

ALEXANDER ANDRASON
Stellenbosch University
andrason@sun.ac.za
ORCID: 0000-0002-8507-9824

САШКО-LECT: THE TRANSLANGUAGED GRAMMAR OF A HYPER MULTILINGUAL GLOBAL NOMAD PART 2 – CONTACT MECHANISMS

Keywords: multilingualism, language contact, code-switching, borrowing

Abstract

This study examines the idiolect of Сашко – a hyper-multilingual global nomad whose language repertoire draws on forty languages, ten of which he speaks with native or native-like proficiency. By analyzing grammatical and lexical features typifying Сашко's translanguaging practices (code-switches, code-borrowings, and code-mixes), as documented in the corpus of reflexive notes that span the last twenty-five years, the author designs Сашко's translanguaged grammar. Instead of being a passive additive pluralization of separated, autonomous, and static monolects, Сашко's grammar emerges as a deeply orchestrated, unitary, and dynamic strategy. From Сашко's perspective, this grammar constitutes a tool to express his rebellious and defiant identity; a tool that – while aiming to combat Western mono-culturalisms, compartmented multilingualisms, and nationalisms – ultimately leads to Сашко's linguistic and cultural homelessness. This paper – the second in a series of three – is dedicated to language-contact mechanisms operating in Сашко-lect: code-switching and borrowing.

1. Introduction

The present study is dedicated to examining Сашко-lect or the idiolect of Сашко – a hyper-multilingual global nomad whose language repertoire draws on forty languages, ten of which he speaks with native or native-like proficiency. The previous article – the first in the series of three – familiarized the reader with the methodological issues of my research: the frameworks that are adopted in different parts of

the study; the method with which the description and analysis of *Сашко*'s idiolect is developed; and the corpus that underlies the original empirical research of *Сашко*-lect. To be exact, I explained the details of the theory of contact mechanisms, i.e. code-switching and borrowing, the theory of a particular type of contact languages characterizing long-term and profound multilingualism, i.e. mixed-languages, and the theory of a multilingual's idiolect, i.e. translanguaging. I explained that the bottom-top method guiding my description and analysis of *Сашко*-lect, ascends from the level that is atomic, analytical, fragmentary, grammatical and named-language oriented, to the level that is global, synthetic, unitary, extra-grammatical, and speaker oriented. I also explained that my research draws on the qualitatively limited corpus containing mainly reflexive discourses.

In this paper – the second in the series – following my bottom-up research designed in the previous article, I will focus on two principal language-contact mechanisms operating in *Сашко*-lect. In Section 2, I will describe and analyze code-switching, and in section 3, I will study borrowing. Lastly, in Section 4, I will formulate interim conclusions and announce issues covered in the third paper – the final part of the study.

2. Code-switching in *Сашко*-lect

Code-switching is ubiquitous in *Сашко*-lect. As its canonical instances, I consider those combinations of languages that are spontaneous and non-entrenched. Indeed, many examples of code-switching are *hapax legomena* – they are documented once in the corpus and only in a particular language combination. The three structural types of code switching – i.e. insertional, alternational, and congruent (cf. Muysken 2000: 4–8; Stam 2017) – are well attested, the insertional variety being, however, by far the most common.

As I will explain further below, any language can feature as an embedded code in insertional code-switching in *Сашко*-lect. In contrast, the selection of a particular language as the matrix code is slightly more restricted. Only languages spoken with native or native-like proficiency are used as the matrix code commonly. Seven of them – English, French, Icelandic, Mandinka, Polish, Spanish, and Swedish – adopt that function especially frequently. These are the languages native to countries in which *Сашко* has resided: South Africa, France, Iceland, Gambia, Poland, Spain, and Sweden. Not surprisingly, various texts in which each of these languages functions as the matrix were produced at the time of residence in or travelling through the respective country. However, in several texts, the correlation between the language donating the matrix and the country in which the text was composed is not observed. German is used as a matrix code rather sporadically – and only in texts written during *Сашко*'s stay in Germany. The use of Lingala and Russian as matrices is much less common. This may be related to the fact that *Сашко* has never resided in countries or regions where these two languages are the main means of communication. Languages that are not native or

have not been mastered to native-like proficiency only function as matrices in the analyzed corpus in exceptional cases.

The matrix code – irrespective of the actual language being selected – donates the main bulk of elements to a sentence and provides all types of structural elements, as is typical of insertional code-switching in general (see Muysken 2000: 64–67; Myers-Scotton 2002: 59–60; Matras 2009: 130–134). That is, any lexical class (i.e. not only nouns, verbs, adjectives, numerals, and adverbs, but also adpositions, connectives, complementizers, particles, interjections, and pronouns) and any morpheme (i.e. both content and system morphemes, including outsider late system morphemes) can feature in the matrix (1.a–b; see also examples 2–8 illustrating other features of the insertional code in Сашко-lect).

(1) a. Polish matrix

Super zrobić to mañana^{SP} i potem nic zero
 super do it tomorrow and later nothing zero
 ‘Great! Do it tomorrow and then [do] nothing, zero’

b. Spanish matrix

Es que djöfulsins^{IC} está loco este
 be that fuck is crazy this
 ‘Fuck, this one is crazy’

Conforming to most models of insertional code-switching (cf. Myers-Scotton, Jake 1995: 983; Muysken 2000: 67; Myers-Scotton 2002: 59), the matrix code determines the surface order of components, whether the morphemes’ order in a word and phrase, or the constituents’ order in a clause and sentence. For instance, *this because* in (2.a) instead of reflecting the English morpheme order *because of this*, maps the order of the adpositional phrase *z tego powodu* (lit. *from this cause*) in Polish – the language donating the matrix. In (2.b), the sentence adheres to V2 word order which is donated by the Icelandic matrix even though the subject (π ‘I’) and negator (*hem* ‘no(t)’) are provided by the embedded code – Russian.

(2) a. Polish matrix

This^{EN} because^{EN} się nie da
 this because REFL not give
 ‘Because of this, it is not possible’

b. Icelandic matrix – Russian embedded

Ðað veit я^{RU} не^{RU}
 that know I not
 ‘I don’t know it’

As observed in scholarly literature on code-switching (see Muysken 2000: 67; Matras 2009: 130–135), the matrix code typically anchors the predication, providing the main finite verb to the sentence, e.g. *está* ‘is’ in (1.b); *da* ‘give’ in (2.a); and *veit* ‘know’ in (2.b). It also determines the scope and properties of the arguments involved, and projects semantic roles to the constituents. In (3.a), the Mandinka matrix requires

the overt presence of an object if the verb *karaj* is to be understood transitively (i.e. *a karaj* ‘study (it)’ versus *karaj* ‘be studied’). However, the matrix code need not be correlated with the first word(s) or with the code that initiates predication. Indeed, sentence-initial interjections (*joder* ‘fuck’ in 3.b), adverbials, discourse markers, modal particles, connectives, and even pronouns (see 2.a above) may be provided by the embedded code (see further below in this section).

- (3) a. Mandinka matrix
 M be to^{PL} karaj kaj
 I NVP this study PROG
 ‘I am studying’
- b. English matrix
 Joder^{SP} this is nonsense
 fuck this is nonsense
 ‘Fuck, this is nonsense’

While only some languages commonly function as matrixes, any language irrespective of proficiency can – generally with a similar frequency – donate its elements to the embedded code. Apart from native-(like) languages, this regularly involves Xhosa, Kikongo, Swahili, Turkish, Arabic, Hebrew, Czech, Portuguese, Malay, Indonesian, and Maasai, as well as Latin. The use of a particular language as an embedded code is not correlated with the linguistic profile of the country or region in which a text was written.

The most common cases of insertional code-switching involve the incorporation of a single element or a single constituent. Typically, it is a noun (*appelsínur* ‘oranges’ in 4.a), a noun phrase (*nowym samochodem* ‘with/in a new car’ in 6.e), or a prepositional phrase (*this because* ‘because of this’ in 2.a). Verbal roots or bases (*þurk-* ‘dry’ in 4.b), adjectives (*sætur* ‘sweet’ in 4.c) and adverbs (*mañana* ‘tomorrow’ 1.a) referring to manner, time, and place also feature prominently. Other lexical classes such as discourse markers, modal particles, interjections (*joder* 3.b), connectives (*i* ‘and’ in 8.b. below), and complementizers (*que* ‘that’ in 4.d) are widely attested as well. Similarly, pronouns appear frequently as elements of the embedded code – e.g. *this* in 2.a; *я* ‘I’ in 2.b, *to* ‘it’ in 3.a (see also *tú* ‘you’ and *oni* ‘they’ in 8.a below) – contrary to what is expected according to most models of insertional code-switching (Matras 2009: 133–134). To conclude this review of lexical classes the embedded code rarely contains inflected verbs and auxiliaries.

- (4) a. French matrix
 N[?] acheter que de appelsínur^{IC}
 Not buy that of oranges
 ‘Only buy oranges’
- b. Polish matrix
 Þurk-^{IC} owa-ć czy też nie þurk-^{IC} owa-ć
 dry- VBL-INF or also not dry- VBL-INF
 ‘To dry or not to dry’

c. Spanish matrix

Sætur^{SP} chico, cual será su nombre?
 sweet boy what will.be his name
 ‘A sweet boy – what could his name be’

d. Icelandic matrix

Ég efast um que^{SP} það skuli vera svona
 I doubt um that that/it should be so
 ‘I doubt that it would be like that’

With regard to the type of morphemes used, the embedded code abounds in content morphemes, see again *appelsínur* ‘oranges’ (4.a), *þurk-* ‘dry’ (4.b), *sætur* ‘sweet’ (4.c), *mañana* ‘tomorrow’ (1.a), as well as *nowym samochodem* ‘with/in a new car’ (6.e). Early system morphemes also feature abundantly in the embedded code. This includes determiners (*þessi* ‘this’ in 5.a), articles (*los* ‘the’ in 5.b; see also *la*^{SP} *śmierć* ‘the death’ used in a Polish matrix), satellite prepositions of phrasal verbs (e.g. *fram*^{IC}-*brać* and *za*^{PL}-*taka* ‘take away’ used respectively in a Polish and Icelandic matrix), plural markers (*naleśniki-s*^{SP} ‘pancakes’ and *kwiat-orna*^{SW} ‘flowers’ used in a Polish matrix), and derivational affixes (*-ismo* in 5.c, additionally accompanied by the plural ending *-s*). In contrast, even though present, bridge system morphemes (for instance the possessive marker *s’n* in 5.d) and outsider late system morphemes, such as verbal inflections (the Latin infinitive marker *-are* in 5.e and the Polish accusative feminine ending *-ę* in 5.f) and case affixes (the Icelandic 2nd sg. ending *-t* in 5.g) feature rather infrequently as embedded codes’ elements. This behaviour is fully congruent with the properties of the embedded code identified cross-linguistically (Muysken 2000: 61–64, 95; Myers-Scotton 1993a: 120; 1993b; 2002: 59; Myers-Scotton, Jake 1995: 983; 2000; 2009; Matras 2009).

(5) a. Spanish matrix

Þessi^{IC} chico allí quién es
 this lad there who is
 ‘This lad over there – who is he?’

b. Polish matrix

Los^{SP} zakupy zrobić
 the shoppings do.INF
 ‘To do the shoppings’

c. English matrix

I hate fuck -ismos^{SP}
 I hate fuck isms
 ‘I hate fuckisms’

d. Spanish matrix

Alex s’n^{A/DU} vida
 Alex POSS life
 ‘Alex’s life’

- e. Icelandic matrix
 Ég ska gang- are^{LT} þangað
 I will go INF there
 ‘I will walk there’
- f. Icelandic matrix
 Takktu flösk- e^{PL}
 take.IMP bottle- ACC
 ‘Take the bottle’
- g. Swedish matrix
 Du är-t^C inte ...
 you are-2SG not
 ‘You are not...’

The elements of an embedded code may be fully integrated into the frame of the matrix by matrix-language morphological shields (cf. Muysken 2000: 4, 31, 64), usually inflectional suffixes, e.g. *za-...-ował* used to mark 3sg.ms. perfective past (6.a), *-o* used to mark 1sg. present (6.b), and *-o* used as a definite nominalizer (6.c; see also the verbal suffix *-owa* and the infinitive ending *-ć* that help to integrate the Icelandic verbal base *þurk-* ‘dry’ into the Polish matrix in 4.b). Embedded elements may also exhibit functional markings typical of their own code, thus constituting embedded-code islands (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002: 54, 139–140), e.g. *konu* – the Icelandic accusative (or oblique) form of the singular *kona* ‘woman’ (6.d) (see also *appelsínur* ‘oranges’ that exhibits the nominative plural ending *-ur* in 4.a, and *sætur* ‘sweet’ that exhibits the nominative singular *-ur* in 4.c). In such cases, the role of an embedded element (e.g. direct object or subject) is typically projected by the matrix code while morphological marking itself (e.g. nominative or accusative case) is provided by the embedded code. Lastly, an embedded element may appear bare (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002: 67, 113), even when languages rich in inflections such as Polish and Icelandic are involved (see *ten chłopak* ‘this boy’ in 6.f and *tarka* ‘grater’ in 6.g).

- (6) a. Polish matrix
 Gdy.bym tylko go za- snert-^{LC} ował
 if.I only him PF- touch PAST.3.SG.MS.
 ‘If I had only touch him’
- b. Spanish Matrix
 Parf-^{LC}o hacer-lo
 need-I do-it
 ‘I need to do it’
- c. Mandinka matrix
 Dog-^{EN} -o a be minto le?
 dog NML it NVP where EMP
 ‘Where is the dog’

d. Polish matrix

Nie ma kon-u^{IC}
 not has woman^{EN-ACC^{EN}}
 ‘the woman is absent (lit. is not)’

e. Spanish Matrix

Ha llegado nowym^{PL} samochodem^{PL}
 he.has arrived new.INSTR car.INSTR
 ‘He came with/in a new car’

f. Icelandic matrix

Ætíi ég tala við ten^{PL} chłopak^{PL}
 should I talk with this.NOM boy.NOM
 ‘Should I talk to this boy?’

g. Icelandic matrix

Kaupa tarka^{PL}!
 buy grater.NOM
 ‘Buy a grater!’

Elements of the embedded code are found in all positions in the clause, whether clause-internally (e.g. 1.a–b, 3.a, 4.d, 5.d–e, 5.g, 6.a) or at the clause’s peripheries – initially (e.g. 2.a, 3.b, 4.b–c, 5.a–b, 6.b–c) and finally (e.g. 4.a, 6.e–g). The inserted element may appear in a nested structure *y-x-y* (cf. Muysken 2000: 63), being intercalated between two related elements of the matrix. For example, in (7), the conditional perfect of the Icelandic matrix (*mynda hafa gert* ‘would have done’) makes use of the Spanish verb *haber* as its second component. Similarly, *za-hjálp-ować* ‘help’ is composed of the elements of the Polish matrix (the perfective prefix *za-* and the verbalizer *-owa* ‘help’ accompanied by the infinitive ending *-ć*) that together circumscribe an element of the Icelandic embedded code (the verbal root *hjálp-* ‘help’) (see also *naj-fallech^{IC}-szy chłopak* ‘the most beautiful lad’ where the Icelandic adjectival root *falleg-* ‘beautiful’, with the Polish spelling *ch* instead of the Icelandic *g*, is nested in a Polish superlative construction *naj-...-szy* ‘the most...’).

(7) Icelandic matrix

Myndi ég haber^{SP} gert það?
 Would I have done that/it
 ‘Would I have done it?’

The embedded code employed in a sentence may draw on more than one language. The use of two languages in the embedded code is relatively common, e.g. *tú* ‘you’ and *oni* ‘they’ in (8.a) and *fram* ‘from’ and *i spowrotem* ‘and back’ in (8.b). A few instances of three and sporadically four languages – usually in lists as illustrated by *Sverige* ‘Sweden’, *Ísland* ‘Iceland’, *The Gambia*, and *España* ‘Spain’ in (8.c) – are also found. Embedded codes that would incorporate elements of five or more languages are unattested.

(8) a. Icelandic matrix

Ég, tú^{SP}, oni^{PL}, við öll skulum fara
 I you they we all should go
 ‘I, you, they, we should all go’

b. Spanish matrix

Fram^{IC} i^{PL} spowrotem^{PL} fram^{IC} i^{PL} spowrotem^{PL} así es la vida
 forth and back forth and back like.this is the life
 ‘Back and forth, back and forth – life is like that’

c. Polish matrix

Gdzie można żyć: Sverige^{SW}, Ísland^{IC}, The Gambia^{EN} – może España^{SP}?
 where can live Sweden Iceland the Gambia maybe Spain
 ‘Where can one live: Sweden, Iceland, Gambia – perhaps Spain?’

Alternational code-switching is also characteristic of *Сашко*-lect, albeit, as explained above, it features less commonly than the insertional type. It is employed in two main cases: to correct an expression (9.a) or to provide supplementary information in relation to an expression used previously (e.g. clarifying it or specifying it) (9.b) – two functions typically associated with this type of code-switching in literature (Matras 2009: 105–106). Switches may take place at two distinct levels: a phrase level (especially in corrections, paraphrases, or reiterations) (9.a) and at an utterance level (especially when a construction of one code is commented on in another code) (9.b). Virtually all languages can appear in switches. However, languages in which *Сашко* is proficient – whether native(-like) or not, and whether modern, classical (Standard Modern Arabic), or ancient (e.g. Latin, Biblical Hebrew, Old Icelandic) – feature especially prominently.

(9) a. Lingala > Icelandic alternation

{Kufa eza likambo}^{LG} {eða frekar blessun}^{IC}
 death it.is problem or rather blessing
 ‘Death is a problem – or rather a blessing’

b. Spanish > Polish alternation

{Un día lo haré}^{SP}: {pojadę na Kamczatkę, zamieszkać w igloo,
 one day it I.will.do I.will.go to Kamchatka I.will.live in igloo
 zajmę się łowieniem ryb i zapomnę o cywilizacji}^{PL}
 I.will.keep REFL fishing fish and I.will.forget about civilization
 ‘One day I will do it: I will go to Kamchatka, I will live in an igloo, I will be fish-
 ing, and I will forget about civilization’

Several features exhibited by alternational code-switching in *Сашко*-lect match the properties identified for this type of code-switching in scholarly literature (Muysken 2000: 97–107, 120). The number of elements used in any given language alternation, and thus its quantitative magnitude, can be considerable (see 9.b above where fourteen words are employed). Similarly, alternations can be qualitatively rich, thus making use of elements that belong to different lexical classes and morpheme types. First, alternations include not only nouns, verbs, and adjectives, but also pronouns (*mna* ‘I’ and *wena* ‘you’ in 10.a), discourse markers and modal particles (*bueno* ‘well’ and *claro* ‘of course’ in 10.b), tags (*ne* in 10.a and *no* in 10.b), interjections (*yoo* in 10.a), conjunctions (*i* ‘and’ in 9.b), and adpositions (*na* ‘to’, *w* ‘in’ and *o* ‘about’

in 9.b). Second, alternations contain not only content morphemes, but also system morphemes, whether early, bridge, or outsider late. This greater diversity of lexical classes and morphemes is especially pervasive in clause-level switches.

(10) a. Icelandic > Xhosa

{Svona ætti það að vera}^{IC}: {mna, wena, yoo,
so should it to be I you INTJ
siyakuhlala eMnaNzi ne?}^{XH}
we.will.live LOC.South.Africa TAG

‘It should be like this: you, me, ah, we will live in South Africa, isn’t it?’

b. French > Spanish

{Qu’es-que tu en penses}^{FR} – {bueno iríamos
what you of.it think well we.would.go
junto claro, no?}^{SP}
together of.course TAG

‘What do you think about it: well, we would go together, of course, isn’t it?’

Switches between the codes tend to take place in clause-peripheral positions, typically at the clause’s boundary. Apart from the clauses separated *asyndetically* (9.a–b, 10.a–b), this involves the following syntactic structures: left dislocation, coordinated clauses (11.a), cleft sentences, and various types of subordinate and relative clauses (11.b). This complies with the position of switches identified in literature on *alternational code-switching* (Muysken 2000: 99–104).

(11) a. Turkish > Xhosa

{Konuşma türkçe}^{TR} {okanye ukufuna isiXhosa?}^{XH}
speak Turkish or read Xhosa
‘To speak Turkish or to read Xhosa?’

b. Xhosa > English

{Ndi-yam-bonile}^{XH} {as he was walking}^{EN}
I-him-have.seen as he was walking
‘I saw him while he was walking’

The items that are switched are usually neither governed nor selected by the elements of the other code. Furthermore, rather than being integrated, they can be marked by *flagging*, e.g. a dummy word (*nje* in 12; see also *bueno* in 10.b) or a pause and “comma” intonation (9.b, 10.a–b) (cf. Muysken 2000: 101–102, 105–106).

(12) Icelandic > Xhosa

{Komdu hingað}^{IC} {nje a-ndi-kwazi}^{XH}
come here just NEG-I-can
‘Nguni, come here, [nje] I don’t know’

Congruent code-switching is the least common out of all types of code-switching in the analyzed corpus. This may stem from the fact that its most evident examples

emerge in cases involving closely related languages in which linear and structural correspondence is unmistakable, in particular: Icelandic and Swedish, Spanish and French, Polish and Russian, Lingala and Swahili, Xhosa and Fanakalo, Hebrew and Arabic.

As was the case of alternational code-switching, all types of categories can appear in congruent switches (cf. Muysken 2000: 129–131). This includes pronouns, finite verbs (auxiliaries and copulas), complementizers, conjunctions, and articles. Moreover, system morphemes, whether early or late, and whether bridge or outsider, are fully tolerated in congruent code-switching.

(13) a. Spanish-French congruence

Jo^{SP} no^{SP} sé^{SP/(FR)} si^{SP/FR} il^{FR} vendrait^{SP/FR}
 I not know if he he.will.come
 ‘I don’t know if he would come’

b. Xhosa-Fanakalo congruence

Mina^{FA} ndi^{XH}-yaku^{XH}-thanda^{XH/FA} wena^{XH/FA}, mina^{FA} funa^{(XH)/FA} wena^{XH/FA}
 I I-you-love you I want you
 ‘I love you, I want you’

The elements are often morphologically integrated by means of the marking typical of one language or a hybrid marking containing elements of the two languages (e.g. *-om* composed of *o* [u] typical of a more formal variety of Swedish and *um* [ym] typical of Icelandic, in *ärom* ‘we are’ in 14). The structures used may – albeit need not – be nested and selected (cf. Muysken 2000: 129–130, 132). As illustrated by examples (13.a–b) and (14), switches may appear in all positions in a clause or sentence: initial, internal, and final.

(14) Icelandic-Swedish congruence

Vi^{SW(IC)} ärom^{SW/IC} hérna^{IC} inte^{SW} þar^{IC}
 We are here not there
 ‘We are here, not there’

The congruence and switches are visible at a word, phrase, and clause level. This entails the presence of structurally intermediate forms (cf. Stam 2017: 22), e.g. *vendrait* ‘he would come’ composed of the Spanish stem *vendr-* (cf. *viendr-* in French) and the French ending *-ait* (cf. the Spanish *ía*) in (13.a); *ärom* composed of the Swedish/Icelandic stem *är-* and the hybrid ending *-om* in *ärom* ‘we are’ in (14); and *newiem* ‘I don’t know’ composed of the Czech negator *ne* and the Polish inflected verb *wiem* ‘I know’ (cf. Czech *vem*) in (15.a). Congruence may also result in hybrid collocations and two-code idioms (cf. Muysken 2000: 134). For instance, in (15.a), *newiem to* ‘I don’t know this/it’ contains, as explained above, the Czech negator *ne* and the Polish verb *wiem* ‘know’, as well as the Czech-Polish pronoun *to* which is used according to the Czech syntax – in Polish the form *tego* would be preferred. In (15.b), the Spanish/French reflexive pronoun *se* is used according to the French expression *qu’est-qui se passe* ‘what is happening?’. In Spanish, an equivalent expression *¿qué pasa?* does not contain a reflexive pronoun.

- (15) a. Polish-Czech congruence
 Možná^{CZ}, ano^{PL/CZ} ne-^{CZ}wiem^{PL} to^{PL/CZ}
 it.can well not-know it
 ‘Is it possible? Well I don’t know’
- b. Spanish-French congruence
 Que^{SP/FR} se^{SP/FR} pasa^{SP} avec^{FR} toi^{FR}
 what REFL occur with you
 ‘What is happening with you?’

To conclude the discussion of code-switching, the following should be noted: no type of code-switching presented above constitutes a rigid category disconnected from the other types. In various texts, code-switching types vary approximating one of the three code-switching prototypes to a greater or lesser degree. Switches found in Сашко’s discourses may simultaneously draw on insertional, alternational, and convergent code-switching varieties, thus yielding a gradual scale and transmuting from one type to another (compare with Muysken 2000: 9). Many of them are found in a transition phase between insertion and alternation; between insertion and congruent lexicalization; and between alternation and congruent lexicalization (cf. Muysken 2000: 9–10).

3. Borrowing in Сашко-lect

Сашко-lect attests to multiple cases and several types of borrowing. An element is understood as borrowed if it forms a permanent characteristic of the recipient code. Its presence is furthermore not limited to a single recipient code. Rather, the element appears in recipient codes that draw on (potentially) all named languages that can be used as such by Сашко. Lastly, due to its entrenchment and frequency, the borrowed element does not produce stylistic marking, thus failing to be disruptive in the recipient code(s) in which it occurs.

Matter borrowing is particularly well attested, and a number of elements have permanently spread to many recipient codes. As far as the lexical class of loanwords is concerned, nouns constitute the largest set of borrowed lexemes, which is congruent with tendencies observed in borrowing taking place in many other languages (see Myer-Scotton 2002; 2006: 226–229; Field 2002: 36–38; Winford 2003: 53; Matras 2007: 61; 2009: 155, 157). Some borrowed nouns constitute culture-specific concepts being thus language-specific. This explains, in turn, their stabilization in Сашко’s vocabulary. Exemplary cases are: *skýr*^{IC} ‘an Icelandic type of yogurt’, *bigos*^{PL} ‘cabbage-based food typical of Poland’, *pierogi*^{PL} ‘Polish dumplings’, *gołąbki*^{PL} ‘stuffed cabbage leaves eaten in Poland’, *paella*^{SP} ‘rice-based Spanish meal’, *longaniza*^{SP} ‘sausage from Aragón in Spain’, *chorizo*^{SP} ‘a spicy Spanish sausage’, *tuba*^{MA} ‘a white expatriate person living in Western Africa’, *fufu*^{LG} ‘a type of maize meal/porridge eaten in Africa’, *umphokoqo*^{XH} ‘Xhosa crumble porridge’, and *umngqusho*^{XH} ‘a typical Xhosa dish made from maize and beans’. Other nominal loanwords are names of countries, towns, or provinces formulated in the language of the people by which they are inhabited.

In other words, *Сашко*-lect preserves the original denominations of place names. Canonical examples are: *Ísland*^{IC} ‘Iceland’, *Kraków*^{PL} ‘Cracow’, *Polska*^{PL} ‘Poland’, *Vaticano*^{SP/IT} ‘Vatican’, *España*^{SP} ‘Spain’, *Mzantsi*^{XH} ‘South Africa’, *Cape Town*^{EN}. A few borrowed nouns have unique referents in *Сашко*’s life, e.g. *jabluszko*^{PL} ‘a specific Mac computer’, *Muzynek Bambo*^{PL} ‘a different computer’, *Nguni*^{XH} ‘the boyfriend’, *Сашко*^{UK}. A significantly larger set of nominal loanwords contains general common nouns, i.e. nouns that exist in virtually all languages known by *Сашко* and do not refer to an individual person, place, institution, or object. Among those nouns a few important subsets can be distinguished: (a) nouns referring to animals, e.g. *hundur*^{IC} ‘dog’, *pieseczek*^{PL} ‘dog’, *koteczek*^{PL} ‘cat’, *ratejilla*^{SP} ‘rat’, *caballito*^{SP} ‘horse’, *pato*^{SP} ‘duck’, *perrito*^{SP} ‘dog’, *gatito*^{SP} ‘cat’, *skova*^{XH} ‘owl’, *dogo*^{EN}; (b) foods, e.g. *fiskur*^{IC} ‘fish’, *síld*^{IC} ‘herring’, *mjólk*^{IC} ‘milk’, *tomatitos*^{SP} ‘tomatoes’, *patata/-itas*^{SP} ‘potatoes’, *vino*^{SP} ‘wine’, *jamón*^{SP} ‘ham’, *woda*^{PL} ‘water’, *herbatka*^{PL} ‘tea’, *kaffi*^{IC} ‘coffee’, *kofu*^{XH} ‘coffee’, *choco*^{EN} ‘chocolate (cookie)’, (c) body parts, e.g. *tromba*^{PL} ‘dick’, *chocho*^{SP} ‘vagina’, *chicha*^{SP} ‘belly, fat’, *susu*^{XH} ‘belly’, *pundu*^{XH} ‘bum’, (d) persons: *monito*^{SP} ‘cutie’, *cosita*^{SP} ‘little thing, cutie’, *papa*^{SP/IT} ‘pope’, *bafana*^{XH} ‘children’, *sisi*^{XH} ‘sister’, *moninga*^{LG} ‘friend’, *girl*^{EN}, *husband*^{EN}, *whitie*^{EN} ‘white person’, (e) objects, e.g. *okulary*^{PL} ‘glasses’, *cosa*^{SP} ‘thing’, *dilili*^{XH} ‘mobile phone’, and (f) places, e.g. *chicken*^{GAM.EN} ‘kitchen’, *háskóli*^{IC} ‘university’, *ofisi*^{XH} ‘office’. If a donor language has diminutives, such forms are often preferred, rather than ordinary forms. For instance, the diminutive form *koteczek* ‘cat’ and *perrito* ‘dog’ were borrowed from Polish and Spanish respectively – not the “neutral” forms *kot* and *perro*.

Interjections constitute another highly common lexical class among borrowings, despite the fact that they (i.e. interjections) usually do not occupy the highest position in hierarchies of borrowability posited in scholarship (see Haugen 1950: 224; Matras 2007: 61; 2009: 157). Several types of interjections are attested: (a) emotive interjections expressing feelings and sensations, e.g. *jo*^{SP}, *ja*^{SP}, *yoo*^{XH}, *ayisuka*^{XH}; (b) expletives or swearwords, e.g. *joder*^{SP}, *mierda*^{SP}, *puta*^{SP}, *hijoputa*^{SP}, *fuck*^{EN}, *shit*^{EN}; (c) conative interjections expressing encouragements, e.g. *venga*^{SP}, *hanewu*^{XH}, *come on*^{EN}; and especially (d) phatic interjections that either communicate agreement (e.g. *já*^{IC}, *jú*^{IC/SW}, *sí*^{SP}, *vale*^{SP}, *yea(h)*^{EN}) or disagreement (e.g. *hayi*^{XH}, *nei*^{IC/SW}, *nie*^{PL}, *nee*^{AF}), and are used in routines of greeting (e.g. *hola*^{SP} ‘hi’, *grisa*^{WY}, *mbote*^{LI}, *salamat*^{IN/ML}, *molo*^{XH}, *kunjani*^{XH}), leave-taking (*pa pa*^{PL} ‘bye-bye’), thanking (e.g. *tack tack*^{SW}, *gracias*^{SP}, *baraka*^{MA}), apologizing (*perdon*^{SP}, *sorry*^{EN}, *xolo*^{XH}) pleading (e.g. *po(r) favo(r)*^{SP}) and well-wishing (e.g. *на здорыве*^{RU} and *skál*^{IC}).

Verbs and adjectives are also well attested although, as predicated by the theory (see Winford 2003: 51; Matras 2007: 48, 61; 2009: 157), their prevalence is significantly lower than that of nouns and interjections. The most common verbal loanwords are imperatives: *takktu*^{IC} ‘take!’, *biddu*^{IC} ‘wait!’, *hættu*^{IC} ‘stop!’, *þurkaðu mig*^{IC} ‘dry me out!’ *yima*^{XH} ‘stop’. Albeit commonly used, two verbs appear only in specific constructions: 1sg. present negative *andyazi*^{XH} ‘I don’t know,’ and 1pl. present interrogative *idziemy?*^{PL} ‘are we going (out)?’. Three verbal roots are used in all possible

¹ According to the norm, the spelling should be *murzynek*.

TAM forms: *elska*^{IC} ‘love’, *hamba*^{FA/XH} ‘go’, and *pee-pee*^{EN} ‘pee’. Their inflections are regularly provided by the recipient code(s) in which they feature. The borrowed adjectives tend to express qualities typical of human beings: *loco*^{SP} ‘crazy’, *bonito*^{SP} ‘cute, sweet’, *emnandi*^{XH} ‘nice’, *lekker*^{AF} ‘nice’ (*emnandi* and *lekker* also apply to non-human referents), and *crazy*^{EN}. Other commonly used adjectives are *búinn*^{IC} ‘finished, ready’, *finito*^{SP} ‘finished, ready’, *tofotof*^{XH} ‘soft, puffy’, and *dololo*^{XH} ‘absent; broken’ (also used as an adverb expressing ‘nothing’).

The borrowing of lexemes belonging to other lexical classes is more restricted. A limited number of adverbs has been borrowed. This includes: (a) adverbs of time, e.g. (*straxt*) (*right*) *núna*^{IC} ‘now’, *luego*^{SP} ‘later’, *mañana*^{SP} ‘tomorrow’; (b) adverbs expressing quantity or intensity, e.g. *dužo*^{PL} ‘a lot, much’, *mikiđ*^{IC} ‘a lot, much’, *lítiđ*^{IC} ‘a little’, *mucho*^{SP} ‘a lot’, *kakhulu*^{XH} ‘a lot’, *kancinci*^{XH} ‘a little’; and (c) manner, especially in an indefinite sense such as *svona*^{IC}, *tak*^{PL}, and *así*^{SP}, the three lexemes signifying ‘like this’. Particles are even fewer. Their main bulk is provided by modal particles, especially those expressing possibility (e.g. *kannski*^{IC} ‘maybe’ and *može*^{PL} ‘maybe’) and certainty (e.g. *claro*^{SP} ‘evidently, for sure’). A few intensive particles are also attested, e.g. *nje*^{XH} and *ke*^{XH}, as well as the tag particle used in questions *ne*^{XH/AF}. Albeit rather sporadically, pronouns can be borrowed too, as illustrated by the personal pronouns *wena*^{XH/FA} ‘you’, *moi*^{FR} ‘I’, *mna*^{XH} ‘I’, *mina*^{FA} ‘I’, *yous*^{SA.EN} ‘you [pl.]’, the demonstrative pronoun *hessi*^{IC} ‘this’, and the interrogative pronoun *qué*^{SP} ‘what’. Conjunctions seem to be the least common lexical class among all borrowings. Only four lexemes have been borrowed: *pero*^{SP} ‘but’, *kodwa*^{XH} ‘but’, *okanye*^{XH} ‘or’, and *since*^{EN}. This contrasts with the high position occupied by conjunctions in hierarchies of borrowability posited in literature (cf. Matras 2007: 54–55, 61; 2009: 157; see however Muysken 1981 and Winford 2003: 53). Lastly, loanwords belonging to the lexical class of numerals are unattested.

Although free morphemes are the most borrowable, the borrowing of bound morphemes is also attested. Most common are derivational affixes, especially diminutive suffixes such as *-śu*^{PL}, *-us*^{PL}, *-ito*^{SP}, and *-ico*^{SP}, as well as the nominal suffix *-sie*^{AF} ‘-tion’ used mostly with abstract nouns and *-ski*^{PL} used with surnames, nicknames, and names of persons. A few genuine inflectional affixes are also attested, in particular the masculine nominative suffixes *-ur*^{IC} and *-us*^{LA} and the class prefixes: *u-*^{XH}, typically added to proper names of persons, *i-*^{XH} often added to inanimate nouns, and *isi-*^{XH} used with names of languages. In the verbal system, 1pl. ending *-mus*^{LA} is widely attested. The set of borrowed bound morphemes, additionally includes the locative prefix *e-*^{XH} and the locative circumfix *e-_-ni*^{XH}, which could be analyzed both as derivational and inflectional morphemes. It should be noted that although the use of the inflectional suffixes may coincide with the donor language (see *-mus*^{LA}), this is not the rule. For example, the use of *-ur*^{IC} and *-us*^{LA} is much broader in the recipient languages than in the languages from which they are borrowed. Contrary to Icelandic and Latin, these two suffixes may occur in any syntactic position in recipient languages, whether employed as subjects, direct objects, indirect and oblique objects, or complements of prepositions. On the contrary, the use of the locative affixes *e-* and *e-_-ni* is more restricted in recipient languages than in

the donor language, Xhosa. In recipient languages, these affixes appear only with proper nouns of places. In Xhosa, however, their presence is grammatical with both proper and common nouns.

Сашко-lect also attests to the borrowing of patterns. In such cases, by analogy to the donor language, certain formal and/or semantic structures are replicated in the recipient codes through their own elements (cf. Sakel 2007; Matras 2009: 235). Pattern borrowing is visible in nominal, pronominal, and verbal systems, as well as in word order and lexicon.

In the nominal system, the most persistent patterns copied are articles (cf. Matras 2009: 252). That is, by imitating languages which contain definite and/or indefinite articles in their grammatical repertoire (e.g. Spanish, Swedish, French, Wymysorys, German, English), sets of articles are created in languages in which articles are not grammaticalized as fully-fledged categories (Polish, Lingala, and as far as the indefinite article is concerned, Icelandic). The replication of definite articles typically proceeds through the use of demonstrative pronouns (e.g. *ten* 'this' in Polish), while that of the indefinite article exploits the numeral 'one' (e.g. *jeden* in Polish and *einn* in Icelandic) or indefinite pronouns (e.g. *jakiś* 'a certain' and especially in plural *jacyś/jakieś* 'certain'). Another type of pattern borrowing concerns the proximate-distal distinction in deictic pronouns which by analogy to the French structures *celui-ci* 'lit. that one-here' and *celui-là* 'lit. that one-there' have been copied to other codes. The exemplary cases are *ten-tutaj*, *este-aquí*, *þessi-hérna* 'this-here' and *ten-tam*, *este-allá*, *þessi-þarna* 'this-there' in Polish, Spanish, and Icelandic respectively. As a result, the set of deictic distinctions is expanded from two (e.g. *þessi* 'this' and *sá* 'that' in Icelandic) or three (e.g. *este*, *ese*, *aquel* in Spanish) to a significantly larger number.

A pronominal pattern that has spread to various recipient codes is the set of possessive pronouns distinct from possessive adjectives, as in French (*le mien* vs. *mon*), Spanish (*el mío* vs. *mi*) and English (*mine* vs. *my*). The structures developed in languages that lack such a morpho-syntactic distinction replicate the French and Spanish pattern, thus using a definite article (already extant or developed by analogy; see above) and a respective possessive, e.g. *ten-mój* in Polish. Another pronominal pattern often replicated in recipient codes is a possessive pronominal linker mirroring the Afrikaans and Dutch construction *s'n/z'n* 'his' or *d'r* 'her' (e.g. *Piet z'n fiets* 'Piet's bicycle'). In languages that lack this type of construction, a 3rd person possessive pronoun is used, e.g. *su* 'his' in *el chico su casa* 'the boy's house' in Spanish, or *jego* 'his' in *ten idiota jego pomysł* 'that idiot's idea' in Polish.²

Although fully recognizable in the nominal and pronominal systems, pattern borrowing is the most visible in the verbal system. It is responsible for the emergence of a perfect (anterior) series (present perfect, pluperfect, and future perfect), an unreal conditional/subjective, and a progressive aspect in the codes that lack (one of) those categories. For instance, in the recipient code based on Polish – a language

² It is possible that the presence of the possessive/genitive 's in English and *s'n* in Afrikaans has substantially contributed to the spread of these pronominal constructions.

with no specialized present perfect – a present perfect gram has been coined imitating the ‘have’-type perfects found in Icelandic, Swedish, English, as well as similar constructions present in Spanish and French. Canonical examples are *ma pojechane* ‘she has/is gone’ (16.a), *mam zrobione* ‘I have done’ (16.b), and *ma mieszkane* ‘he has lived’ (16.c). This innovative replica is employed in the three senses associated cross-linguistically with the category of present perfect: resultative (16.a), experiential (16.b), and inclusive (16.c). Similarly, past perfect (or pluperfect) and future perfect grams are formed and used accordingly to their cross-linguistic prototypes (see *miała pojechane* ‘she had gone’ in 16.d).³ Another gram replicated in various recipient codes is an unreal counterfactual conditional and/or subjunctive comparable to *habría hecho* ‘I would have done’ and *hubiera hecho* ‘if I had done’ in Spanish (and similar constructions in French, English, and Icelandic). These constructions constitute permanent features of a Polish recipient code, e.g. *byłbym zrobił*,⁴ *byłbym miał zrobił*, *miałbym był zrobił* ‘I would have done / (if/that) I had done’. Lastly, a series of progressive grams (present, past and future) has been introduced to recipient codes in the standard varieties of which such constructions are absent. For example, contrary to Standard Polish – a language with no dedicated progressive gram but only a broader imperfective – Сашко’s Polish exhibits a progressive series that matches the English and Spanish participial or gerundial constructions, e.g. *jestem myślący* ‘I am thinking’ (present progressive in 16.e) and *byłem idący* ‘I was walking’ (past progressive).

(16) Polish recipient code

- a. U-^{XH}Monika ma już pojechane
 Monika has already gone
 ‘Monika is already gone’
- b. Nigdy tego nie mam zrobione
 never this not I.have done
 ‘I have never done this’⁵
- c. Ma tu mieszkane od tylu lat
 he.has here lived from so.many years
 ‘He has lived here for so many years’
- d. Zanim przyszedł ta już miała pojechane
 before he.came that.FM already had gone
 ‘Before he came, she had/was already gone’

³ The imitation of pluperfects found in other languages also leads to an increased usage of the ‘be’-type pluperfect construction in the Polish-based code (e.g. *byłem pojechał* ‘I had gone’), a construction that previously existed in Standard Polish but is currently lost. However, a more direct influence from French (*j’étais allé*) or English (*I was gone*), where the “be” auxiliaries are employed, cannot be ruled out.

⁴ The form *zrobiłbym* which in Standard Polish is commonly used in all counterfactual senses, whether real (‘I would do’) or unreal (‘I would have done’), is almost exclusively used by Сашко to express real counterfactuality.

⁵ Compare with the meaning of this construction in Polish, i.e. ‘I never get this done’.

- e. Jestem myślący że się da
 I.am thinking that REFL it.will.give
 'I am thinking it will be possible'

Pattern borrowing often results in replica grammaticalization. That is, abstract functions conveyed by a construction in the donor language are reconstructed through more concrete lexical elements of the recipient language (cf. Heine, Kuteva 2003; 2005; Matras 2009: 239–240). This creates the impression of advancement along a grammaticalization path (cf. Heine, Kuteva 2003; 2005; Andrason, Visser 2016). For instance, demonstrative pronouns are grammaticalized as definite articles (e.g. *ten* 'this' in Polish); numerals or indefinite pronouns are grammaticalized as indefinite articles (e.g. *jeden* 'one' and *jakiś* 'certain' in Polish); and a possessive resultative construction is grammaticalized as a present perfect (e.g. *mam (to) zrobione* 'I have this done' in Polish).

Complying with several linguistic models of borrowability (Stolz, Stolz 1996; Aikhenvald, Dixon 2001; Ross 2001; Matras 2007; 2009), word order is another area profoundly affected by pattern borrowing. The "free" pragmatically driven word order typical of Slavonic languages (e.g. Polish, Russian, Ukrainian) and to an extent, Romance languages (Spanish) is often used in codes based on Germanic languages (e.g. Icelandic, Swedish, German) (17.a). In such cases, the V2 rule is often preserved too (17.b).⁶

- (17) a. English recipient code
 I yesterday to meet that idiot went
 'Yesterday I went to meet that idiot'
- b. Icelandic recipient code
 Í fyrra var ég auðvitað arabísku læra
 In last.year was I certainly Arabic learn
 'Of course, I was studying Arabic last year'

The polysemy of a lexeme – or the entire map of its senses – can also be copied from a donor code to recipient codes (regarding polysemy copying consult Heine, Kuteva 2005: 100–103 and Matras 2009: 239). For instance, the verb (*to*) *close* is used in the English recipient code in the sense of both 'close' and 'lock' in analogy to the meaning of the verbs *zamknąć* in Polish, *cerrar* in Spanish, and *fermer* in French. The adjectives referring to the colours green and blue may be used synonymously reflecting usage typical in Xhosa, where *luhlaza* means both 'blue' and 'green'. In such cases, they are usually accompanied by a recipient-code's expression 'like sky' or 'like grass', again matching the usage in Xhosa, i.e. *nje ngenca* and *nje ngeisibakabaka*

⁶ It is often difficult to determine which instances of word order permutation constitute cases of borrowing and which should rather be analyzed as code-switching. This stems from the high schematicity of word order patterns. The pattern itself may be entrenched and common; however, its particular instantiation need not be so. On the whole, pragmatically driven word order is a permanent (entrenched and common) feature of the recipient codes whose standard varieties' word order is not principally determined by pragmatics but rather by syntax.

respectively. Lastly, a few lexical calques are found in the analyzed corpus: *ísskáþ/kylskáþ*^{IC} > *ice-board*^{EN} (instead of fridge) and *lód-szafa*^{PL} (instead of *lodówka*); *washing machine*^{EN}/*tvättmaskin*^{SW}/*þvottavél*^{IC} > *maszyna do prania*^{PL} (instead of *pralka*).

4. Interim conclusion and prelude to Part 3

In this paper – the second in the series of three articles dedicated to the idiolect of a hyper-multilingual global nomad, Сашко – I described and analyzed the two language-contact mechanisms common in the discourses produced by multilingual speakers: code-switching and borrowing. The evidence demonstrates that both mechanisms are extensively exploited by Сашко. Three types of code-switching are attested, i.e. insertional, alternational, and congruent. With a few exceptions (e.g. the presence of pronouns in the embedded code in insertional code-switching), the insertional, alternational, and congruent variants exhibit the usual properties associated with each one of them respectively in scholarly literature. Similarly, the two types of borrowing are widely used, i.e. matter and pattern borrowing, with most borrowability tendencies and hierarchies generally respected – despite minor divergences, such as the scarcity of borrowed conjunctions.

In the next paper – the third in the series – following the bottom-up research strategy adopted in this study, I will expand the scope of my discussion from language-contact mechanisms to language-contact types, specifically mixed languages, and ultimately to the translanguaged grammar that typifies Сашко-lect in its entirety.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative; IMP – imperative; INF – infinitive; INSTR – instrumental; INTJ – interjection; LOC – locative; ML – mixed language; MS – masculine; NEG – negative/negator; NML – nominalizer; NOM – nominative; POSS – possessive; PROG – progressive; REFL – reflexive; SG – singular; TAM – tense/aspect/mood; VBL – verbalizer.

Languages: AF – Afrikaans; CZ – Czech; DU – Dutch; EN – English; FA – Fanakalo; FR – French; GAM.EN – Gambian English; IC – Icelandic; IN – Indonesian; IT – Italian; LG – Lingala; LT – Latin; MA – Mandinka; ML – Malay; PL – Polish; RU – Russian; SA.EN – South African English; SP – Spanish; SW – Swedish; TR – Turkish; XH – Xhosa.

References

- Aikhenvald A.Y., Dixon R.M.W. 2001. Introduction. – Aikhenvald A.Y., Dixon R.M.W. (eds.). *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1–26.
- Andrason A., Visser M.W. 2016. Affordances perspective and grammaticalization – incorporation of language, environment and users in the model of semantic paths. – *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 5.4: 663–698.

- Field F.W. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haugen E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. – *Language* 26: 210–231.
- Heine B., Kuteva T. 2003. On contact-induced grammaticalization. – *Studies in Language* 27: 529–572.
- Heine B., Kuteva T. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras Y. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. – Matras Y., Sakel J. (eds.). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 31–73.
- Matras Y. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken P. 1981. Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: The case for relexification. – Highfield A., Valdman A. (eds.). *Historicity and variation in Creole studies*. Ann Arbor: Karoma: 52–78.
- Muysken P. 2000. *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton C. 1993a. *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton C. 1993b. *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton C. 2002. *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton C. 2006. *Multiple voices. An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton C., Jake J. 1995. Matching lemmas in a bilingual competence and production model: Evidence from intrasentential code switching. – *Linguistics* 33.5: 981–1024.
- Myers-Scotton C., Jake J. 2000. Four types of morpheme: Evidence from aphasia, codeswitching, and second language acquisition. – *Linguistics* 38: 1053–1100.
- Myers-Scotton C., Jake J. 2009. A universal model of code-switching and bilingual language processing and production. – Bullock B., Toribio A.J. (eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 336–357.
- Ross M. 2001. Contact-induced change in Oceanic languages in north-west Melanesia. – Aikhenvald A.Y., Dixon R.M.W. (eds.). *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 134–166.
- Sakel J. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. – Matras Y., Sakel J. (eds.). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 15–29.
- Stam N. 2017. *A typology of code-switching in the Commentary to the Félire Óengusso*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Stolz C., Stolz T. 1996. Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch-amerindischer Sprachkontakt Hispanoindiana II. – *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 49: 86–123.
- Winford D. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.