A Note on Borrowing Constraints: The case of Daman Indo-Portuguese adpositions

J. Clancy Clements

Indiana University-Bloomington

Daman Indo-Portuguese (DamIP) has a unique feature: the adposition *junt* 'with' appears as a postposition with pronominal objects (*dil junt* 'with him') and as a preposition with full NPs (*junt de Paulo* 'with Paulo'). Using three data sources, it is shown that the postposition *junt* is attested starting in the second half of the 19th century and that it is still found in DamIP narratives from the early 2000s. This feature is significant because it suggests that speakers of DamIP speakers borrowed a structural property (the postposition of an adposition) without having borrowed a postposition from Gujarati (the substrate and adstrate language) that would serve as a model. This is important because it represents a clear counterexample to constraints on borrowing proposed by King (2000) and implied in the contact intensity-sensitive borrowing scale proposed by Thomason & Kaufman (1988).

Key words: Daman Indo-Portuguese, prepositions, postpositions, structural borrowing, constraints on borrowing

1. Introduction

In the research on language contact, there have been proposals stating that certain parts of a language's grammar are impervious to contact-induced change through interference. In this note, we focus on the borrowing of a structural property by speakers of one language from another language. Specifically, I ask whether a structure from one language can be borrowed into another without borrowing the corresponding lexical items first. Put another way, can speakers borrow a structure into their language from another language without having borrowed lexical items from that language that have the same structure?

The DamIP data suggests that borrowing a structure but not the lexical items that have that structure is, indeed, possible. After providing relevant historical background in section 2, in section 3 the phenomenon in the northern-most Indo-Portuguese varieties (those in Daman and Diu) is described and the data is presented and discussed. In section 4, a constraint on borrowing that has been proposed in the literature is presented; it is then argued that the data from

DamIP represents a counterexample to this constraint. Final remarks are given in section 5.

2. Some historical background

In contrast to the fairly rapid establishment of Portuguese settlements elsewhere on the west coast of India, it took the Portuguese more than 50 years to establish Daman as Portuguese. They began their efforts in 1529, but it was not until 1581 that Daman was granted the rights and privileges of a Portuguese city (Moniz 1923: 25). In the 18th century, when the Marathas took over various cities of the Portuguese Northern Province in 1740, they allowed the Portuguese to keep Goa, Diu, and Daman. Thereafter Daman became a secondary administrative presence in the Portuguese empire, but continued to function as a cultural and commercial center up until the mid-20th century. When Daman, along with Diu and Goa, was taken over by the Indian government in 1961, it was made a federal territory that answers directly to the federal government. Although the Portuguese governmental presence existed in Daman only up until 1961, an unmistakable Portuguese influence has continued there until today. This is so because of the Catholic religion of the people, many of whom up until the early 2000s still worshipped in the Portuguese language, and because of the English-medium Catholic schools that taught Portuguese as a subject until 1993 and again starting in 2000. In the early 2000s, children also studied Portuguese in private classes (Clements & Koontz-Garboden 2002). A further link to Portugal exists because Damanese living in Portugal routinely return to Daman to visit friends and relatives. Incidentally, these same factors also support the presence of Portuguese in Diu (Cardoso 2007).

In the Daman Christian community, a largely two-language contact situation (DamIP, Gujarati) prevailed until the 20th century. A small but relevant example of Gujarati influence in DamIP is the extension of meaning: Portuguese *pe* 'foot' historically referred to, and continues to refer to, the foot below the ankle whereas in DamIP *pe* refers to the foot and leg, as it does in Gujarati. In the 20th century, English began to play an ever more prominent role in the Daman Catholic parochial schools, and in church services.

Interestingly, there are two DamIP lectal varieties in Daman, most notable in the pronominal system and the use of some verb forms (Clements 2014). The more acrolectal variety is closer linguistically to the DiuIP, while the more basilectal variety is particular to Daman and spoken predominantly in the neighborhood of Badrapur in Big Daman.

As for the status of DamIP, it is an in-group oral language used among the Daman Christians. Given the centuries-long contact between DamIP and Gujarati, it is not surprising that some structures from Gujarati, which is an SOV postpositional language, are part of DamIP, as is the case with the comitative *junt* 'with'.

As we will see in the next section, an interesting side note is that Daman and Diu share the trait of postpositional *junt* 'with'. As noted by Cardoso (2009: 23), the connection between Daman and Diu is linked to their geographical proximity and to the fact that they have always been part of the same political unit. During the existence of the *Estado da Índia*, the Portuguese State of India, both were part of the same administrative unit of the *Província do Norte* 'Northern Province'. As noted above, after 1961 Daman and Diu became part of the Union Territory. Because the two communities were relatively close to one another, the practice of intermarriage was very common. And it is common for inhabitants of Daman to live and work in Diu, and vice versa. There have also been many Damanese living in Diu for official duties. I personally know a member of the Daman community who worked in Diu as a police officer for several years. Given the closeness of the two communities, the Indo-Portuguese varieties spoken in the two communities are very similar. They are mutually intelligible to the extent that Dalgado (1902-03) considered them both subdialects of the northern variety of Indo-Portuguese.

3. The phenomenon and the data

The phenomenon is that although DamIP, as well as DiuIP, are prepositional languages, they both have one postposition, DamIP *junt* 'with' (and *jũt* in DiuIP). Regarding DiuIP, Cardoso (2009: 134) states that '[o]ne adposition sometimes contradicts the canonical PREP + NP word order: *jũt də* 'COMITATIVE' sometimes occurs in a *(də)* + NP + *jũt* construction.'. He cites the example in (1), and adds that there is variation in the placement of *jũt* in DiuIP.

(1) *mĩ*   *jũ*   *nã*   *te*   *muyt*   *diŋer*   *nã*   *te.*

1s.OBL   together   NEG.CL EXS.NPST   much   money   NEG.CL EXS.NPST

'I don't have much money.' [lit. with me/next to me there isn't much money] in Cardoso (2009: 134)

In DamIP, the distribution seems to be more predictable based on the data consulted. The data comes from three sources: 1) data taken from Dalgado (1902-03); 2) from stories collected by me in the early 2000s; 3) data from a data collection task, carried out in the early 2000s by me.

First, it is important to mention that *junt* in DamIP is still found in the narratives with the interpretation 'to, next to, near to', as shown in the example in (2), taken from one of the stories collected.

(2) | *Amya* | *vi* | *ɔs,* | *yo* | *kontan* | *es* | *istɔr.* | *Bẽ.* |
     | tomorrow | come | 2SG.FAM | 1SG | telling | this | story | well |

   | *Jafoy* | **junt** | **də.su** | **mulyer,** | *kunto* | *istɔr* | *tud* | *asĩ.* |
   | went | to/near | of | his | wife | told | story | all | like.that |

   'You come tomorrow and I'll tell this story. So, he went to his wife and told [her] the whole story.'

In DamIP, *junt* also appears with *ko* 'with' with the meaning 'together', as shown in (3).

(3) | *Barel,* | *trəze* | *ũ* | *mətkə* | *vi* | **ko** | **tamp** | **junt** |
     | earthen jar | bring | one | earthen.jar | come | with | lid | together |

   'Earthen jar, bring an earthen jar with a lid on it.'

Regarding *junt* with the comitative reading 'with', the first data source is Dalgado (1902-03). Using singular instances as examples, he notes that while *commig* (< Ptg. *comigo* 'with me') is occasionally encountered in DamIP, *min junt* 'with me', *d'oss junt* 'with you' are much more commonly found. The lexical elements of the postpositional phrase *minh junt* 'with me' come from Portuguese *mim* 'me'/*minha* 'my.FEM' + *junto (de)* 'next to, near to'; those of the phrase *d'óss junt* 'with you' come from Portuguese *de* 'of' + *vós* '2PL'/*vosso* '2PL-POSS' + *junt*. The postpositional phrase structure is clearly based on that of the substrate/adstrate language, Gujarati: *mārī sāthē* [lit. my with] 'with me', *tamārī sāthē* [lit. your with] 'with you' (Dave 1995).

Elsewhere, Dalgado (1902-03) states that "[a] preposição *junt* rege o complemento pronominal antes de si, isto é, torna-se pospositiva: *ficou d'óss junt* = fiquei junto de vós (convosco). Também *minh junt* = junto de mim, comigo …". It is important to highlight that the comitative reading of DamIP *junt* 'with' and DiuIP *jũt* with' is an innovation. In Portuguese, *junto (de)* had

and has the meanings 'near, beside', and 'together' when appearing with *com* 'with', similar to what we find in example (3) in DamIP.

The second data source is the many stories collected by me in the early 2000s. In these narratives, the only postposition found is *junt* 'with' with the same constraint. That is, *junt* appears as a postposition with pronouns, and as a preposition with full NPs. This is shown in Table 1, in which the 1SG is used for purposes of illustration.

Table 1: DamIP *junt* with pronominal objects and with full NP objects

Pers./Num.	with pronoun	with full noun phrase
1SG	*minh junt*	
2SG.INFORM	*d'os junt*	
2SG.FORM	*d'use junt*	
3SG.MASC	*d'il junt*	*junt de Paulo* (**de Paulo junt*)
3SG.FEM	*d'el junt*	*junt de Mercy* (**de Mercy junt*)
1PL	*d'nos junt*	
2PL	*d'usez junt*	
3PL	*d'illot/d'ez junt*[1]	*junt de Paulo e Mercy*

The third source of data is from an elicitation task carried out with a DamIP native speaker who assisted me in recording and transcribing the stories in DamIP. In the stories collected in the early 2000s, *junt* 'with' always appears as a postposition with pronouns, as described by Dalgado and shown in Table 1. All other adpositions always appear as prepositions. The questions that arise are: why does only *junt* appear as a postposition? And, apart from *junt*, can other DamIP adpositions be used as postpositions?

Regarding the first question, the structure of the postpositional phrase, as noted above, is most likely taken from Gujarati: Gujarati is an OV language that only has postpositions and postpositions take the genitive or possessive case. Thus, *māri sāthē* 'with me' literally translate as 'my with'. There are no clear answers to the question of why *junt* has become a postposition in DamIP. No sound correspondences exist between DamIP *junt* and Gujarati *sāthē*. Nevertheless, there are some possibilities. There exists one sound correspondence between DamIP *junt* 'beside, near' and Gujarati *bājumām* 'beside' and *najika* 'near': these elements all share the sound [dʒ] but even with this sound correspondence, it does not account for the comitative interpretation of *junt*. Thus, this question remains a topic for further research.

---

[1] *Ilot* is the more basilectal form, *ez* is the more acrolectal form.

As for the second question, of whether other DamIP adpositions can be used as postpositions, I carried out an elicitation task with the afore-mentioned native DamIP speaker. Given that *junt* appears as a postposition predominately with the 1SG pronoun in the historical texts and in stories I recorded, I elicited grammaticality judgments for the compound adpositions containing *de* (phonetically [də]) with the 1SG pronoun, i.e., *mi* [miŋ] 'my'. The adpositions are listed in Table 2.[2]

Table 2: Adpositions for which judgments were elicited

Adpositions	
ant də 'before'	*isim də* 'above'
bash də 'under, below'	*junt də* 'with, near, from'
dəpəy də 'after'	*lad də* 'beside'
dent də 'inside'	*rrib də* 'above, on top of'
fɔr də 'outside	

The phrases for which I elicited grammaticality judgments are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Phrases for which grammaticality judgments were elicited

PREPOSITION	**POSTPOSITION**
ant də mi 'before me'	*mi ant* 'ditto'
bash də mi 'under/below me'	*mi bash* 'ditto'
dəpəy də mi 'after me'	*mi dəpəy* 'ditto'
dent də mi 'inside me'	*mi dent* 'ditto'
fɔr də mi 'outside'	*mi fɔr* 'ditto'
isim də mi 'above me'	*mi isim* 'ditto'
junt də mi 'with, near, from me'	*mi junt* 'ditto'
lad də mi 'beside me'	*mi lad* 'ditto'
rrib də mi 'above me'	*mi rrib* 'ditto'

Asked about the grammaticality (that is, acceptability) of the phrases with *mi* in both columns 1 and 2 in Table 3, the DamIP consultant unequivocally accepted all phrases. This was unexpected since in all the narratives I collected and in those from Dalgado (1902-03), no adposition apart from *junt* appears as a postposition.

Thus, although DamIP *junt* is the only adposition that systematically appears as a postposition with pronouns, it turns out that at least one native DamIP finds that all the compound adpositions in Table 3 can be used as both prepositions and postpositions. As to why *junt* is the only adposition in the

---

[2] The adpositions *nə* 'in, at, on' and *də* 'of, from' do not allow postposing under any circumstances. Thus, they do not appear in the list in Table 2.

narratives and in Dalgado's (1902-03) collected data, there is as yet no straightforward answer to the question. However, it is remarkable that the postpositional structure shown by *junt* has been borrowed without having borrowed any postpositions from Gujarati that would serve as a model. This turns out to be important for understanding how borrowing takes place, which is taken up in the next section.

4. Broader significance of the DamIP Portuguese-origin postposition for constraints on borrowing

With regard to whether the borrowing of an element or a structure from one language into another is constrained or blocked, Moravcsik's (1978) response is affirmative; she proposes various constraints on borrowing. The ones that are of interest in the present context are given in (4).

(4) a. A bound morpheme cannot be borrowed until some lexical items containing the morpheme in question have also been borrowed.

b. A preposed grammatical item (prefix or preposition) may not be borrowed as a postposed one, and vice versa.

These two constraints have as a prerequisite that if borrowing takes place, the borrowed feature has to be attached to some phonological content, whether it be a lexical item or a grammatical element. King (2000) extends this idea: she proposes that the direct borrowing of a grammatical feature from a source language, such as the postplacement of an adposition in an otherwise prepositional language, cannot take place directly, but rather can only take place after a lexical item with the relevant syntactic properties is borrowed. That is, a lexical item with a corresponding structural property borrowed by the receptor-language speakers would introduce the property (i.e., order of adpositions relative to their NP) into the borrowing language and this, in turn, would then make the possibility of incorporating the structural feature available to be borrowed by the receptor-language speakers. The existence of the postposition *junt* 'with' is a counterexample to this constraint, as is the data from the above-mentioned elicitation task in Table 3.

Thomason & Kaufman (T&K) (1988) propose a different approach to borrowing and possible constraints. They link this to the level of contact intensity among speakers of communities in contact. In their chapter 2 (1988:

87

13-34), they discuss various constraints on borrowing, including those proposed by Moravcsik (1978), and find counterexamples for each one. They then state (1988: 35): "Ultimately, all the proposed structural constraints … fail because linguistic interference is conditioned in the first instance by social factors, not linguistic ones. Both the direction of interference and the extent of interference are socially determined; so, to a considerable degree, are the kinds of features transferred from one language to another." T&K propose a borrowing scale with five degrees of contact intensity among members of language communities. At each level there is a greater likelihood of extensive borrowing.

With regard to the DamIP case, at their Level 3 of borrowing intensity, T&K (1988: 75) state that "postpositions may be borrowed into an otherwise prepositional language (or vice versa)."

At Level 5, "changes in word structure rules" are found (1988: 75). That is, instead of VO there may be OV default structure, or instead of prepositions, there may be postpositions. One way to interpret T&K's borrowing scale is that one would expect in a borrowing language the presence of borrowed postpositions (Level 3) before the speakers of that borrowing language apply a structural rule that changes prepositions to postpositions (Level 5). However, what we have in DamIP is that a structural property has been borrowed without having borrowed a lexical or grammatical element with the relevant structural property. In order words, with specific reference to DamIP's postposition, it seems that the borrowing intensity is at a Level 5, without displaying in this particular instance the Level 3 of contact intensity. If this is the case, why would it be so? The answer to this question is most likely complex and will have to remain for now a question for future research.

5. Concluding remarks

DamIP and DiuIP are two highly re-structured Indo-Portuguese varieties that have been in contact with Portuguese in varying degrees of intensity since the 16th century. Both DamIP and DiuIP are in-group languages and all speakers of these varieties also speak Gujarati, and many also speak English and other languages. The focus of this brief note has been on the placement of the adposition *junt* 'with' in DamIP, which appears as a postposition with pronominal objects but as a preposition with full NPs. I used three sources of DamIP data to show that this structural property of *junt* goes as far back as the later half of the 19th century in DamIP. The sources of data strongly indicate that DamIP contains no borrowed postpositions from the adstrate language, Gujarati.

That is, speakers of DamIP borrowed a structural property (the postposition of an adposition) without having borrowed a postposition from Gujarati that would serve as a model. This is important because it represents a clear counterexample to King's (2000) claim that the borrowing of a structural property cannot take place unless the borrowing language speakers have also borrowed an element (lexical or grammatical) with the relevant structural property. It also seems to be a counterexample to the contact intensity-sensitive borrowing scale proposed by T&K (1988).

Two questions will remain for future research: 1) why did *junt* 'with' become a postposition in DamIP and not other adpositions, and 2) why is it that DamIP borrowed a structural property without having borrowed a corresponding grammatical element (i.e., a postposition) with the relevant structural property.

References

Cardoso, Hugo C. 2007. Linguistic traces of colonial structure. In Eric A. Anchimbe (ed.), *Linguistic identity in postcolonial multilingual spaces*, 164-181. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cardoso, Hugo C. 2009. *The Indo-Portuguese language of Diu.* Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2014. Lectal differences in Daman Indo-Portuguese. *Revista de Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola* 5. 115–156.

Clements, J. Clancy & Andrew Koontz-Garboden. 2002. Two Indo-Portuguese creoles in contrast. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 17. 191–236.

Dalgado, Sebastião Rodolfo. 1902-03. Dialecto Indo-Português de Damão. *Ta-ssi-yang Kuo* (Lisbon) 3. 359–367 (1902); 4. 515–523 (1903).

Dave, Jagdish. 1995. *Colloquial Gujarati.* London/New York: Routledge.

King, Ruth E. 2000. *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French case study*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Moniz, A. F. 1923. *Notícias e documentos para a história de Damão: Antiga província do norte*, Vol. I. Bastora: Tip. Rangel.

Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Language contact. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language*, vol. 1, 93–122. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrance Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.