DOI https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-304-3-3

LANGUAGE CONTACT AND ITS OUTCOMES

Iryna HUMENIUK
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
Higher Educational Institution "Podillia State University"
irynahumenyuk79@gmail.com

Introduction. There is no doubt that different communities, groups of people, and entire nations enter one or another contact – cultural, political, economic, military, and others during their historical development. However, all of them inevitably imply parallelism of language contacts. True, in the current situation of the global dominance of the English language, there is also an inverse relationship, when "Anglo-American traditions, value systems, lifestyle, mentality, worldview are imposed on the whole world... Frequently this cultural and ideological charge borrowed from the language conflicts with the local national culture" [47].

Language contacts are the interaction of languages because of communication between their speakers, one of the strongest external factors of language development. They determine not only borrowing at all levels of the language structure, but also the convergent development of languages, the formation of auxiliary common languages, and even language assimilation. The reasons for these transformations lie not in the structure of interacting languages but in the importance of a certain language, which depends primarily on the level of economic, political, and cultural development of its speakers, as well as their militancy, fanaticism, and zealotry. The most influential language is exposed to the conditions of contact with a closely related language. When languages are characterized by deep structural differences, the possibility of influencing each other is insignificant.

The problem of language contact has been significant and provocative for several decades so far. As there is neither a unified apparatus nor a solo approach to research the issue. It's an interdisciplinary field study covering a wide range of linguistic contact phenomena and problems, linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociological, and psycholinguistic ones [50].

Thus, Muysken claimed that "bilingualism or language contact in itself is not a scientific discipline" [47]. More recently, Coetsem pointed out that "Contact linguistics still lacks an adequate conceptual basis on which a synthesis can be built that is theoretically well-founded" [26].

In modern linguistics, special attention is paid to the study of language contacts. There is a separate linguistic paradigm called "contact linguistics", "linguistics of lingual contacts" or "linguistic contactology", which studies the processes and results of contacting languages in a specific geopolitical space under certain historical and social conditions of communication between peoples, ethnic groups, ethnic communities, individual human groups speaking different languages [48].

Also in recent decades, the Internet has linked many languages, thus influencing each other. However, only several languages influence the web, influencing others, observes Translate Media. English is heavily monopolized, along with Russian, Korean, and German. Even languages spoken by several million people, such as Spanish and Arabic, in contrast, are not widely on the Internet. As a result, English words are much more influential in other languages around the world, a straight outcome of Internet use.

The English term "cloud computing" has become extremely popular in France in spite of attempts to get French speakers to embrace "Informatique en Nuage" [50].

Thus, the issue of language contact is valid and worthy to be studied.

The objective of the current research is to analyze the notion of language contact, trace linguistic consequences of language contact, study possible outcomes of language contact, and investigate Ukrainian-English contact in Canada.

Language contact

There are some definitions of language contacts proposed by several scholars evolving through time. Thus, in the paper by Haugen language contact is explained as "the alternating use of two or more languages by the same persons", who are related to as bilingual or bilingual speakers [35].

A very thoughtful view of language contact would probably be that speakers take on sets of formal and operative features, so to speak, of semiotic signs, from the analogous contact language and insert them into their language. Of course, this view is too facile and is no longer earnestly assisted. Perhaps the more sensible vision held by the study of language contacts is that whatever material is transferred in a situation of language contact, that material necessarily undergoes some modification through the contact [51].

Demonstrations of language contact are found in various fields, as well as language acquisition, its processing and production, conversation and discourse, the social purposes of language and language policy, typology, and language change, and much more... The study of language contact has implications for understanding the internal functions and internal structure of 'grammar' and the language faculty itself [43].

"Language contact is a major driver of language change," notes Stephan Gramley, author of several books on the English language. "Contact with other languages and other dialect varieties of the same language is the source of alternative pronunciations, grammatical structures, and vocabulary. Prolonged language contact usually results in bilingualism or multilingualism" [33].

Language contact is a social and linguistic aspect through which speakers of different languages (or various dialects of the identical language) interact with each other, resulting in the transmission of linguistic attributes [50].

The study of language contact

Most languages have been affected by contact erratically, subsequent in varying degrees of properties being passed on from one to the other. For example, there are many French, Latin, Greek, and many other languages borrowings from the English language. Transmission of this kind does not even demand real contact between divergent language speakers, since it can be performed while researching books by teachers, who then transfer the current vocabulary to other speakers through literature, religious texts, dictionaries, etc. But many other contact cases have resulted in the transmission of contrasting language types, often so broad that new contact languages are created [51].

Uriel Weinreich and Einar Haugen are commonly considered discoverers in the study of language contact. It was Weinreich who first observed that second-language learners assumed the language forms of their first and second languages to be equal [35].

For languages to begin to interact, they must get close enough to designate interlinguistic connections between them, i.e. lingual contacts. They can be direct (immediate) when native speakers come into personal contact with each other. But they can also be indirect when two languages contact through a third one. It is believed that indirect lingual contacts relate to only the lexical system of the language, while direct contacts have a much broader and deeper impact on the language (Garnik, 2015).

Due to Garnik language contacts are divided into:

1) casual, i.e. temporary, random; this happens when the languages contact each other irregularly. The consequences, in this case, are limited to the borrowing of a small group of lexemes;

2) permanent, i.e., constant close contacts, which are established because of intensive contact of languages with each other.

In turn, permanent contacts are divided into two types:

1) external, i.e., those that are established between the peoples of various states located in close territories that have close economic, political, and cultural ties. At the same time, a large

amount of vocabulary of a very different nature is transferred from language to language, vocabulary and phraseology are traced, and even some phonemes are borrowed (for example, ch [x] from Greek to Latin);

2) internal ones, which appear among the languages of the peoples from the same state; in Rome, these were Latin and Italic, as well as the languages of the conquered peoples.

Consideration should be given to the great differences that arise between different forms of language contact: 1) when contacts occur during direct communication between speakers of contrasting languages; 2) when a foreign language is studied at school. In the first case, language errors are allowed that do not interfere with mutual understanding, and in the second case, the language must be acquired in the correct form, without errors.

Depending on how close the contacting languages are, the following modes of contact are distinguished:

1) contacts of unattached languages of different structures;

2) contacts of related, but distant from each other, languages that differ in their grammatical structure, vocabulary, etc.;

3) contacts with correlated and firmly related languages.

Some scholars believe that the outcome of lingual contact is completely independent of the degree of proximity of the contacting languages (G. Paul, A. Martinet, U. Weinreich).

Linguistic consequences of language contact

The representation of a minority or threatened language to document the linguistic outcomes of lingual contact and limitation has now emerged as a separate field of exploration among sociolinguistics was presented by Raymond Mougeon and Edouard Beniak [44]. The scientists announced a set of analyses of the influence that contact with English firstly, and restrictions on the use of language secondly, performed on the advancement of the French dialect spoken in the prevailing English-speaking province of Ontario, Canada in their paper. As a framework for the analyses, the authors supply sociohistorical and sociolinguistic details on the Franco-Ontarian society and compare with other arrays of French both in and out of North America. They address basic theoretical questions such as the reciprocity between lingual and extra-lingual roots of structural swap and the instruments of linguistic switch in bilingual as contrary to monolingual speech societies.

Such a notion of intervention appears when there is an impact of one language on another. According to Uriel Weinreich, the condition for the emergence of linguistic intrusion is lingual contact, which can be understood as either "verbal interaction between two language communities" or a learning situation. "Two or more languages are in contact if they are used alternately by the same person. Thus, the place of contact is the individuals using the language. The consequence of language contact is often intrusion, that is, "cases of fluctuation from the norms of each language that appear in the speech of bilinguals as an outcome of their acquaintance with more than one language" [42].

Weinreich's concept of interference includes examples of speech effects over time: one language leaves its traces in another like sand remains on the bottom of a river. This concept of interference is much broader than the strictly synchronous concept of interference in psycholinguistics [47].

Weinreich examines in detail speech contacts at all rates of the speech scheme and analyzes the nature and characteristics of phonetic, grammatical, and lexical intrusion. The author believes that part of the demand for updating the dictionary can be satisfied by neologisms of internal origin, but especially rich and fresh material is drawn from foreign languages. With mass bilingualism, the lexical impact of one language on another can reach a large scale. In determining the sociocultural conditions of bilingual speakers, something like the merging of the vocabulary of two languages into one pool of lexical innovations takes place [51].

Possible outcomes of language contact

The linguistic outcomes of lingual contact are assured in large part by the history of social relations among populations, involving economic, political, and demographic factors. Although a more extensive discussion of the speech community is to be found in the "Speech Community" chapter by Patrick, it is important to situate any discussion of the results of lingual contact within a sociohistorical perspective that considers the historical forces that brought to language contact. Such a perspective is central to the important and influential work of Thomason & Kaufman (henceforward, T&K), who attribute these socio-historical factors a unique causal weight in determining language contact outcomes. Lacking a quantitative perspective, however, T&K is forced to deny the importance of internal linguistic factors. Devoting a major chapter to "The failure of linguistic constraints on interference", they argue that: "linguistic constraints on linguistic interference ... are based ultimately on the premise that the structure of a language determines what can happen to it because of outside influence. And they all fail" [39].

Various scholars define various possible results of language contact. Thus, Kyle Shields suggests the following division.

Contact outcomes:

1. Contact-induced language change:
   - change through borrowings;
   - change through imperfect learning.
2. Extreme language mixture:
   - pidgins and creoles;
   - bilingual mixed languages.
3. Language death:
   - attrition;
   - grammatical replacement;
   - extinction [47].

The most influential outcomes are described below.

Borrowings

Due to the Collins Dictionary (2022), the following definition of linguistic borrowings is enforced "*borrowing*" is a word acquired, often with some form transformations, within languages.

Borrowing is the consequence of cultural contact between two lingual societies. Borrowing words can go both ways between two contacting languages, but there is often an asymmetry, so more words move from one side to the other. Thus, the source language community has a certain advantage in power, prestige, and/or wealth, which makes the objects and ideas it brings desirable and useful for the borrowing language community. For example, the Germanic tribes in the first few centuries of our era adopted multiple borrowings from Latin, as they adopted new products through trade with the Romans. On the other hand, few German words were converted to Latin [38].

The borrowing concept has been the focal point of the inquiry of lingual contact at the minimum since the middle of the 19th century. Amid there has been a concord on the distinction between the various language components as to the range to which they can be borrowed. Simultaneously, there has been an appreciable dispute about the scope to which borrowing was feasible at. Linguists view language as a systematic sovereign system inclined toward rejecting borrowing as an origin of language switch, while scholars view language as an unsteady organization, that is in continuous reciprocity with its social, cultural, and linguistic environment, fielded to obtain borrowing rather easily. Thus, in the 19th century, Schuchardt opposed the Neo-Grammarians in the same way as in the present era some sociolinguists and anthropological linguists oppose the generativist tradition on this issue. Both the Neo-Grammarians and the generativists tend to reject borrowing overall. The mixability of a language is an inverse function of its systematization, i.e., the more systematic the component of a language, the less easily it is included in the borrowing processes [46].

The glossary is most effortlessly borrowed since it is mainly a list of words; then the more superficial aspects of the pronunciation of a language; then some of the derivational morphology; then some of the articulation morphology; and ultimately, some of the syntactic rules [32].

Different scholars have formed this ranking incongruously, and specifically, researchers have tried to discover the words type which can be borrowed smoothly. Here the overall deduction is that common nouns are by far the class of elements most easily borrowed, succeeded by adjectives, verbs, etc. This outcome, however, could have a cultural explanation besides a linguistic one. It is eminent that the cultural components that are most frequently borrowed are also the ones expressed by nouns, such as animals and objects.

Sometimes phonological changes appear to be introduced despite the existence of more similar segments across donor and borrowing languages. Naim reports that although non-pharyngealized consonants appear in Beirut Arabic, consonants in Italian and French loan words are pharyngealized when they occur preceding long low vowels, apparently due to an identification speakers make between the vowels in these foreign words and the local allophone of Arabic /a/ that occurs after pharyngeals [49].

The English language has experienced many stages where many words from a certain language have been borrowed. These periods coincide with times of essential cultural interaction between English speakers and speakers of other languages. Waves of borrowing during periods of especially powerful cultural contact are not sharply demarcated but can intersect. For example, Norman's impact on English began as early as the 8th century AD and continued well after the Norman Conquest led to a large influx of Norman French into the language.

Bilingualism

Bilingualism (derived from Latin *bi* – two, *lingua* – language) is a sign not only of the language status of the individual but also the language situation of the country, or region, i.e. the phenomenon of possession and use of a person or a set of ethnic groups in two languages, another acquired, but important for communication in various communication areas. Bilingualism is usually defined as the ability of an individual or the members of a community to use two languages effectively (Nordquist, 2020).

Bilingualism usually resolves itself and one language thrives over another (English over other languages with which it has direct contact) except for the languages implicated come into a particular harmony for social or political motives, as appeared in Belgium with French and Flemish, for example. There is an even more comprehensible sort of fixed bilingualism called diglossia. This refers to a situation where two languages (Spanish and Guarani in Paraguay) or two diverse varieties of the same language (Swiss and High German in Switzerland) are used parallel in separate fields of life, commonly public and private. sphere. The operating difference between the two varieties/language guarantees their continued existence in the language society [54].

Code-switching

Code-switching is a phenomenon where speakers switch from one language to another and come back with the same sentence. There are many suggestions as to why this happens, but two reasons can be given: 1) speakers have become familiar with some phenomenon in the second language and switch to it when they talk about it; 2) speakers believe that the second speech is more prestigious. and switch to it to make their language more fashionable [54].

Switching can engage separate words or entire sentences. The final type is guided by strict rules about which clause in a sentence can perform a switch rotation. In case code-switching is ubiquitous in society and becomes humanly appropriate, then over time, it may lead to a change in the original language in the same way as borrowing or structural alteration in cases where this is attested.

Although code-switching involves the use of two languages within the same segment of discourse, both languages do not participate on an equal footing. At any given time, only one of the languages is perceived as "the language we speak", the primary language, while the other

language is secondary. This may change during one discourse segment, but such changes are not common. It is very common for a speaker to be more proficient in the primary language than in the secondary, but this need not be the case, especially since the choice of primary language and degree of code-switching is often decided by communal norms, not just individual choices [51].

Pidgins and creoles

Similarly, definite languages have vanished strained by socially superior languages, and other languages are newly born, often within one or two generations.

Amidst the most beneficial cases of lingual contact are those which appeared as the consequence of trade or colonial spread. The last has led to diverging types of linguistic arrangement for barter and exchange. Such compromises often lead to pidgins, greatly decreased languages with a nominal vocabulary and grammar, and restricted basically to the function of trade. The term 'pidgin' itself is broadly recognized to derive from 'business'. Some pidgins imply more composition of vocabulary than others. For instance, Russenorsk, used in trade between Russians and Norwegians up to the 19th century, engaged vocabulary from the languages of both groups [51].

Other pidgins like Eskimo Trade Pidgin and Chinese Pidgin English acquire their vocabulary primarily from one origin, customarily the language of the group that was controlling the trade or its location. Pidgins have also appeared in contexts other than trade, for example in occasions of military occupation (Pidgin English in Japan) or domestic settings for intercourse between masters and servants of contrasting language backgrounds (Indian Butler English) or on plantations (Hawaiian Pidgin English). Pidgins demonstrate different levels of amplification in both vocabulary and grammar if their set of functions expands beyond the boundaries of the original context of the application. In such cases, there may be diverse degrees of incorporation of features from both the dominant 'lexifier' or 'superstrate' language and the native or 'substrate' languages of other groups. Some pidgins achieve such a degree of elaboration in this way that they are in principle no longer pidgins, but fully developed natural languages. Examples include languages like Tok Pisin and Bislama, official languages of Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu respectively, both originated from an earlier plantation pidgin, in turn, derived from early Pacific trade pidgin [51].

Most frequently pidgins and creoles come up in a colonial context, out of the contact of a colonial language and several languages spoken by the colonized or by slaves put into from the outside (as in the popular case of the Caribbean). Regarding the pidgins' and creole origin, there are two antagonistic schools of thought. The historicists consider creoles as being descended via unequivocal processes of historical transmission or change from other languages, including greater or lesser amounts of the grammatical mixture. The romanticists, on the other hand, tend to accept creole languages as being born in a linguistic vacuum (besides some vocabulary), through the intervention of the forces of nature (in the form of Universal Grammar or the bio program, cf. Bickerton 1981), when the process of historical transmission was interrupted.

European colonial expansion during the 15th–19th centuries brought the formation of advanced societies where colonial languages connected with the aboriginal languages of the colonized. In utmost cases, such as the plantations of the New World, where enormous numbers of West African slaves emigrated during the era of European colonization, contact led to the emergence of creole languages, so-called because they were used by the 'creole' or locally born slaves (as well as many Europeans) in the colonies. These creole languages are a blend of mostly European vocabulary with a grammar representing a bargain between that of the West African substrate and that of the European superstrate. Creoles differ primarily in the extent of one or the other of these influences on their grammar. The varying outcomes depended on the demographic structure of the community, the social settings and codes of social interaction governing contact and relations between the groups, and the types of linguistic input involved What is perhaps distinctive if not unique about creoles is that they are new creations whose birth accompanied the emergence of completely new communities of speakers. Born in conflict and

the need to compromise, they developed their autonomy, creating new usage norms which define the social identity of their speakers and their membership in a distinct creole community. Creoles represent a compromise among competing linguistic inputs, just as creole culture reflects a compromise among competing sociocultural traditions [51].

The fact that such languages are simplified is a common feature for both, but these kinds of languages are not the same. The Canadian sociolinguist Ronald Wardhaugh (2006, p. 61–63) writes that pidgin is a language with no aboriginal speakers: it is no one's mother tongue but is a contact language. That is, it is the result of a multilingual case in which those who desire to interact must discover or improvise an elementary language system that will empower them to do that way. Opposed to pidgin, creole, is often interpreted as a pidgin that has turned into the first language of a new generation of speakers. A creole, therefore, is a "normal" language in almost every perception.

So, the key distinction between pidgins and creoles is that the first one has no native speakers, while another one has, because being formed based on pidgin, it became native to a certain community.

The other factor that could describe only the pidgin language is its quick and sudden emergence. It arises in certain situations when there is a need for communication. For example, for trade or labor. It is worth mentioning here that one of the hypotheses as to the origin of the term 'pidgin' is a derivation from a Chinese pronunciation of the word 'business'. This fact proves once again the main purpose of the emergence of such language.

Pidgin language can also be characterized as a language with simplified vocabulary and grammar structure. This simplification is seen in comparison with the dominant language, the one a certain speaker was using before daily, this speaker's native language.

When pidgins first appeared, they were restricted. That means they served certain situations and were used only for functions. However, some pidgins became extended. They began to be used in different areas of life, such as social or family life, and not only at work or for business purposes. Extended pidgins as non-native lingua francas can also be passed from generation to generation.

Similarly, the creoles, are developed first as pidgins. Yet, when this kind of language survives and becomes the native language of a new generation of people, then it can be called a creole language. So, in circumstances in which a pidgin language becomes extended very quickly within the same community, there is a big chance for the creole language. This process of transition from a pidgin to a creole, from a language without native speakers to one which such speakers already have, is called creolization.

Language shift

Language shift is defined as the process whereby an individual or speech society moves from habitually using one language to using another, often culturally dominant language [27].

So, language shift is the procedure by which members of a community in which more than one language is spoken abandon their original mother tongue in favor of another. The historical transition to English by Celtic speakers in the United Kingdom and Ireland is a particularly well-studied example of good census data from the last 100 to 120 years in many areas where Celtic languages were once predominant [37].

Although the notion of language shift at the population level can be traced back to Fishman [30], it was Fishman [31] who made it particularly relevant to considerations of language threat and loss, which were also emphasized by Ostler [53] and Powell [54]. Indeed, Fishman used language shift in situations where a population gives up their heritage language for another which from thereon functions as their vernacular [45].

Fishman discussed language shift initially concerning immigrants. Immigrants typically appropriate the (dominant) language of the host population, to function competitively in the latter's economy. It is what most continental Europeans in Anglophone North America and Australia did as they gradually assimilated to the Anglo socioeconomic system and shifted to English at the expense

of their heritage languages and economic practices. In the case of the United States, it generally took until after the American Revolution and sometimes up to the twentieth century before these immigrants contributed to making English the dominant language [31].

Nevertheless, language shift is an evolutionary outcome of an ecology in which there are fewer and fewer opportunities or motivations to speak a particular language. Although linguists have been more interested in the process at the population level, individual speakers are the unwitting agents of the process, as they respond adaptively to social or economic pressures they experience [45].

Language death

In many places of the world languages that are spoken by small minorities or by groups with a very low social status (often peasants) are in the process of disappearing, because more powerful groups utilize the organization of the state to oppress these languages. Well-known cases include the Celtic languages in Western Europe and the Indian languages in the Americas. Some decades ago the disappearance, termed language obsolescence and then language death has been the object of scholarly study [47]. The questions posed in this discipline are both structural and functional:

(a) Is there a pattern to the gradual loss of linguistic elements, categories, and distinctions that can be generalized from one situation of language death to the other?

(b) Are specific functions of the language lost earlier than others, in several cases? What groups of speakers show the loss fastest?

(c) What are the ways of reviving dying languages, given that the social and political situation that originally lead to the death of the language has changed?

Since the destruction of the Inca empire, the Indian languages of the Andes have been in the position of the loser, even if they were accorded a status within the colonial hierarchy. This has led to widespread bilingualism throughout the Andes and the disappearance of Quechua in some places. Some scholars, such as Albo and Torero [18] have documented the political and sociological dimensions of this process, but the linguistic dimensions have been studied less. Exceptions are Albo study of the Cochabamba valley and Lefebvre's [42] on Cuzco Quechua. There it is argued that the loss of a semantic distinction in the address form is due to the increasing use of Spanish, which takes over some functions.

Bilingualism in Canada

The Canadian official language is presented in two versions – English and French. Such bilingualism in the Canadian state is the result of historical correspondence between the British and the French, who became the first settlers in this territory. Thus, 67% of the Canadian population now communicates in English, while 21% speak French, and 12% speak both languages, respectively. The degree of ethnolinguistic diversity in the language situation in Canada is multi-component and multilingual. Along with English and French, Chinese is also spoken in Canada – by 790,035 (2.6%) people; in the Punjabi language – by 278,500 (0.8%) people; in Spanish – by 209,955 (0.7%) people; in Italian – 170,330 (0.6%) people; in Ukrainian – 148,090 (0.5%) people; in Arabic – 144,745 (0.5%) people; in German – 128,350 (0.4%) people; in Tagalog – 119,345 (0.4%) people; in Vietnamese – 111,440 (0.4%) people; in Portuguese – 103,875 (0.3%) people; in Urdu – 102,805 (0.3%) people; in Polish – 101,575 (0.3%) people; in Korean – 101,500 (0.3%) people; in Persian – 97,220 (0.3%) people; in Russian – 93,805 (0.3%) people; in Tamil – 92,680 (0.3%) people; in Greek – 55,100 (0.2%) people; in the Gujarati language – 52,715 (0.2%) people; in Romanian – 51,060 (0.2%) people. Aboriginal languages, many of which are unique to Canada, are now spoken by less than one percent of the population and are in decline in most cases.

It can be noted that Canadian bilingualism is one-sided. The French-speaking population living in the cities of the English-speaking part of Canada must be fluent in spoken English, which is used everywhere in everyday communication. Thus, bilingualism is typical mainly for the part of Canada that is French-speaking: Anglo-Canadians do not feel the vital need to learn French.

Language contact in Canada: historical background

The English language was originally applied in Canada in the 17th century, in periodic fishing settlements along the Atlantic coast, together with Newfoundland, and also in Hudson Bay – at fur trade posts. Following the convey of Nova Scotia to Britain under the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), perpetual English-speaking communities were entrenched in the territories, such as Halifax, endowed in 1749. Following the exclusion of the French-speaking Akkadian society in the 1750s. The large English-speaking settlement of the rest of eastern Canada was made attainable by Britain's victory in the Seven Years' War, after which France ceded the British Canadian region under the Treaty of Paris (1763).

Thus, English is the main language in every Canadian province and territory, with the exceptions of Quebec (where there is a French-speaking population prevails) and Nunavut (where the majority are Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun speaking Inuit languages). As was already mentioned, Canadian English owes its existence to crucial historical events, namely: the Treaty of Paris of 1763, which ended the Seven Years' War and opened much of eastern Canada to English-speaking settlements; the American Revolution of 1775–1783, which prompted the first large group of English speakers to move to Canada; and the Industrial Revolution in Britain, which prompted an even larger group to join them in the 19th century. These and other developments defined patterns of English-speaking settlement in Canada, which in turn influenced the modern form of Canadian English [24].

Boberg claims that English is predominantly used by Canadians nowadays in the regions of British Columbia to Nova Scotia. It is distinctly the type of North American English most like English in the western United States and General American English. This is principally true of his grammar (the way lexemes and sentences combine what scholars name syntax and morphology) and the most systematic aspects of his pronunciation (what linguists name phonology and phonetics). It is expected that the history of English-speaking settlements in Canada has led to the creation of a hybrid variety of English with a distinguishing synthesis of American and British features [24].

Now the country's population is divided into three linguistic groups: Anglophones – Canadians whose native language is English; Francophones – Canadians whose mother tongue is French; Allophones are Canadians whose native language is some other language.

Five waves of Ukrainian migration to Canada

The first documented wave of emigration to Canada took place in 1891–1892, although it is generally believed that immigrants from Ukraine appeared there much earlier, their impact on Canadian communities was simply insignificant.

The second wave of immigration began after the First World War and continued from 1922–1939 Third wave of immigration. In 1946–1961 Ukrainians were driven across the ocean by the consequences of World War II. The political situation in Eastern Europe forced Ukrainians to seek asylum outside the borders of their homeland. Of these, 37,000 found a place for themselves in Canada. Among the refugees – now from all regions of Ukraine – there were representatives of various professions and branches of science and art. The arrival of Ukrainians revived in the 1980s, the fourth wave when the immigration of Polish citizens of Ukrainian origin began. After 1991, when the USSR ceased to exist, a wave of immigration from independent Ukraine began. Vsevolod Isaev, professor of sociology at the University of Toronto, considers this to be the 5th wave [42].

The situation that can be observed now, during the Russian-Ukrainian war, will become the sixth wave of emigration.

However, Ukrainian immigrants did not relate promptly. They established quarterly settlements in three prairie provinces, in which they preserved their language, customs, and religious traditions. Due to their numbers, they even assimilated other smaller Slavs, such as Poles

and Russians. Until 1939, the Ukrainian census found that there were more Ukrainian-speaking people in Canada than Ukrainians living in the country [29].

Canada is the third most populous with Ukrainians country in the world. As of 2016, there were 1.6 million Ukrainian Canadians in Canada.

The speech situation that has developed in the diaspora provinces of Canada demonstrates the relevance of bilingualism in multicultural countries, especially immigrant ones, which contributes to the cultural exchange of two ethnic groups and allows immigrants who find themselves in a new environment to become full-fledged members of society.

Proficiency in English and Ukrainian improves the level of education of children, youth, and adults, which is important for their future life and helps them adapt to the Canadian land. The idea that almost every citizen of Canada is bilingual, guarantees his development as a highly cultured person.

It is worth noting that the language of Ukrainian migrants in Canada has changed with each wave of migration, resulting in a kind of dialect of Ukrainian Canadians. The Western Ukrainian dialect had the greatest influence on the language of Ukrainians in Canada. This phenomenon arose as a result of the fact that the first wave of migration was actually the inhabitants of Western Ukraine, who made the greatest contribution to the formation of this community on the North American continent. Modifications in tokens formed as a result of English language interference at the phonetic, morphological, and lexical levels are reflected in the language of modern Ukrainian Canadians [52].

Analysis of the English-Ukrainian contact in Canada

An important role in the linguistic and sociolinguistic adaptation of immigrants, including Ukrainian ones, in Canada, as the main factor of integration into the economic and social environment of the recipient country, is played by the linguistic self-determination of immigrants who become bilingual, which, in turn, contributes to their successful adaptation to new living conditions.

"Language is not only a given system of means of cognition... it is at the same time a way of creating aesthetic and moral ideals" [21]. English for Ukrainians in Canada is not only a tool for adaptation to the new political, social, and economic structure of life, but also to study the history, culture, and traditions of the recipient country.

For each wave of Ukrainian immigrants to Canada, Ukrainian is both their mother tongue and English language, as a language of communication and a means of adaptation to the new environment, performing mainly different functions for Ukrainian immigrants. Ukrainian is the mother tongue for most immigrants from Ukraine communicative, ethno-preserving, and identifying functions. English language, which is necessary for the full-fledged existence of Ukrainian immigrants in Canada, helps them to adapt to new conditions as soon as possible life and performs communicative, integrative, and cultural functions. This distribution of functions between the two languages spoken by Ukrainians throughout their stay in Canada did not help full assimilation, including the language, of Ukrainian immigrants, and more cultural exchange, which is the best form of intercultural coexistence. In this case, the two cultures, Ukrainian and Canadian, almost coexist and mutually enrich each other.

Ukrainian immigrants, mostly uneducated, created isolated settlements, where the traditional cultural structure of the life of the Ukrainian peasant was preserved, language communication was Ukrainian and it was enough to solve all the problems of the settlement. But later the spread of trade and social ties with English-speaking neighbors has given rise to a new special form of the Ukrainian language "gef for half", which eventually continued to be used in Ukrainian settlements [48].

Communicating with their English-speaking neighbors, Ukrainians "Ukrainianized" English words. For example, the English word «пейнт», which translates as "paint", they pronounced as «пейнтувати», English «шат» ("shut") Ukrainians used as «зашатнути», for the English word

«холодний», "cold", "get cold") was pronounced as «замерзати» and so on [48]. And although these words have changed the Ukrainian language, which Ukrainian immigrants and their descendants spoke in Canada, preserving the semantics of these words made it possible for Ukrainians should always remember the peculiarities of their native language and then return to its literary version. At that time, it was important for Ukrainians to learn English as soon as possible would allow them to successfully adapt to life in an English-speaking environment [48].

Studying the work of such an author of Ukrainian origin as Janice Kulik Kiefer and her latest novels "Green Library" and "Honey and Ashes", it can be stated that the presence of the Ukrainian language in English texts makes readers (both Canadians and Ukrainians) reevaluate their positions ethnic minorities in Canadian society, to experience the language problems faced by the first.

Ukrainian emigrants understand the importance of the native language for the national self-awareness of a person in a modern multicultural environment. And, in modern bilingual novels, there is an attempt to recognize that any ethnic language affects the language that is native to a larger number of members of society and vice versa [28].

Some scholars in their publications draw attention to the unfortunate mistake that often occurs in both oral and written speeches of Ukrainian immigrants, namely the use of female adjectives in the masculine form. "English, due to the peculiarities of its morphology, does not know such a distinction of surnames: both male and female surnames have the same sound. However, under the influence of English in the Ukrainian language, which is characterized by generic opposition, occur forms such as *Maria Podilsky* where it should be *Maria Podilska*. The use of these forms is a violation of the Ukrainian language and evidence of the lack of language culture among Ukrainian immigrants – this is the conclusion reached by all linguists who have covered this topic" [39].

There is also a reverse effect of the Ukrainian language on English. "Influence of the Ukrainian language on English affected the level of word formation. Thus words – internationalisms were used from uncharacteristic affixes (біологіст, аналіст, транспортація, instead of біолог, аналітик, транспорт) or in the transliteration of English terms in the presence of Ukrainian equivalents (tape recorder instead of 'магнітофон')" [48].

Bilingualism as a factor of sociolinguistic adaptation of Ukrainian immigrants in Canada

An important role in the linguistic and sociolinguistic adaptation of immigrants, including Ukrainian ones, in Canada as the main factor of integration into the economic and social environment of the recipient country is played by the linguistic self-determination of immigrants who become bilingual, which, in turn, contributes to their successful adaptation to new living conditions.

It is necessary to consider the fact that there is a certain connection between the national language and self-identification of a person, and any changes in national self-awareness and self-definition that occur in the case of communication in another, non-native language cause, first of all, assimilation, without which the adaptation of newcomers is impossible people in a new society for them. Translated from Latin, assimilation means "assimilation". During immigration to a new country, partial assimilation can occur – this is an option when immigrants sacrifice their language and the culture of communication they are used to in some limited area – work or study but preserve their traditions and culture in family ties, religion, etc. and complete assimilation when immigrants completely abandon their language, cultural traditions, norms, and customs and try to fully assimilate another culture and another language.

Therefore, to assimilate a people is to create a situation or conditions that will contribute to the complete rejection of the customs and traditions of the native people, the native culture, and the native language. It is well known that when the mother tongue is forgotten, which the child learns in family communication, complete cultural and linguistic assimilation takes place and, as a result, a person no longer identifies himself with his native people. But complete assimilation

indicates that there has been a complete sociolinguistic adaptation of the individual to the conditions of the new society.

The above testifies to the fact that language is the basis of national dignity and a manifestation of national consciousness. The national language preserves the ethnos in conditions of constant life in a foreign national environment, in conditions of immigration. But, speaking of Ukrainian immigrants in a new unfamiliar country, it must be considered the fact that it is very important for them not only to preserve their national identification, but also to adapt to their stay in a new country, adapt to a new way of life, new laws, and norms of life, learn a new culture and local traditions, and become full members of the society in which they find themselves. Language is not only a given system of means of cognition... it is simultaneously a way of creating aesthetic and moral ideals. For Ukrainians in Canada, English is not only a tool for adaptation to the new political and social environment.

For each of the four waves of Ukrainian immigration to Canada, the Ukrainian language as a native language and English as a language of communication and a means of adaptation to a new environment performed mainly different functions for Ukrainian immigrants. The Ukrainian language, as a mother tongue, for most immigrants from Ukraine performs communicative, ethno-preserving, identifying functions. The English language, which is necessary for the full existence of Ukrainian immigrants in Canada, contributes to their fastest adaptation to new conditions of life and performs communicative, integrative, and cultural functions. This is the distribution of functions between the two languages, in which Ukrainians communicated throughout their stay in Canada, contributed not to complete assimilation, including language, of Ukrainian immigrants, but rather to cultural exchange, which is the best form of intercultural coexistence. In this case, two cultures, Ukrainian and Canadian, almost coexist and mutually enrich each other.

Cultural exchange can even take place between two languages. For example, in the first years of the stay of Ukrainian settlers on Canadian soil, situations for full and adequate communication in English were limited. Ukrainian settlers, who were mostly poorly educated, created isolated settlements where the traditional cultural system of Ukrainian peasant life was preserved, the language of communication was Ukrainian, and it was sufficient to solve all the problems of the settlement.

The second wave of Ukrainian emigration in the interwar period had the opportunity to join already existing emigrant organizations. Bilingual Ukrainian-English education programs for children and youth contributed to the implementation of the provisions of the concept of multiculturalism in Canada, which later received the name the concept of Canadian multiculturalism. Even though the Ukrainian community made a lot of efforts to preserve the Ukrainian language among its representatives, there were rare cases when the Ukrainian language was not a priority in education in some Ukrainian families, so children in these families did not understand it very well and did not always have a good opportunity to learn the native language even in Ukrainian schools due to the language barrier between children born in Canada and teachers who came to Canada during the second and third waves of emigration.

Activists of the fourth wave stimulate the involvement of newly arrived migrants in the public life of Ukrainians in Canada and promote their activities in any organizations and centers of the Ukrainian community to prevent rapid assimilation and preserve their national identity, namely the use of their native language in the life of the diaspora. Observing sociocultural processes in the modern Ukrainian diaspora, we believe that the Ukrainian language does not lose its main functions and characteristics, but the number of people who speak it most of the time is decreasing.

According to a statistical study, every year approximately 1.2% of Ukrainians stop considering the Ukrainian language as their native language. The main means of communication in various intra-ethnic and extra-ethnic communicative situations is the English language. In the families of Ukrainian immigrants, there is a weakening of national language education and a decline in language skills. This is primarily due to demographic factors, namely mixed marriages,

the increase in geographic mobility of Ukrainian settlers in search of work, and the related dispersion of family and ethnically related people. Some researchers believe that in 2030, if there are no significant changes in the attitude toward the Ukrainian language and its purity among representatives of the Ukrainian community, it may disappear in Canada altogether, giving way to the English language, which will become the only language necessary for communication in any what communicative situations.

As we see, in the conditions of the diaspora, with influential processes of linguistic and cultural assimilation, maximum integration into the linguistic environment of society, family traditions regarding the preservation of the native language play the most important role in the national self-determination of Ukrainian children and youth. At that time, the English language is necessary for a person's full existence in an English-speaking environment, his sociolinguistic adaptation to a foreign-language environment, and for solving the daily problems that make up his life.

Conclusions. Linguistic contact, lingual contact, interlingual contact, or language contact – the interaction of two or more languages, which affects the phonetic and grammatical structure and vocabulary of one or more of these languages. Language contacts are one of the most important features of international communication and exchange of information, a necessary condition for the development of political, cultural, and trade relations between countries and peoples.

The problem of language contact has been relevant and perspective for several decades. This is an interdisciplinary field study that covers a wide range of phenomena and issues of linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociological, and psycholinguistic interactions. That is why it must be studied in a complex.

Language contact is not a homogeneous process, it recurs in several phenomena such as borrowings, bilingualism, code-switching, pidgins, creoles, language shift, and language death. These are the most widespread outcomes of language contact.

The language interactions in Canada as a bilingual country were analyzed. Thus, the Canadian language community is presented by three linguistic groups: Anglophones, Francophones, and Allophones. The English language is a predominant language in Canada, but such a notion as one-sided bilingualism can be stated in Canada.

English influences greatly other minor languages used by immigrants in Canada. Thus, the Ukrainian language, used in immigrant communities is influenced on lexical and grammatical levels.

The language situation that has developed in the diaspora provinces of Canada demonstrates the relevance of bilingualism in multicultural countries, especially immigrant countries, which promotes cultural exchange between two ethnic groups and enables immigrants who find themselves in a new environment to become full members of society.

References:

1. Albo X. Social constraints on Cochabamba Quichua. Ithaca, New York : Cornell University Press, 1970. 448 p.
2. Ansaldo U. Contact languages: ecology and evolution in Asia. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2009. 257 p.
3. Appel R. Language contact and bilingualism. Amsterdam : Amsterdam Academic Archive, 2005. 213 p.
4. Azhniuk B. Movna yednist natsii: diaspora i Ukraina [The linguistic unity of the nation: diaspora and Ukraine]. Kyiv : Ridna mova, 1999. 312 p. [in Ukrainian]
5. Bang J. C., Door J. Language, ecology and society: a dialectical approach. Bloomsbury Academic, 2008. 248 p.
6. Besten H. Roots of Afrikaans: selected writings of Hans Den Besten. Benjamins Publishing, 2012. 458 p.
7. Boberg C. Canadian English. The Canadian Encyclopedia. 2019. URL: https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/canadian-english
8. Clyne M. Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. 282 p.
9. Coetsem V. F. A general and unified theory of the transmission process in language contact. Heidelberg : Carl Winter, 2000. 309 p.
10. Collins Dictionary Online. URL: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/

11. Diebold A. The consequences of early bilingualism in cognitive development and personality formation. The study of personality. An interdisciplinary appraisal. New York, 1966. P. 218–245.

12. Duravetz G. The first wave of Ukrainian immigration to Canada, 1891–1914. *The Ukrainian Canadian magazine*. Toronto, Ontario : Kobzar Publishing, 1988. P. 24–29. URL: https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=story_line&lg=English&fl=0&ex=464&sl=5504&pos=1

13. Fishman J. A. Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry: Definition of the Field and Suggestions for Its Further Development. *Linguistics.* 1964. Vol. 9. P. 32–70.

14. Fishman J. A. Reversing Language Shift. Clevedon, UK : Multilingual Matters, 1991.

15. Gardani F., Arkadiev P., Amiridze N. (eds.). Borrowed Morphology (Language Contact and Bilingualism 8). Berlin, Boston : De Gruyter Mouton, 2015. P. 1–23.

16. Gramley S. The History of English: An Introduction. London : Routledge, 2018. 506 p. URL: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429460272

17. Grosjean F. Life with two languages: an introduction to bilingualism. Cambridge : Mass, 1982. 370 p.

18. Haugen E. Blessings of Babel: bilingualism and language planning: problems and pleasures. Walter de Gruyter, 2012. 185 p.

19. Humeniuk I. Gender markers in the English picture of the world. Wisdom, 2022. Vol. 19 (3). P. 100–114. URL: https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v19i3.506

20. Kandler A., Unger R., Steele J. Language shift, bilingualism, and the future of Britain's Celtic languages. *Philosophical transactions of the royal society B. Biological sciences.* URL: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0051

21. Kemmer S. Loanwords. Major Periods of Borrowing in the History of English. Words in English, 2019. URL: https://www.ruf.rice.edu/~kemmer/Words/loanwords.html

22. Kerswill P. Dialects converging: rural speech in urban Norway. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1994. 181 p.

23. Lakoff G. Metaphors we live by. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.

24. Langacker R. W. Concept, image and symbol: the cognitive basis of grammar. Berlin ; New York, 2002. 366 p.

25. Lefebvre C. Quechua's loss, Spanish's gain. *Language in society*. 1979. Vol. 8. P. 395–407.

26. Matras Y. Language contact. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2012. URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809873

27. Mougeon R., Beniak E. Linguistic consequences of language contact and restriction: the case of French in Ontario, Canada. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1991. 247 p.

28. Mufwene Salikoko S. The ecology of language evolution. Cambridge University Press, 2001. 255 p.

29. Mufwene S. S. Language shift. International encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology. USA : University of Chicago, 2020. URL: http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0357

30. Muysken P. Linguistic dimensions of language contact: the state of the art in interlinguistics. *Revue québécoise de linguistique*. 1984. Vol. 14 (1)б. P. 49–76. URL: https://doi.org/10.7202/602527ar

31. Mykhailenko T. V. Bilingualism as the Key Factor of the Ukrainian Immigrants' Sociolinguistic Adaptation in Canada. *Bulletin of Zhytomyr State University*. 2011. Issue 59. URL: http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/7318/1/vip_59_15.pdf

32. Naim S. L'Aventure des mots arabes venus d'ailleurs: emprunts et pharyngalisation. *Linguistique.* 1998. Vol. 34. P. 91–102.

33. Nordquist R. Learn the function of code-switching as a linguistic term. Glossary of grammatical and rhetorical terms. 2019. URL: https://www.thoughtco.com/code-switching-language-1689858

34. Nordquist R. Definition and examples of language contact. *Glossary of grammatical and rhetorical terms*. 2020. URL: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-language-contact-4046714

35. Olejnik M. Features of the language of the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada: master thesis. Lublin, 2015.

36. Ostler N. Language Maintenance, Shift, and Endangerment. Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2011. P. 315–334.

37. Pauwels A. Language Maintenance and Shift. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2016.

38. Pereira J. Algunnos factores sociales del bilinguismo Quichua-castellano. In I. Almeida (ed.), 1979. P. 95–128.

39. Schuchardt H. Dem Herrn Franz von Miklosich zum 20. Slawo-Deutschesund Slawo Italienisches. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky, 1884.

40. Shields K. Language contact and its outcomes. 2014. URL: https://www.slideshare.net/luvogt/language-contact-and-its-outcomes-kyle-shiells

41. Shindler O. From Ukraine to Canada: let the numbers speak. P&M, 2020. URL: https://petrimazepa.com/iz_ukrainy_v_kanadu_pust_govoryat_cifry

42. Siemund P. Language contact: Constraints and common paths of contact-induced language change. 2008. URL: https://www.academia.edu/38183343/

43. Singleton D. M. Exploring the second language mental lexicon. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1999. 341 p.

44. Siemund P. Language Contact and Contact Languages. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2008. P. 3–11.

45. Sperber D. Claude Levy-Sfrauss. Structuralism and science from Levi-Strauss to Derrida. Oxford University Press, 1979. P. 19–51.

46. Talmy L. Toward a Cognitive Semantics: in 2 vol. Cambridge : The MIT Press, 2000. Vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems. 495 p.

47. Thomason S. G. Language contact, creolization and genetic Linguistics. London : University of California Press, 1988. 412 p.

48. Thomason S. G. On mechanisms of interference. Language and its ecology: essays in memory of Einar Hauge. In S. Eliasson, E. H. Jahr. Walter de Gruyter (eds.), 2011. P. 181–208.

49. Thomason S., Kaufman T. Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics. Berkley : University of California Press, 1988.

50. Thomason S. G. Language Contact: An Introduction. Edinburgh : University Press, 2001.

51. Wei L. Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. In Hornberger N. H. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer, Boston, MA, 2008. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_250

52. Wierzbicka A. Bilingualism and cognition: the perspective from Semantics. Language and Bilingual Cognition. In V. Cook, B. Bassetti (eds.). New York : Psychology Press, 2010. P. 191–218.

53. Winford D. Some issues in the study of language contact. *Journal of Language Contact*. 2007. URL: www.jlc-journal.org

54. Winford D. Languages in contact. Linguistic Society of America. 2022. URL: https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/languages-contact