

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229586168>

# Code-switching with English: Types of switching, types of communities

Article in *World Englishes* · February 2007

DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1989.tb00673.x

---

CITATIONS

41

READS

3,890

---

1 author:



Carol Myers-Scotton

Michigan State University

96 PUBLICATIONS 3,253 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



I do not have time to send you any of my older publications. If you want them, you will have to get them yourselves. I did not sign on to supply you with my publications.  
[View project](#)



It doesn't belong to any project. It is just the latest article/book chapter that deals with the 4-M model. [View project](#)

## Codeswitching with English: types of switching, types of communities

CAROL MYERS-SCOTTON\*

- Jones, W. and Stewart, W. (1951) Bilingualism and verbal intelligence. *British Journal of Psychology*, **4**, 3-8.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1978) Code mixing as a communicative strategy in India. In *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*. Edited by J. E. Alatis. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 107-124.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1983) On mixing. In *The Indianization of English: the English Language in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 193-207.
- Kahane, Henry and Kahane, Renée (1979) Decline and survival of Western prestige languages. *Language*, **55**, 183-198.
- Nkonko, M. (1987) The pragmatics of code mixing with English: the case of African languages. Paper read at the Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 17-18 April.
- Kanwangamalu, Nkonko M. (1989) Code-mixing across languages: structure, functions and constraints. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- MacNamara, J. (1967) The bilingual's linguistic performance: a psychological overview. *Journal of Social Issues*, **23**, 58-77.
- McClure, Erica (1977) Aspects of code switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children. *Georgetown Round Table on Language and Linguistics, 93-115*.
- McLaughlin, B. (1978) Second Language Acquisition in Childhood. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mkilifi, Abdulaziz M. (1978) Triangulation and Swahili-English bilingualism in Tanzania. In *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*. Edited by J. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 129-149.
- Pandharipande, Rakeshwar (1983) Mixing and creativity in multilingual India. *SLS*, **13**(2), 99-115.
- Pandit, Ira (1985) *Mixed Hindi-English Code Switching: Mixed Hindi-English*. Delhi: Datta Book Centre.
- Pfaff, Carol W. (1979) Constraint on language mixing. *Language*, **55**, 291-318.
- Poplack, Shana (1978) Syntactic structure and social function of code switching. In *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*. Edited by R. Duran. New Jersey, pp. 164-184.
- Sesep, N'Sial B. (1978) Le métissage Français-Lingala au Zaïre: essai d'analyse différentielle et sociolinguistique de la communauté bilingue. Unpublished thèse de doctorat de 3ème cycle, Université de Nice, Nice.
- Sridhar, S. N. (1978) On the function of code-mixing in Kannada. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **16**, 99-117.
- Weil, Sheva (1977) Verbal interaction among the Bene Israel. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **13**, 71-85.
- Wu, Yi-an (1985) Code mixing by English-Chinese bilingual teachers of the People's Republic of China. *World Englishes*, **4**, 303-317.

### INTRODUCTION

One purpose of this paper is to explain a type of codeswitching (CS) which is especially common in many parts of the multilingual world but which heretofore has been largely neglected or only vaguely characterized. A second purpose is to show how different types of switching patterns can be used to identify different types of bilingual communities. Such switching is of interest in this volume because English is typically one of its components in those parts of the multilingual world where English is a former colonial language and possibly still an official language and/or a medium of education (such as in parts of Southeast Asia or in Anglophone Africa). This type of switching is defined here as CS as the unmarked choice. It is illustrated in (1) and (2). Note the convention followed in all examples is that codeswitched words are in capital letters while borrowed words are *underlined*.

- (1) A woman school teacher in Western Kenya is being interviewed by a male teacher about activities at her school. Both are native speakers of Lwidaiko, the matrix language used, with switches to English.  
 Interviewer: Na usuvila inyigii yindi mivisa mutiskhu ku-COMPETITION  
 ('Do you think there is a time you'll be able to go for competitions?')  
 Teacher: YES, khuchelitsong BECAUSE I'M TELLING THE HEADMASTER TO TRY HARD BECAUSE vana yava kenyekhangaa JOIN-khu mu-extra-curricular activities AT LEAST va-LOOK-khu LIKE OTHER SCHOOLS. Vani LIKE IN ENCLOSURE WHERE THEY ARE NOT EXPOSED OUTSIDE SO va-FEELA-khu SORROW. I AM HOPING SOON khutsa khuvangitsa the choir club AND MORE ESPECIALLY FOR COMPETITION PURPOSES.  
 ('Yes, we are trying because I'm telling the headmaster to try hard because our students are supposed to be given the chance to join extra-curricular activities, at least to look like other schools. Here they are like in (an) enclosure where they are not exposed outside so they feel sad. I am hoping soon we will start the choir club and more especially for competition purposes.')
- (2) A Kikuyu businessman in Nairobi is telling a Kenyan from another ethnic group about how his father started his charcoal business. Swahili is the matrix language with switches to English.  
 Businessman: Baba alijenga kibanda kidogo—JUST A SHED AND STARTED kazi yake mwenyewe ya kuiza makaa. Wengi walichukua kazi hii kuwa DIRTY AND BAD FOR HEALTH. Lakini huyu mzee wangu a-li-CHOOSE TO RISK HIS LIFE TO DO THIS WORK ('Father built a little shed—just a shed and started his work himself of selling charcoal. Many took this work to be dirty and bad for (the) health. But my father chose to risk his life to do this work.')
- Businessman (later): Kazi yetu tunasimama mimi na ndugu yangu mwengine. Tu-me EMPLOY wafanyakizi wengi . . .  
 ('We oversee the business (work) me and my other brother. We employ many workers . . .')

\*Linguistics Program, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA.

This paper will argue that in such conversations, individual switches (i.e. points at which switches occur) do not carry any special social message. Rather, it is the overall pattern of using two languages which conveys social meaning. And the message is that the participants have shared and simultaneous membership in two social identities, those symbolized by each of the languages used. This type of switching differs at a number of levels from other codeswitching, it will be argued: in terms of structural constraints, in social meaning conveyed, and in the type of community where the switching may occur. Note that some [e.g.] Kachru (1978), Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) and Bokamba (1988) differentiate codeswitching (as intersentential) from codemixing (CM) (as intrasentential). Bokamba (1988: 24) writes, "the two phenomena make different linguistic and psycholinguistic claims . . . (codeswitching) does not require the integration of the rules of the two languages involved in the discourse, whereas codemixing does." It is likely that switching within a sentence vs switching at a sentence boundary makes different cognitive demands. However, I claim that because *both* intra- and intersentential switches can occur as part of the same conversational turn, with both serving the same social function, the CM vs CS distinction is poorly motivated. Both types occur with CS as the unmarked choice.

### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In order to make an argument about CS in general and this type of CS in particular, I begin with an overall markedness model (Scotton, 1983) of the interpersonal use of linguistic choices as negotiations of identity. My premise is that code choice is always indexical of the social relationships between speaker and addressee. That is, at some level (and typically a subconscious level) speakers make the code choices they do to negotiate relationships in the current talk exchange.

In order for this to be so, a natural theory of markedness and indexicality is assumed as part of the communicative competence faculty of all humans. This theory underlies speakers' ability to assign to specific code choices readings of markedness for a specific exchange. Arising from innate speaker competence must be the knowledge that, for a particular conventionalized exchange in one's community, a certain code choice will index an expected rights and obligations set between participants. This code will be the unmarked choice for that exchange. Other codes will be more or less marked in that exchange, meaning their use will convey a negotiation for something other than the unmarked balance of rights and obligations. Speakers use their tacit knowledge of readings of markedness (is the code unmarked for this exchange or for another exchange?) to interpret the social meaning of any choice in any exchange.

Speaking of choices as marked or not assumes they take place in a normative framework. Through the weight of frequency of its use for a particular interpersonal balance in a particular exchange, a code becomes associated with encoding that balance. Speakers abstract this information through exposure to use, and their theory of markedness enables them to assign this code the status of unmarked choice to index the particular rights and obligations balance in a particular talk exchange. Making the unmarked choice, then, becomes a matter of following community norms. Put another way, making the unmarked choice is normative behavior because it communicates the expected balance of rights and obligations between participants.

Other choices become perceived as marked for this exchange because they are infrequent and therefore unexpected. It follows that marked choices communicate negotiations for an unexpected balance of rights and obligations between participants. A marked choice,

therefore, always calls for a move from the expected relationship of participants, a readjustment of the expected social distance which would hold between them. Markedness is a gradient, not a categorical, concept. One choice is more unmarked than others; and, among marked choices, some are more marked than others. Further, the same choice need not be equally marked for all participants in the same exchange.

Yet while a normative framework is needed to make sense out of linguistic choices, to assign relative markedness to choices, norms do not determine choices. Since all members of the same speech community have similar markedness readings (i.e. they all have identical markedness models permitting them to abstract markedness judgments based on exposure to language use in their community), they make similar interpretations of the intended indexicality of a given code choice in a specific exchange; in other words, they perceive in the same way its meaning as a negotiation of a particular balance of rights and obligations. Therefore, what norms do is give speakers an indication of the consequences of their choices.

But speakers, not norms, make choices. If speakers make the unmarked choice, that is, the expected balance of rights consequence will be a negotiation of the status quo, that is, the expected balance of rights and obligations. If speakers make marked choices, they will be interpreted as negotiations away from the expected, encoding either more or less social distance between participants than would be the norm, given the social identity factors of the participants (e.g. status, sex, age) which are salient in that speech community for that context. Thus, code selection is a dynamic process, driven by individual motivations, but with consequences which can be anticipated.

Empirical verification of these claims is both appropriate and possible. The model predicts the unmarked choice will be the most frequent in a conventionalized exchange since it is normative.

Quantitative evidence supporting the existence of such choices can be found in Scotton (1972), which reports on language use patterns in Kampala, Uganda, showing that speakers form a consensus in overwhelmingly using one language rather than others in certain conventionalized exchanges such as interethnic conversations at work. And Scotton (1987) discusses quantitative data showing that a particular discourse pattern and particular directive structures are most frequent (and therefore unmarked) for the conventionalized exchange of direction-giving on an American university campus, regardless of such social identity factors as sex and age.

Further, the markedness model can be applied to other data sets on a predictive basis, although I have not yet attempted to do this. Some predictions are motivated by findings in other sociolinguistic studies. For example, an obvious prediction is that social groups shown to be more linguistically conservative in a community (perhaps women) would make more unmarked choices for a particular exchange than men. Another prediction is that those speakers who have the potential for upwards mobility (having youth, high education, the 'right' ethnic group membership, etc.) will make more attempts to negotiate their position upwards and therefore will make more marked choices than other speakers in those exchange types allowing status-raising.

To summarize the key points in the markedness model:

- (a) An innate markedness theory underlies a therefore universal ability to use code selection indexically. This theory is part of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972).
- (b) But the details of each speaker's actual markedness readings are speech-community-specific since they are filled in through exposure to language in use.
- (c) An unmarked choice communicates a normative or expected balance of rights and obligations between participants in a given conventionalized exchange.
- (d) Which choice is unmarked depends on the balance of rights and obligations for that exchange. In turn, this

balance depends on which situational features are salient in the specific exchange. (For example, certain social identity features, such as socioeconomic status, may be salient in one exchange, but not in another.)  
 (e) Therefore, no single unmarked choice exists, but rather the unmarked choice varies across exchanges.  
 (f) The unmarked choice for any exchange can be identified as the most frequent choice for the exchange; that is, frequency is synonymous with unmarkedness. This frequency is motivated by speakers' desires for predictable outcome (i.e. to maintain the status quo).  
 (g) Speakers need not choose the unmarked choice. They will make marked choices when attempting to negotiate balances of rights and obligations other than the expected one.

### CS WITHIN THE MARKEDNESS MODEL

Under the markedness model, there are four related motivations for changes in code within a single conversation. CS is defined here as the speaker-motivated use of two or more linguistic varieties (language, dialects or styles) in the same conversation.

#### *Sequential unmarked choices*

This pattern consists of a switch from one unmarked choice to another one when external forces (e.g. a new participant, a new topic) alter the expected balance of rights and obligations and therefore the relative markedness of one code vs another. Having originally made an unmarked choice, speakers wishing to maintain the status quo switch to a new unmarked choice when circumstances change. Blom and Gumperz (1972: 424) refer to this type as situational switching; but highlighting its markedness component better relates it to other types of switching. Making sequential unmarked choices is common in all communities. Note, however, that, strictly speaking, such a strategy is not CS as defined in this paper (i.e. speaker-motivated) since the initial motivation for the change of varieties is a change in the components of the interaction.

Example (3) illustrates sequences of unmarked choices in East Africa, with English as a component. A school principal who speaks English and Swahili in addition to his first language is in Nairobi on a visit. He wishes to call on a friend working for a large automobile sales and repair establishment. While speaking to the guard at the gate, he uses Swahili as an unmarked choice; but once inside the office, he switches to English as the unmarked choice there.

(3) Guard (Swahili): Unapenda nikusaidie namma gani?

(In what way do you want me to help you?)

Ningependa kumwona Peter Mbaya.

(I would like to see Peter Mbaya.)

Bwana Peter hayuko saa hii. Ingia na uende kwa office ya inquiries na umongojo.

Atarudi.

(Mr. Peter isn't here right now. Go inside to the inquiry office and wait for him. He'll return.)

Receptionist (English): Good morning. Can I help you?

Principal (English): Good morning. I came to see Mr. Mbaya.

Receptionist (English): He is out but will soon be here. Have a seat and wait for him.

#### *Switching as an unmarked choice*

When participants are bilingual peers, the unmarked choice may be switching, but with no changes at all in setting, participants, topic, or any other situational feature. That is, for ingroup communication—especially in an informal setting—the pattern of alternating between two varieties may be unmarked. The motivation is the same as when a single code is the unmarked choice. Remember that the unmarked choice indexes a speaker's normative position in a balance of rights and obligations. When the unmarked state of affairs is simultaneous participation in two rights and obligations balances, each associated with a different social identity, speakers switch between two codes, each one

being unmarked in the specific context for one of the identities. The overall pattern of switching is the major social message (i.e. dual identities) in this type of switching; each individual switch point need have no social significance at all.

Having two or more social identities is a universal condition; what is less common is having a separate linguistic variety associated with each identity. A discussion of whether this is a stable condition or only transitory as a stage in language shift and what social conditions promote which result is beyond the scope of this paper. The point being made here is that such CS is common in today's world, even though it has largely been ignored or written off as a 'broken' variety.

Examples (1) and (2) have already illustrated this type of switching. More examples follow, (4) showing extrasyntactical switching and (5) and (6) involving intrasyntactical (especially intra-word) switching. Although the transcript does not show it, there are no hesitation phenomena and no change in the stress pattern.

(4) A school principal from Western Kenya is in Nairobi visiting a friend who is an administrator at the Government Printer. Their conversation has been in their shared mother tongue, Lwidakho, when a telephone call interrupts them.

Administrator (English, Lwidakho):

GABRIEL.  
OH, ELIJAH. Mbulili unwele mwale uvira khulishi?  
(How are you? I heard you were sick.)

YES, WITH HENRY. HE'S BEEN HERE ABOUT AN HOUR.

(to Henry, the principal): WHEN ARE YOU RETURNING?

THE FIRST WEEK OF NEXT MONTH—BEFORE SCHOOLS REOPEN.

(on telephone) Alatsya lisitsa lyukhura mu mweli mwiliya.

(He'll go during the first week of the new month.)

YES, I'LL TELL HIM THAT.

Lakinini, bwana, siku hizi huonekani. Umepotea wapi?

(But, master, you aren't seen these days.)

Where are you lost?

(5) Two University of Zimbabwe students are chatting in their dormitory. Their shared mother tongue, Oramba achi-ngo-DELIBERATE a-ichi-ngo-DELIBERATE a-kwava kuzoti tava kusika pat mu-class tava kutosvika pa-ma-classes.

(She kept on deliberating up to a point when we were about to reach the classrooms.)

Note: At issue is the status of CLASS as a loan word or a switch.

(6) Two Tanzanian graduate students at an American university are chatting about shipping things home when their studies are over. Swahili is the matrix language.

CARPET ni matatizo. Inabidi u-li-SHIP. huwezi kulipeleka kwenye idege kwa sababu ya urefu wake...  
Sisi tunayotaka kumunua ni ki-CLOTH.

(A carpet is problems. You have to ship it. You can't carry it on the plane because of its length . . . What we want to buy is cloth.)

Note: Swahili words for the English switched words are readily available.

#### *CS as a marked choice*

Switching away from the expected, away from the unmarked choice, in a conventionalized exchange is a negotiation to replace the current—and unmarked—rights and obligations set with another one.

Making a marked choice is a common form of CS, a speaker-motivated negotiation to change the social distance in some way. Marked choices to ingroup varieties among group members typically encode solidarity. Quite another effect typically results from switching to varieties associated with education and/or authority. Such switches often encode more social distance between participants, sometimes out of anger or a desire to lower the addressee's or increase one's own status. Because it is associated with authority (either in former colonial regimes or in present governments or educational systems), English is often the language of such a marked switch, especially in the Third World. Note, however, that the indexical message of a code is context-specific, not general as Gumperz (1982) implies it is in his reference to 'we' and 'they' codes. Thus, for example, in some contexts English may encode solidarity, even though it is a second language, such as between highly educated peers. Example (7) illustrates two different marked choices, one to a mother tongue not shared by all (communicating solidarity with the speaker's ethnic group member, but distance from the others) and one to English (communicating authority).

(7) Four young office workers in the same government ministry in Nairobi are chatting. Two are Kikuyu, one is a Kisii and one is a Kalenjin. Swahili-English switching has been the unmarked choice up to the switch to Kikuyu. The conversation about setting up a group 'emergency fund' has been proceeding when the Kikuyus switch to Kikuyu to make a negative comment about what has just been said, a marked choice communicating solidarity between the two Kikuyus but distancing them from others. At this point, the Kisii complains in Swahili and English and the Kalenjin makes a switch from Swahili to a sentence entirely in English, a marked choice, to return the discussion to a more business-like plane.<sup>3</sup>

Andu amwe nimendaga kwaia maundu maria matari na ma namo.

(‘Some people like talking about what they’re not sure of.’)

Wira wa muigi wa kigina ni kuiga mbecca.

(‘The work of the treasurer is only to keep money, not to hunt for money.’)

Ubaya wenu ya Kikuyu ni ku-ASSUME kila mtu anaewela Kikuyu.

(‘The bad thing about Kikuyu is assuming that everyone understands Kikuyu.’)

Kalenjin (Swahili, English): Si intumie lughu ambayo kila mtu hapa atasikia?

(‘Shouldn’t you use a language which every person here understands?’)

(said with some force): WE ARE SUPPOSED TO SOLVE THIS ISSUE.

Marked choices are often flagged, such as by hesitation phenomena or because they involve repetition or special stress. For marked choices to draw attention to themselves is entirely in accord with the social message conveyed: they are negotiations to disidentify with the current balance of rights and obligations in effect. Sometimes marked choices consist only of single words, including what Poplack (1988) characterizes as a 'not just', forms often marked by changes in intonation. These single words negotiate a change in social distance because they are means to enhance the speaker's position in the balance of rights and obligations by invoking the social message associated with the variety of the switch. Therefore, single-word switches to marked codes constitute this type of CS as much as longer stretches from a marked code since they all are bids for change.

#### *CS as an exploratory choice presenting multiple identities*

In non-conventionalized exchanges or simply when meeting someone for the first time and when all the relevant social identity factors of the other person or other situational factors are not known, multiple identities sometimes are presented via CS as an exploratory choice. In these circumstances, since no unmarked choice is obvious, speakers may switch in order to settle upon a code which will be mutually acceptable as the unmarked choice of the exchange. Accepting a code as the basis for the conversation, of course, means accepting the balance of rights and obligations indexed by that code. Example (8) illustrates such switching in a community where English is a frequent component of

exploratory switching. Note that this type of switching highlights the interactional nature of CS as a negotiation of identities; while any speaker can switch to any code to negotiate a particular relationship, for the negotiation to succeed requires that the addressee reciprocate with this code.

(8) A young man has come into the manager's office in a Nairobi business establishment. The manager has been chatting with a friend who is still present. The young man begins in English, but finally switches to Swahili, following the manager's lead. Either language would be a possible choice, but each communicating different relationships. The manager's insistence on Swahili denies the young man's negotiation of the higher status associated with English.

Mr. Muchuki has sent me to you about the job you put in the paper.  
Ulituma barua ya application?  
(‘Did you send a letter of application?’)  
Yes, I did. But he asked me to come to see you today.  
Ikiwa ultuma barua, nenda ungojeo majibu. Tutakuita ulike kwa interview siku itakapofika.  
Asante. Nitangoia majibu.  
(‘Thank you. I’ll wait for the response.’)

CS showing multiple identities in non-conventionalized exchanges is also used as a neutral strategy. Since each code communicates a particular identity in a given situation, when it is unclear which identity offers the speaker the most positive evaluation, the speaker may see CS as a solution (Scotton, 1976; Heller, 1988).

Treating CS under the markedness model offers a principled and parsimonious way to characterize its social meaning. On this view, all CS is a message about the balance of rights and obligations which the speaker expects or desires (or both) for the current talk exchange.<sup>4</sup> The message has four variations: (1) switching as sequential unmarked choices, occurring when situational factors change and therefore change the unmarked balance of rights and obligations for a specific exchange; (2) switching as an unmarked choice, used when indexing the unmarked balance of rights and obligations calls for two linguistic varieties; (3) switching as a marked choice, used to index a negotiation to change the unmarked balance; and (4) switching as an exploratory choice or to establish multiple identity, used in non-conventionalized exchanges when the unmarked balance of rights and obligations is not obvious.

#### CS AS A STRUCTURAL PHENOMENON

It is argued here that, structurally, CS as an unmarked choice typically includes intra-word switches. However, some earlier researchers on CS discounted intra-word forms as ‘true’ CS. For example, Poplack and associates [e.g. Poplack (1988), Poplack and Sankoff (1987), and Poplack *et al.* (1987)] do not accept as switching many instances of forms combining a matrix and an embedded language if these forms include bound morphemes. Rather, they refer to such forms as *nonce borrowings*. These forms are distinguished from true CS, they reason, because they are morphologically integrated into the matrix language. Established borrowings, of course, are often phonologically, morphologically and syntactically integrated into the matrix language. They recognize that nonce forms borrowings differ from established borrowings in occurrence patterns (since nonce forms may occur only once); but they seem to claim that they are more like borrowings than codewords. I argue against this position.

Let us first acknowledge the relationship between CS and borrowing. Both represent normative use in a matrix language of linguistic forms from an embedded language. That is, the entire matrix community recognizes their use as within the range of expected behavior, either for special groups or the entire community. (This is not to claim either phenomenon is positively valued; CS, especially, is often decried by language purists.) Also, their occurrence presupposes social contacts between the communities speaking the matrix and embedded language, at least sufficient for some bilingualism to have resulted for some matrix language speakers. Both CS and borrowing, therefore, carry a macro-level social meaning: contact between speaker groups.

Another relationship between the two phenomenon is as poles on a continuum because the route for some established borrowings to enter the matrix language probably is through their repeated occurrences as codeswitches. CS is likely as a vehicle for core loans (i.e. words for which the matrix language already has its own equivalents).

However, CS and borrowing differ in three related ways. First, while both are normatively sanctioned, it is only under borrowing that specific lexical items from the embedded language are sanctioned. That is, these forms are now part of the lexicon of the matrix language. Under CS, it is only the *behavioral pattern* of using forms from the embedded language which is sanctioned. Second, this distinction has important consequences. Prediction of the potential frequency of borrowed words is part of the speaker's grammar of the matrix language. But what forms from the embedded language will appear in CS is beyond prediction. That is, switched forms do not have the status in the matrix community's lexicon which borrowed forms have. Gardner-Chloros (1984: 102) compares the two in this way: "A loan is a codeswitch with a full-time job." Related to this point, of course, is the fact that borrowed words are available to monolingual speakers of the matrix language but switched forms are not [see also Kachru (1978)].

Third, it follows that only CS, precisely because it does not contain members of a specific set in the matrix language, is able to convey micro-level social meaning in interpersonal negotiations. Consider why CS has this potential role. It is a well-established tenet of sociolinguistics that linguistic forms which are social markers are able to encode social meaning (about social group memberships) because their occurrence across the speech community is variable, not categorical (Labov, 1972). That is, in order for a form to be a social marker and therefore able to carry meaning about the identities of its user (in addition to its referential meaning) the form, or a frequency of use, must be unique to certain speakers only. Once it is part of the entire community's repertoire and/or its frequency is the same across the community, it loses its power to flag only certain groups.

Now, both borrowings and switches can also be social markers and produce macro-level social meanings of group membership. Borrowings can do this if their use, or a certain frequency of their use, is variable across social groups. For example, a certain borrowing may be current only among the educated. And if CS, a specific type of CS, or a certain frequency of CS is specific to certain social groups, it also can be a social marker. But switches show another type of variability setting them off from orthodox social markers, including borrowings. A switched form from the embedded language is not 'available' in the same way as matrix language forms are every time the referential meanings for which they stand come up, as is the case with orthodox social markers. Thus, when a switch to an embedded language form occurs, its appearance—because of its unpredictability—is highlighted in a way that a borrowing's appearance never can be. The message of this highlight is that *something more* than a message of referential meaning or even social group membership is being sent. This highlighting enables CS to signal a

context-specific negotiation of interpersonal relationships.<sup>5</sup> Thus, this paper rejects 'nonce borrowing' as a well-motivated category.<sup>6</sup>

Let us look now specifically at the structural features of CS as an unmarked choice. Such a pattern of CS characterizes a data corpus of 10 hr of interethnic, ingroup conversations audiorecorded in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1983. Eighteen conversations are included, drawn as a random sample from an accidental population of a total of 60 conversations recorded at this time. There are about 70 persons in the sample. The conversations were taped by local African research assistants who were familiar to the participants; they solicited their permission to use the recordings for linguistic research, usually after the recording since speakers typically did not know they were being recorded as they spoke. In line with other purposes of the data collection, the speakers are nonnative Swahili speakers; but their dialect of Swahili definitely approximates Standard Swahili and in no sense is a pidgin even though it shows some neutralizations of morphosyntactic variation and some syntactic innovations. It turned out there is some switching to English in 17 out of the 18 conversations in the sample.

A major methodological issue was separating single-word English words as established borrowings vs CS. If embedded language forms (i.e. English) occurred 3 times and in more than one conversation and also showed gross phonological integration into the matrix language<sup>7</sup>, they were considered borrowings. (Further, *known* established loans were not considered switches, whether or not they met these criteria. It is predicted that in a larger data corpus such forms would be identifiable as borrowings by their frequency.) Note that these criteria refer only to single-word embedded language forms since they are the only problematic ones. Certain other embedded language forms, such as prepositions or conjunctions, may occur very frequently if they are part of longer embedded language switches (e.g. prepositional phrases, clauses or sentences). For example, such forms as *in alikutana naye IN THE OFFICE* 'she met him in the office' are not at issue. If such forms were established borrowings, they would *also* occur as single-word forms and then would be identified as borrowings by their frequency.

As has been the case in many other studies, a large percentage of the Nairobi switches were nouns, 162 or 44% of the 367 switches identified (types only). For example, in a study of Hebrew-Spanish CS, Berk-Seligson (1986) found that 40% of her total of 3777 switches were nouns. Only 15 of the English nouns in the Nairobi corpus were inflected with the Swahili bound morpheme marking Bantu noun classes. That is, most of them occurred as bare forms with no morphological integration, although it could be argued they are perceived as class 9/10 nouns since a zero allomorph is a possible realization of the noun class prefix for this set of classes. The class 6 (plural) prefix *ma*-occurred with 14 of these nouns; half of these also had an English plural marker, as in (9):

(9) ma-GHOSTS 'ghosts'

In sharp contrast to earlier CS data sets, this corpus showed verbs as the second most frequently switched category (99 or 27%). There were 52 inflected finite verbs and 25 inflected infinite forms.

(10) Unaanza ku-BEHAVE kama watu wa huko  
wa-na-vyo-behave  
they-PRES-MANNER-behave  
'You begin to behave as people from there behave.'

(11) Lakini yeye pia akaitaka nyuma a-ka-ni-connect  
he-CONSECUITIVE-me-connect  
mnoja SOLID sana kwa jicho.  
'But he also came from behind and connected to me one solid (punch) on the eye.'

- (12) Sasa kuingia huko natio tukaambiwanga tu-APPLY tena.  
we-SUBJUNCTIVE<sup>8</sup>

'So when we got there we were told we should reapply.'

Whole sentences as CS ( $N=24$ ) and parts of sentences ( $N=5$ ) were the third largest category, but make up only 8% of the data. Thus, the majority of switches were intrasentential, not extrasentential, as was the case with many earlier studies [e.g. Poplack (1979)]; however, these studies may have ignored single-word switches.

Adjectives were the fourth most frequently switched class (26 or 7%). Examples occur as (13) and (14):

- (13) ... Na utakuwa na mambu mengi NEW. Maypa kauka maisha yako.  
things many new

'And you'll have many new things. New in your life.'

- (14) —nikapatu chakula nyigine iko GREY ni-ka-i-TASTE I-CONSECUITIVE-it-taste

nikaona i-na TASTE LOUSY sana.

it-with taste lousy very

'—And I got some more food that was grey and I tasted it and thought it had a very lousy taste.'

Example (13) shows an English adjective, *new*, following Swahili word order. Further, its occurrence cannot be accounted for as filling a temporary lexical gap (how one might characterize nonce borrowings if they did exist) since the speaker clearly has available the Swahili word for 'new' (*majya*), demonstrated by the fact it is used as the next word.

Example (14) is especially important because it shows several supposedly prohibited structures (according to earlier views expressed by many researchers). Of the proposed constraints, those taken the most seriously seem to have been the free morpheme constraint and equivalence constraints put forth in Poplack (1979). The verb form [as do those verbs under (10)–(12) above] violates the free morpheme constraint since bound morphemes are involved in the switch. The NP *taste lousy sana* violates the equivalence constraint since the adjective *lousy* follows Swahili word order [as does *new* in example (13)]; this constraint disallows switching where the surface structures of the two languages are not equivalent. Note that these NP switches do not violate the 'dual structure principle' of Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) which basically states that what they refer to as codemixing must follow the matrix language's rules. Bokamba (1988) offers a full discussion of proposed structural constraints, concluding that none of them hold across all languages.

In fact, examples violating stated structural constraints are not hard to find. Several follow in (15):

- (15a) Ta RANG-is DOORBELL-i.  
'He/she rang the doorbell.' [Five-year old boy conversing with his sister who is also bilingual.]

[Vilman, 1985: 12]. Estonian-English.]

- (15b) I HAVE WIDELY TRAVELED IN NORTHERN PARTS BANK-nu venti.  
Aviokote pookumoot ii muRi hindi aenkiilum. MuRi hindi WAS USEFUL TO ME.

'I have travelled widely in the northern parts for the bank. When travelling there this broken Hindi, even though it was broken Hindi, was useful to me.' [Indian university graduate speaking to an interviewer sharing Malayam as a first language. (Southworth, 1980: 133). Malayam-English.]

- (15c) a n̄ mi HELP-e

'They are helping me.' [Educated Ghanaian in informal exchange with fellow native speakers of Adangme. (Narrey, 1982: 185). Adangme-English.]

It seems that all of these examples, including those from the Nairobi data set, show CS as an unmarked choice.<sup>9</sup>

In addition to showing both extra- and intrasentential switching, CS as the unmarked choice is also distinguished by its lack of flagging at switch points.<sup>10</sup> When one considers that what is being communicated is an unmarked state of affairs, it is not surprising that there are no obvious discourse markers at the switching points. Further, because each

individual switch does not carry its own special social meaning, no special discourse markers are needed to mark switches. Conversely, it is no surprise that CS as a marked choice is often flagged since part of the social message is *take notice: this is a change*.

An obvious question at this point is why the many scholars studying CS have not found more instances of intrasentential switching and/or arrived at the notion of CS as an unmarked choice as differentiated from other types. Some explanations may have to do with methodology and some with the communities studied.

In reference to methodology, it is possible that the conversations studied were not perceived by the speakers as the type in which it was appropriate for bilingual peers to encode dual identities. This would be the case under such circumstances as the following: (1) conversations are recorded in an interview-type situation which evokes formality; or (2) even though the interviewer may be a bilingual, even a member of the community, s/he is not perceived as a peer; or (3) the topic is metalinguistic (especially if when switching occurs is discussed). In such cases, CS may well occur, but it is more likely to be as a marked or exploratory choice. Also, as noted above, earlier researchers may have discounted as CS many intra-word switches showing morphological integration into the matrix language.

### COMMUNITY CONSTRAINTS ON CS

This paper argues that only certain community types promote CS as an unmarked choice. Some CS studies have been carried out in communities where conditions do not favor such switching. CS as an unmarked choice is only prevalent where speaker and addressee share identities (as peers) in social groups whose memberships are symbolized by the matrix and embedded languages AND if the two memberships are positively evaluated by both participants.

These conditions are met in many communities, but especially in those Third World nations where: (1) ethnic group languages are maintained and/or an indigenous language has some official status; but (2) a former colonial language has been institutionalized as the unmarked medium of activities such as higher education, interethnic communication between the educated, or business and governmental interactions with foreign nationals. For the sake of an example, assume the former colonial language is English. In such communities, English was/is the unmarked choice for informal exchanges between English native speakers. Locals used to speak their own ethnic group language with their ethnic peers. Higher education, however, and international contacts have made some locals bilingual in English; further, these persons now hold the positions formerly held only by the native speakers of English—in universities, business and government. Following the model of the foreign national, the locals begin to use some English in the same contexts as the native speakers used it/still use it. For the non-native speakers, English symbolizes their membership in the group of educated persons having positions of authority and/or high status. But because their *other* group memberships are *also* salient for them, they do not use English exclusively. In informal conversations, at least, the matrix language of their conversations is typically not English, but either a shared ethnic group language (e.g. Kannada in Karnataka) or a relatively ethnically neutral *lingua franca* if participants come from several ethnic groups (e.g. Swahili in Nairobi or Lingala in Kinshasa). But note that simply having two or more varieties widely used in the community is not a sufficient criterion to promote CS as an unmarked choice; both varieties must symbolize identities valued by the speakers.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Based on the above discussions, these claims about different types of CS have been supported: (a) CS as an unmarked choice occurs typically only between ingroup members who are peers. This is a requirement because the participants must share the dual identities which the switched languages symbolize. (b) With unmarked CS, it is the overall pattern of switching which symbolizes the shared identities, not each individual switch. (c) Such CS is often intrasentential and is the only type of CS including intra-word switches. It is also extrasentential. (d) None of the proposed structural constraints applies universally to such switching. However, new research (Myers-Scotton and Azuma, 1989) suggests the centrality of matrix language assignment in setting constraints for all types of switching. The matrix language word order prevails in code-switched constituents (those composed of morphemes from both languages) and all system morphemes in such constituents come from the matrix language. (e) CS as an unmarked choice can occur only in certain types of bilingual communities where two conditions hold: there are models to follow for the individual unmarkedness of both codes for some persons for the same exchange, and the two linguistic varieties are not symbols of intergroup competition (between the groups identified with the two varieties) in the community; rather, the identities both varieties encode for the given exchange are positively evaluated by the speakers.

Several predictions follow from this statement. A first hypothesis predicts that such CS does not occur at all in narrow diglossic communities, i.e. those discussed by Ferguson (1959) in his original formulation of diglossia. Since the high and low varieties never occur in the same situation, the two can never be simultaneously unmarked, even for different individuals [see Scotton (1986) for an extended discussion of this point]. Further, another hypothesis predicts CS as an unmarked choice in many broad diglossic communities (Fishman, 1967), but not all. For example, little CS as an unmarked choice should take place in Finland between Finnish and English, since it is predicted there are few models of English as an unmarked choice for the same exchanges for which Finnish is unmarked. Also, little CS as an unmarked choice is predicted to occur between French and English for informal exchanges between French Canadians in Quebec who are bilingual in English. This is not because English is never associated with positive values by these Francophones, but rather because the identity indexed by English *for informal exchanges with Francophone peers* is not valued. Of course switches to English as a marked choice are possible with these same peers. (Poplack (1988), which compares an Ontario Francophone sample with one from Hull in Quebec, reports much higher rates in 'nonce borrowings' (i.e. intra-word switches) in Ontario. These findings are totally consistent with this hypothesis.) Because they also symbolize intergroup rivalries, Flemish and French should show little CS as the unmarked choice in Belgium; the same applies to Catalan and Castilian in Catalonia [see Calsamiglia and Tuson (1984)]. (f) CS as either a marked choice or an exploratory choice is more structurally constrained than CS as an unmarked choice. Such switching is typically extrasentential. It may be intrasentential, but it is seldom intra-word. CS as a marked choice is often flagged in some way, whether by suprasegmental phenomena or by such discourse devices as repeating in the embedded language what has already been said in the matrix language. (g) The social constraints on CS as a marked choice are few. Such switching occurs only in conventionalized exchanges but it may occur apparently in any community and for both ingroup and intergroup exchanges. CS as an exploratory choice occurs in non-conventionalized exchanges, but otherwise is not restricted.

## NOTES

1. This paper is a revision of a paper (Scotton, 1988a) given at the 1987 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics.
2. Note that lexical items are readily available in Lwidakho [in (1)] and in Swahili [in (2)] for those words which are switched to English.
3. This is the only sentence in the conversation entirely in English. While an overall pattern of CS as an unmarked choice also could include entire sentences as switched material, switched words or phrases and intra-word switches are probably more frequent under this type of switching. The entire conversation appears in Scotton (1988b).
4. Of course some CS does occur as performance error in the sense the speaker is unable to think of a word or phrase in the variety being spoken in the exchange, or a speaker makes a false start. Such switches are a permissible form of marked choices under the markedness model, governed by a 'virtuous maxim' (Scotton, 1983) which enjoins speakers to use a marked code when either the speaker's or the addressee's grammatical ability in the unmarked code choice makes choosing that variety infelicitous.
5. Of course the categorical choice of one linguistic variety vs another can carry micro-level social meaning as well. For example, a person using English only in a Nairobi office can be seen as negotiating a persona of high education and occupational status and possibly an interactional position of authority. Further, at the stylistic level, borrowings can convey interpersonal negotiation *when they function as style switches within the matrix language*. For example, if a borrowing is used in a matrix language style for which it is marked, it can be a distancing or solidarity device (which one depends on the case in point).
6. The same argument applies to 'constituent insertion', another category recently proposed (Poplack and Sankoff, 1987). Discussing an Arabic-French data set with Arabic as the matrix language, Poplack and Sankoff label as constituent insertion instances of a French determiner + noun, with French inflections, in the syntactic slot for an Arabic NP. Neither 'nonce borrowing' nor 'constituent insertion' serve any explanatory purpose and both seem to have no motivation other than to preserve the equivalence constraint and the free morpheme constraint proposed earlier by Poplack (1980). The free morpheme constraint prohibits switching involving a bound morpheme from one language and a root from the other, and the equivalence constraint prohibits switching if the resulting constituent does not conform to the syntactic rules of both languages.
7. In a new model (Myers-Scotton and Azuma, 1989), the type of constituents which Poplack and Sankoff describe under 'constituent insertion' (as apparently unique to Arabic-French CS) are treated as one example of 'embedded language islands'. These islands are intrareferential phrases or clauses entirely in the embedded language, occurring in utterances which otherwise have constituents composed of morphemes from both the matrix language and the embedded language, or constituents composed only of matrix language material. While what can occur as an embedded language island varies from language to language, Myers-Scotton and Azuma (1989) suggest some universal tendencies regarding their composition.
8. The subjunctive here except the absence of a tense/aspect prefix following the subject prefix *tu*. This particular English verb stem does not show morphological integration since it lacks the obligatory subjunctive suffix -e. Scotton (1988c) discusses such examples as countervidence to the claim that 'gross phonological integration' means either: (1) conforming to the phonotactics of the matrix language (e.g. vowel insertion in prohibited consonant clusters) or in word final position to conform to the typical CVCV' pattern of Swahili, or (2) substitution of a Swahili phoneme for a prohibited English one.
9. Other data sets, such as Bentahila and Davies (1983) for Arabic-French switching in Morocco, Berk-Seligson (1986) for Spanish-Hebrew switching in Israel, and Gardner-Chloros (1985) for Aesirenne-French switching, give extended discussions of examples of CS which seem possible to characterize as CS as the unmarked choice. All the data violate the equivalence constraint while the Bentahila and Davies seem to discount what their own data demonstrates. Kachru (1978) reports on switching in India, some of which also would seem to be CS as the unmarked choice.
10. Poplack (1988) comments on the 'smooth' switching found in the Spanish-English CS data she studied among Puerto Ricans in New York. She also refers to their switching as 'emblematic' of their two identities. For these reasons, these data may show CS as the unmarked choice, too.

## REFERENCES

- Bentahila, Abdellali and Davies, E. E. (1983) The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua*, **59**, 301–330.
- Berl-Seligson, Susan (1986) Linguistic constraints on intrasentential code-switching: a study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. *LIS*, **15**, 313–348.
- Blon, Jan P. and Gumperz, John (1972) Social meaning in linguistic structures: code-switching in Norway. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Edited by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. pp. 407–434.
- Bokamba, Eyamba (1988) Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory: evidence from Bantu languages. *Lingua*, **76**, 21–62.
- Calsamiglia, Helena and Tuson, Aampara (1984) Use of languages and code-switching in groups of youths in a barrio of Barcelona. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **47**, 105–121.
- Ferguson, Charles A. (1959) Diglossia. *Word*, **15**, 325–340.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1967) Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *The Journal of Social Issues*, **23**, 29–38.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope (1984) Code-switching in relation to language contact and convergence. In *Actes du 2e colloque sur le bilinguisme*. Université de Neuchâtel, 1984. Edited by Georges Ludi. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. pp. 99–113.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope (1985) Choix et alternance des langues à Strasbourg. Ph.D. dissertation, Université de Louis Pasteur.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, Monica (1988) Strategic ambiguity: codeswitching in the management of conflict. In *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Edited by Monica Heller. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 77–96.
- Hymes, Dell (1972) On communicative competence. In *Sociolinguistics*. Edited by John Pride and Janet Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin. pp. 269–293.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1978) Code-mixing as a communicative strategy in India. In *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*. Edited by James E. Alatis. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. pp. 107–124.
- Labov, William (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol and Azuma, Shoji (1989) A process model of code switching. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Narrey, Jonas (1982) Code-switching, interference or faddism? Language use among educated Ghanaians. *Anthropological Linguistics*, **24**, 182–192.
- Poplack, Shana (1980) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, **18**, 581–618.
- Poplack, Shana (1988) Language status and language accommodation along a linguistic border. In *Language Spread and Language Policy*. Edited by Peter Lowenberg. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. pp. 90–118.
- Poplack, Shana and Sankoff, David (1987) Code-switching. To appear in *Sociolinguistics*. Edited by Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar and Klaus J. Mattheier. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Poplack, Shana, Wheeler, Susan and Westwood, Arnell (1987) Distinguishing language contact phenomena: evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. In *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics 6*. Edited by Pirkko Linna and Mirja Saari. Helsinki. pp. 33–56.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1972) *Choosing a Lingua Franca in an African Capital*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1976) Strategies of neutrality: language choice in uncertain situations. *Language*, **52**, 919–942.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1983) The negotiation of identities in conversation: a theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **44**, 115–136.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1986) Diglossia and code switching. In *The Fergusonian Impact*. Vol. 2. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 403–415.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1987) In what ways are conversations conventionalized? Paper presented at First International Pragmatics Conference, Antwerp.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1988a) Codeswitching and types of multilingual communities. In *Language Spread and Language Policy*. Edited by Peter Lowenberg. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. pp. 61–82.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1988b) Codeswitching as indexical of social negotiations. In *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Edited by Monica Heller. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 151–186.
- Scotton, Carol M. (1988c) Differentiating borrowing and codeswitching. In *Linguistic Change & Contact*. Edited by Kathleen Ferrara *et al.* Austin, TX: University of Texas. pp. 318–325.
- Southworth, Franklin C. (1980) Indian bilingualism: some educational and linguistic implications. In *Studies in Child Language and Multilingualism*. Edited by New York Academy of Sciences. Vol. 345, pp. 121–135.
- Sridhar, S. N. and Sridhar, Kamal K. (1980) The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, **34**, 407–416.
- Vihman, Marilyn M. (1985) A developmental perspective on codeswitching: conversations between a pair of bilingual siblings. Ms.

## The seed concepts constraint in code switching

UDAY C. NAVAL\*

**ABSTRACT:** The 'seed concepts' hypothesis states that there exists in the human mind a set of most fundamental concepts that crystallize during the earliest period of 'concept formation' in the mind of the infant, a period which is broadly concomitant with the incipient 'single-word' stage (around 18–24 months) in the child's language acquisition process. These concepts seem to stem from the child's need to distinguish his 'self' from the 'nonself' through the instrumentalities, primarily, of sensorimotor activity. This notion of 'seed concepts', in turn, gives rise to the 'seed concepts constraint', an all-encompassing, universal principle. This principle holds that in the intrinsententially code-switched speech of the bilingual the 'seed concepts' get heavily marked for realization in the phonetics of the first language ('seed language') in contradistinction to the second language (the 'feed language'). It is claimed that, although subject to parameterization to a limited extent, the 'seed concepts constraint' suffices to replace the various particularistic grammatical claims concerning intrasentential code switching hitherto proposed in the literature.

## INTRODUCTION

## CODE SWITCHING

Language contact is a phenomenon that has been in operation since perhaps the birth of language itself. When two languages come into close proximity, various things may happen: they may influence and modify each other at one or more levels, i.e. of lexicon, phonology and syntax; they may give rise to new, hybrid languages called pidgins or creoles; or they may just get systematically intermixed, for the moment, without affecting the fundamental linguistic structure of either.

The last of the above-mentioned phenomena generally occurs when the speakers involved are linguistically competent individuals, possessing a fairly adequate mastery over both the languages. Given this situation, they may want to 'mix' the two languages for functional, pragmatic, communicative or any other reason. Such interaction between the two languages can take place at either the intersentential level or the intrasentential level. At the intersentential level, the speaker uses a group of sentences in one language and then switches to utter another sequence of sentences in the second language.

At the intrasentential level, on the other hand, elements of the second language are integrated with those of the first language within a single sentence. In other words, at the intrasentential level, one of the two languages is retained as the base language [henceforth the seed language (SL)] while elements from the other [henceforth the feed language (FL)] are fed into it to generate the linguistic mixture. The result is not the chemical compound of a new and different, i.e. a third, language, but rather a strictly transient and functional composite, generated by independent and discrete phonologies and grammars of the two languages involved. This phenomenon has been characterized as 'code switching' (CS).<sup>1</sup>

\*Department of Speech and Theater, Herbert H. Lehman College, City University of New York, Bronx, NY 10468, USA.