plural. This is evident in the last three examples of the above given table. It is interesting to note that as Urdu has borrowed the words from other language, it has also borrowed the syntactical rules of making words singular or plural from the language it borrows but this is not the case with English. Though English borrows words from Urdu, yet it implies its own rules of making words plural.

4.3 Phonological changes

In the course of borrowing, it is common for phonological changes to occur as Tsujimura (1996) stated, "When a word is borrowed into another language, the pronunciation of the word is inevitably altered. It is because the sound being borrowed may not exist in recipient language. For example Urdu sound [ڄ] does not exist in English language. Alternatively this sound will be replaced with the most similar type of sound in recipient language.

Table 4.3: Phonological Variations of Urdu loan words in English

Urdu	English
دھنیا, dhanīa (noun)	dhanīa (noun) [dɑ:nɪə]
دھوتی dhoti (noun)	dhoti (noun) ['dəʊti]
دیوان divan (noun),	divan (noun) [dɪ'væn]
دوپٹہ dupatta (noun)	Dupatta (noun) [dʊ'pʌtə]
گھی ghee (noun)	Ghee (noun) (gi:)
خان khan (noun)	Khan (noun) [kɑ:n]
حلوا halwa (noun)	halwa (noun) [hælwɑ:]
حلال halal adjective	Halal adjective ['hælæl]
کافر kafir (noun)	Kafir (noun) ['kæfə(r)]
کباب kebab (noun)	kebab (noun) [kɪ'bæb]
لسی lassi (noun)	Lassi (noun) ['læsi]
اسلام islam (noun)	Islam (noun) ['ɪzlɑ:m]
اسلامی islami (adjective)	Islamic (adjective) [ɪz'læmɪk]

4.3.1 Discussion

At the phonological level, there are also three types of variations that can be traced in Urdu loanwords in English. The first one is the replacement of the sound that doesn't exist in English. For example in first sound of the first six examples, English language has not the origin sounds of Urdu words. That is why English borrows words with such sounds with similar native sounds. The initial sounds of following Urdu words do not exist in English language: گھی, دیوان, دھنیا, بھائی, and خان. So these sounds are replaced with [b], [d], [d], [g] and [k] respectively in Urdu loanwords in English language.

The second pattern is the replacement of long vowel sounds into short vowel sounds or vice versa or the variations in the place and manner of articulation of vowel sounds as is the case in *halwa* [hælwɑ:] where Urdu word requires back open vowel [ʌ] and English requires front open vowel [æ] after [h]. Same is the case in the words Halal ['hælæl], Kafir ['kæfə(r)], kebab [kɪ'bæb], Lassi ['læsi] after [h], [k], [k] and [l] sounds respectively.

The third category of variation at phonological level is the change of consonants sounds even when origin sound is also existed in the recipient language as in the last two examples where [s] sound is replaced with [z] in loanwords.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion it can be said that Urdu borrowed words which are now used in English language have been adopted with little variations at syntactic, structural and phonological levels. The patterns of variations can easily be traced in the class, form and sound of Urdu borrowed words in English. It can also be concluded that English does not borrow the pattern of morphology with the words because English follows its own rules even when borrowing. On the other hand it can also be said that Urdu loan words are almost similar in English language at semantic level.

The study found that due to the difference in Urdu and English language structure, English just borrow one inflection from Urdu language. In fact English follows its own rules and its own inflections whether it wants to treat the countable as uncountable or uncountable as countable. In few cases it treats the adjectives as nouns and adds inflections to those words. When Urdu sound is absent in English the sound of Urdu loanwords is replaced with similar sounds in English. English adopts short vowels instead of long vowels.

References

- Baumgardner, J. (1993). The indigenization of English in Pakistan. In Baumgardner, J. (Ed.), *The English language in Pakistan* (pp. 41-54). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Baumgardner, J., Kennedy, A., & Shamim, F. (1993). *The Urduization of English in Pakistan*. In Baumgardner, J. (Ed.), *The English language in Pakistan* (pp. 83-203). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Bilal, H. A., Warraich, A. A., Fatima, N., Tiwana, D. S., & Bhatti, T. R (2012) Urdu Loan-Words in Pakistani English. *Global Journal of HUMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE Linguistics & Education: Volume 12 Issue 9 Version 1.0 June 2012*
- Bynon, T. (1977). *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26.210–231.

- Kachru, B. (1986). 'The power and politics of English', *World Englishes* 5: 121–40.(ed.) 1992 [1982]. *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Substantially revised edition with additional chapters. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. (1997) 'English as an Asian language', in Bautista (ed.), pp. 1–23.
- Kennedy, A. (1993a). A bribe by any other name....:Terms of gratification in Pakistani English. In Baumgardner, R. (Ed.), *The English language in Pakistan* (pp. 204-211). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, A. (1993b). Of dacoits and desperados: Crime reporting in Pakistani English. In Baumgardner, R. (Ed.), *The English language in Pakistan* (pp. 69-79). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Megerdooimian, K. (2000) Unification-based Persian morphology. In *Proceedings of CICLing 2000*, Mexico.
- Miura, A. (1979). *English loanwords in Japanese*. Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- Payne, T. E. (2006). *Exploring languages structure*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rehman, T. (1990). *Pakistani English: The linguistic description of a non-native variety of English*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-e-Azam University.
- Tallat, M. (2002). *The form and function of English in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved June 08, 2015, from <http://eprints.hec.gov.pk>
- Tallat, M. (1993). *Lexical variation in Pakistani English*. In Baumgardner, R. (Ed.), *The English Urdu Loan-Words in Pakistani English*© 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US) language in Pakistan (pp. 55-62). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Tsujimura, N. (1996). *An introduction to Japanese linguistics*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell publishing.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.